1 (10.00 am) 2 (10.00 am) 3 (10.00 am) 4 (10.00 am) 5 (10.00 am) 5 (10.00 am) 6 (10.00 am) 6 (10.00 am) 6 (10.00 am) 7 (10.00 am) 7 (10.00 am) 8 (10.00 am) 9 (10	1	Tuesday, 5 April 2022	1	article 3 violations but only when they are accompanied
THE CHAIR: Good morning, thank you. Mr Alman, good  morning.  MR ALTMAN: Thank you, chair.  Closing statement by MR ALTMAN  MR ALTMAN: Chair, the purpose of my remarks this morning is to outline counsel to the inquiry's suggested approach to the making of findings of fact by you under the impury's terms of reference. Can I say immediately that a note containing these submissions has already been crimaled to all crow principunts.  So that these listening can follow the remarks I am about to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am about to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make, cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am down to make cent 1 set out my headings. First, I am				•
MR ALTMAN: Think you, chair.  MR ALTMAN: Think you, chair.  MR ALTMAN: Think you, chair.  Choing statement by MR ALTMAN  MR ALTMAN: Chair, the purpose of my remarks this morning is to the making of findings of the find				-
5 MR ALTMAN: Thank you, chair 6 Chosing statement by MR ALTMAN 7 MR ALTMAN: Chair, the purpose of my remarks this morning in 8 to outline coursed to the insquiry's segment of the purpose of my remarks this morning in 9 to the making of findings of the by you under the 10 inquiry's terms of reference. Can I say immediately 11 that a note containing these submissions has already 12 been circulated to all core participants. 13 So that those lishening can follow the remarks I am 14 about to make, can I set out my hondings. First, I am 15 going to deal with what we submit to be the currect 16 approach to the standard of proof, second, the type and 17 quality of evidence required to meet the standard of 18 proof and, third, its application to the evidence the 19 inquiry has received during the course of finde 20 learnings. Finally, I am going to deal with the kind of 21 questions which rought to be considered by you before you 22 arrive at mirvhalud combissions on article 3. 23 So let me start by setting out how the terms of 24 reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will 25 be considering under article 3. 26 So let me start by setting out how the terms of 27 edegrates in which and the particle and the participants of the participant of t				
6 Closing statement by MR ALTMAN 7 MR ALTMAN: Chair, the purpose of my remarks this morning is 8 to outline consule to the inquiry's suggested approach 9 to the making of findings of find by you under the 11 inquiry's terms of reference. Call say immediately 12 been circulated to all core participants. 13 So that those listening can follow the remarks I am 14 about to make, can I set out my headings. First, I am 15 going to deal with what we submit to be the correct 16 approach to the standard of must be standard of for proof second, the type and 17 quality of evidence required to meet the standard of 18 proof and, third, its application to the evidence the 19 inquiry has received during the course of these 19 inquiry has received during the course of these 10 hearings. Finally, I am going to deal with the kind of 10 quantities with the standard of proof so the applied when assessing the credibility of a claim of article 3 mistreatment? 10 a claim of article 3 mistreatment? 11 mistreatment and individual and the standard of proof in the 12 mistreatment of detainces held at 13 Brook House during the course of these house during the received the findings that you, chair, will 14 a conclusions about the treatment of detainces held at 15 a Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is a received well and the remarks of the proof in the reconclusions about the treatment of detainces held at 14 a Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is a received well and the remarks and proof in the resistance. 15 Page 1  16 The terms of reference mortary to degrading preatment of proof in the resistance of methods, policies, practices, et certain, you true, inhuman or 18 degrading reatment or punishment – and then make any 19 will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been in instructment." 19 mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any 10 mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any 11 mistreatment." 12 mistreatment and identifying responsibility		C		
as the making of findings of fact by our undership to the inquiry's suggested approach to the standard of frortiered fact by you undership to inquiry's terms of reference. Can I say immediately industry terms of reference. Can I say immediately in that a note containing these submissions has already in the an ote containing these submissions has already in the standard of about those listening can follow the remarks I am about the standard of proof, second, the type and approach to the standard of proof, second, the type and quality of evidence required to meet the standard of proof of evidence required to meet the standard of proof and, third, its application to the evidence the inquiry has received during the coarse of these bearings. Finally, I am going to deal with the kind of questions which ought to be considered by you before you arrive at individual conclusions on article 3.  So let me start by setting out how the terms of expected colors about the treatment of detainese held at conclusions about the treatment of detainese held at credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to adapting identifying whether there has been mistreatment."  Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment."  Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of the enternation of the complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment."  Point 1 of the terms of reference require imistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require imistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require imistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require imistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, or more vulnerable, or the would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, or the vould reach the high		•		_
to outline counsel to the impairy's suggested approach to the making of findings of fact by you under the judgest stems of reference. Can last jumediately that a note containing these submissions has already to evidence required to meet the standard of proof is obtained when an inequiry flush facts. Inquiries already and the lequiry Rulls of 2006 anot assist, as the year of t		·		
to the making of findings of fact by you under the inquiry's terms of reference. Can I say immediately 10 that a note containing these submissions has already 11 that a note containing these submissions has already 12 been circulated to all core participants. 12 inches those listening can follow the remarks I am 13 about to make, can I set out my headings. First, I am 14 does it amount to article 3 mistreatment; and second, if so, does it amount to article 3 mistreatment and second in the particle 3 mistreatment and second in the particle 3 mistreatment and second in the part	8		1	
inquiry's terms of reference. Can I say immediately that a rote containing these sobmissions has already 11 been circulated oal all one participants.  So that those listening can follow the rerurks I am 13 about to make, can I set out my headings. First, I am 14 about to make, can I set out my headings. First, I am 15 going to deal with what we authorit to be the correct 16 approach to the standard of proof, second, the type and 17 quality of evidence required to meet the standard of 17 quality of evidence required to meet the standard of 18 proof; and, third, its application to the evidence the 19 inquiry has received during the course of these 19 to be earings. Finally, I am going to deal with the kind of 20 questions which ought to be considered by you before you arrive at individual conclusions on a tricle 3. So let me start by setting out how the terms of 23 so let me start by setting out how the terms of 24 reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will 25 be considering under article 3. Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach 20 conclusions about the treatment of detainces held at 22 conclusions about the treatment of detainces held at 23 ericle 3 - that is to say, torture, inhuman or 24 degrading treatment or punishment - and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry 3 with receivant period. Where there is including identifying whether there has been 11 mistreatment. These issues are only 2 mistreatment. These issues are only 2 relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of 14 to such a standard of proof is most unlikely to be approach to the standard of proof. I mean that the chair cannot express him-herself as being burnel, and a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof is most unlikely to be uppropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not prove the implementation of fhose policies, practices, et cetem, or cumulatively if the policies	9		9	-
that a note comaining these submissions has already been circulated to all core participants.  So that those listering on follow the remarks I am about to make, can I set out my headings. First, I am going to deal with what we submit to be the correct approach to the standard of proofs second, the type and proofs and, third, its application to the evidence the imagine to course of these possible to receive the standard of good and, third, its application to the evidence the imagine to course of these possible to redefine the standard of good and, third, its application to the evidence the imagine to course of these possible to the findings that you, chair, will be considered by you before you arrive at individual conclusions on article 3.  So let me start by setting out how the terms of reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will provide the standard of proof as required by the particular factual circumstances.  Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of detainness held at 3 Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is a credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to a degrading treatment or punishment – and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Page 3  The terms of reference invite you to reach degrading treatment or punishment – and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Proof of the terms of reference require in invite you for the proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in mistreatment. These is suese are only related to a depth and proof in the proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in in the proof is of the terms of reference require in the proof is mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment. These issues are only related to a deal of the proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in in the proof is of the terms of reference require in the proof is mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any unlikely	10		10	
been circulated to all core participants.  So that those linening can follow the remarks I am about to make, can its cut any headings. First, I am going to deal with what we submit to be the correct going to edine required to meet the standard of proof to be applied when assessing the credibility of good the proof to be applied when assessing the credibility of good the proof to be applied when assessing the credibility of good to revised and ricide and article and and increase the principles which go admit provide for any burden or standar of proof as required by the particular factual circumstances.  In his ruling on the standard of proof in the  Page 1  Undercover Policing Inquiry, the late Sir Christopher Pitchford concluded:  "1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long a	11		11	First, do the facts give rise to an identifiable
about to make, can I set out my headings. First, I am about to make, can I set out my headings. First, I am approach to the standard of proof; second, the type and quality of evidence required to meet the standard of proof is proof, and, third, its application to the evidence the impairty has received during the course of these pairty at individual conclusions on article 3.  20 hearings. Finally, I am going to deal with the kind of questions which ought to be considered by you before you arrive at individual conclusions on article 3.  21 series are reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will be considering under article 3.  22 arrive at individual conclusions on article 3.  23 So let me start by setting out how the terms of reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will be considering under article 3.  24 reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will a proof to be applied when considering the correct standard of proof is to be applied when an inquiry finds ficts. Inquiries have, therefore, adopted different approaches to the standard of proof as required by the particular factual circumstances.  25 In his ruling on the standard of proof in the Page 3  1 The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of detainees held at Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is credible evidence of mistreatment reotherary to a stuch recommendations as may seem appropriate.  2 Page 1  1 The terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been including identifying whether there has been mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  2 Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies where the policies or the implementation of those policies where the pre	12	been circulated to all core participants.	12	
so going to deal with what we submit to be the correct approach to the standard of proof, second, the type and quality of evidence required to meet the standard of 17 proof and, third, its application to the evidence the inquiry has received during the course of these 19 proof, and, third, its application to the evidence the inquiry has received during the course of these 20 questions which ought to be considered by you before you arrive at individual conclusions on article 3. 20 so let me start by setting out how the terms of 22 reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will 25 be considering under article 3. 23 Leaves the standard of proof in the 24 conclusions about the treatment of detainees held at 3 Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is 2 conclusions about the treatment of detainees held at 3 article 3 - that is to say, torture, inhuman or 6 degrading treatment or punishment – and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate. 8 Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, 10 including identifying whether there has been 11 mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any 12 mistreatment." 12 prints 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require 13 prints 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require 13 prints 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require 14 investigation of methods, policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies 20 were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 thesehold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, to more than 19 professions of susption are permissible. They 25 in policies and practices alone as amounting to 25 comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries are properly	13	So that those listening can follow the remarks I am	13	
may be applied when considering the correct standard of proof to be applied when assessing the credibility of proof, and, third, its application to the evidence the inquiry has received during the course of these questions which ought to be considered by you before you arrive a individual conclusions on article 3.  So let me start by setting out how the terms of reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will be considering under article 3.  Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions on article 3 and the conclusions on article 3.  Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to a still e3 article 3 and the transment of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in the required to adopt any specific standard of proof in mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies and proof in the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon	14	about to make, can I set out my headings. First, I am	14	does it amount to article 3 mistreatment?
proof to be applied when assessing the credibility of a claim of article 3 mistreatment? The Inquiries Act of questions which ought to be considered by you before you arrive at individual conclusions on article 3.  So let me start by setting out how the terms of reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will be considering under article 3.  Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of detainces held at a Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to a degrading treatment or punishment — and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, in cetter, and caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 the standard of proof as required by the particular factual circumstances.  In his ruling on the standard of proof in the Page 3  Undercover Policing Inquiry, the late Sir Christopher Pitchford concluded:  "1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly;  "2) Uniform application of the criminal standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of those policies, practices, tectera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, to the cleaning persons of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, to the cleaning persons of suspecion are permiss	15	going to deal with what we submit to be the correct	15	So with that in mind, what are the principles which
a claim of article 3 mistreatment? The Inquiries Act of inquiry has received during the course of these inquiry has received during the course of these learnings. Finally, I am going to deal with the kind of 20 questions which ought to be considered by you before you arrive at individual conclusions on article 3.  So let me start by setting out how the terms of 24 reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will 25 be considering under article 3.  Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach 2 conclusions about the treatment of detainees held at 3 Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is 24 credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to 3 article 3 - that is to asy, torture, inhuman or 4 degrading treatment or punishment and then make any 3 such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry 3 will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been 3 mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any 3 mistreatment. These issues are only 7 relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of 4 those policies, practices, 9 vere, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that 4 they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered 22 the detained persons vulnerable, to 4 the identified abuse.  A li is our view that you should not identify failures 25 in policies and practices alone as amounting to 25 in policies and practices alone as amounting to 25 in policies and practices alone as amounting to 26 in the proof is the deat and proof in the 20 the detained persons valuerable, to 4 mistreament? The Inquiries Act of 20 the depth provide for any bursted by of the high article 3.  10 including the relevant period. Where there is 2 article 3 mistreament. The inquiries have for a treat and article 3.  11 Undercover Policing Inquiry, the late Sir Christopher Pictheford concluded:  22 "1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof is most unlikely	16	approach to the standard of proof; second, the type and	16	may be applied when considering the correct standard of
page 1  Inquiry has received during the course of these bearings. Finally, I am going to deal with the kind of questions which ought to be considered by you before you arrive at individual conclusions on article 3.  So let me start by setting out how the terms of reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will be considering under article 3.  Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of detainces held at 3 Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to 4 article 3 that is to say, torture, inhuman or 4 degrading treatment or punishment and then make any 7 such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, 10 including identifying whether there has been 11 mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any 12 mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require 12 those policies, practices, et ectera, that caused or contributed to identifiable 13 the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered 2 the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  19 2005 and the Inquiry Rules of 2006 do not assist, as they dorly provide for any burden or standard of proof as required by the particular factual circumstances. In his ruling on the standard of proof in the 2 prichery adoption and proof in the 2 prichery and proof in the 2 prichery and proof in the 2 prichery and proof as a trequired by the particular factual circumstances. In his ruling on the standard of proof in the 12 profession about the treatment and of proof in the 12 profession and proof in the 12 proof in standard of proof in the 12 proof in storage and proof in the 12 proof in storage and proof in the 12 proof in storage and in the fundance of proof in the 12 proof in storage of the criminal standard o	17	quality of evidence required to meet the standard of	17	proof to be applied when assessing the credibility of
bearings. Finally, I am going to deal with the kind of questions which ought to be considered by you before you arrive at individual conclusions on article 3.  So let me start by setting out how the terms of reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will be considering under article 3.  Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of detainces held at Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to a degrading treatment or punishment — and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  20 they don't provide for any burden or standard of proof as tequired when an inquiriries have, therefore, adopted different approaches to the standard of proof as required by the particular factual circumstances.  In his ruling on the standard of proof in the  Page 3  1 Undercover Policing Inquiry, the late Sir Christopher Pitchford concluded:  2 Pitchford concluded:  3 "1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly;  6 "2) Uniform application of the criminal standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being sure that something occurred if it chooses to being sure that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and	18	proof; and, third, its application to the evidence the	18	a claim of article 3 mistreatment? The Inquiries Act of
questions which ought to be considered by you before you arrive at individual conclusions on article 3.  So let me start by setting out how the terms of reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will 24 reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will 25 be considering under article 3.  Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach 2 conclusions about the treatment of detainces held at 3 Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is 4 credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to 5 article 3 - that is to say, torture, inhuman or 6 degrading treatment or punishment - and then make any 7 such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Be Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been 11 mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require 13 relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of 15 those policies, practices, et ectera, of cumulatively if 16 the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that 12 they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered 12 the detained persons vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  21 to be applied when an inquiry finds facts. Inquiries have, therefore, adopted different approaches to the standard of proof as required by the particular factual 24 circumstances.  22 the have, therefore, adopted different approaches to the standard of proof in the 24 circumstances.  23 the value of proof in the 2 Page 3  1 Undercover Policing Inquiry, the late Sir Christopher 2 Pitchford concluded: "1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly; 20 Uniform application of the criminal standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mental the chair cannot express him/herself as being sure that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible a	19	inquiry has received during the course of these	19	2005 and the Inquiry Rules of 2006 do not assist, as
22 arrive at individual conclusions on article 3. 23 So let me start by setting out how the terms of 24 reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will 25 be considering under article 3.  26 Page 1  27 The terms of reference invite you to reach 28 credible evidence of mistreatment of detainces held at 3 Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is 4 credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to 5 article 3 that is to say, torture, inhuman or 6 degrading treatment or punishment and then make any 7 such recommendations as may seem appropriate. 8 Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry 9 will investigate "the treatment of complainants, 10 including identifying whether there has been 11 mistreatment." 12 mistreatment. 13 Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require 14 investigation of methods, policies, practices, 15 et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable 16 instances of mistreatment. These issues are only 17 relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of 18 those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if 19 the policies or the implementation of those policies 20 were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that 21 they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered 22 the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to 23 the identified abuse. 24 It is our view that you should not identify failures 25 in policies and practices alone as amounting to 26 to the extension of the terms of a mountainty failures 27 in policies and practices alone as amounting to 28 the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to 29 the identified abuse. 29 the identified abuse. 20 to fine the standard of proof in the 20 the identified abuse. 20 the identified abuse. 21 the journey of the terms of reference. 22 the identified abuse. 23 the vertherence adopt a different approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full 29 and nuanced approach to the determination of facts. 29 the identified abuse. 20 the identified abuse. 21 the vould reach	20	hearings. Finally, I am going to deal with the kind of	20	they don't provide for any burden or standard of proof
standard of proof as required by the particular factual circumstances.  Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of detainces held at Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to article 3 - that is to say, torture, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate. Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  So let me start by setting out how the terms of proference is accomment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries  standard of proof as required by the particular factual circumstances.  In his ruling on the standard of proof in the  Page 3  Undercover Policing Inquiry, the late Sir Christopher Pitchford concluded:  "1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly;  "2) Uniform application of the criminal standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference.  13 When deciding upon its approach to the	21	questions which ought to be considered by you before you	21	to be applied when an inquiry finds facts. Inquiries
reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will be considering under article 3.  Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of detainees held at Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to article 3 - that is to say, torture, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate. Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  In his ruling on the standard of proof in the  Page 3  Undercover Policing Inquiry, the late Sir Christopher Pitchford concluded:  "1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly;  "2) Uniform application of the criminal standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  "4) The majority of recent public i	22	arrive at individual conclusions on article 3.	22	have, therefore, adopted different approaches to the
Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of detainees held at Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to clegrading treatment or punishment and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate. Point I of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been including identifying whether there has been including identifying responsibility for any mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  Doints 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et e cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered they detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  In his ruling on the standard of proof in the  Page 3  Undercover Policing Inquiry, the late Sir Christopher Pitchford concluded:  "1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly;  "2) Uniform application of the criminal standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry sterms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible	23	So let me start by setting out how the terms of	23	standard of proof as required by the particular factual
Page 1  The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of detainees held at Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to degrading treatment or punishment and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate. Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  Page 3  Undercover Policing Inquiry, the late Sir Christopher Pitchford concluded: "1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly;  "2) Uniform application of the criminal standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the tash which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference.  It is most unlikely to be appropriate.  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to	24	reference relate to the findings that you, chair, will	24	circumstances.
The terms of reference invite you to reach conclusions about the treatment of detainees held at Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to degrading treatment or punishment and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate. Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment."  Point 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  Undercover Policing Inquiry, the late Sir Christopher Pitchford concluded: "1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly;  "2) Uniform application of the criminal standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determinat	25	be considering under article 3.	25	In his ruling on the standard of proof in the
2 conclusions about the treatment of detainees held at 3 Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is 4 credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to 5 article 3that is to say, torture, inhuman or 6 degrading treatment or punishment and then make any 7 such recommendations as may seem appropriate. 8 Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry 9 will investigate "the treatment of complainants, 10 including identifying whether there has been 11 mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any 12 mistreatment." 13 Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require 14 investigation of methods, policies, practices, 15 et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable 16 instances of mistreatment. These issues are only 17 relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of 18 those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if 19 the policies or the implementation of those policies 20 were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that 21 they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered 22 the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to 23 the identified abuse. 24 It is our view that you should not identify failures 25 in policies and practices alone as amounting to 2 Picthford concluded: 3 "1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly; 4 required to adopt any specific standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'unive inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'unive inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'unive inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'unive inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair c		Page 1		Page 3
Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is credible evidence of mistreatment contrary to article 3 — that is to say, torture, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment — and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  Brook House during the relevant to say, torture, inhuman or required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly;  "2) Uniform application of the criminal standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are pr	1	The terms of reference invite you to reach	1	Undercover Policing Inquiry, the late Sir Christopher
required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly;  degrading treatment or punishment and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Point I of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been instreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et ectera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  4 required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long as it acts fairly;  6 "2) Uniform application of the criminal standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, in is does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to of proof.  10 being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to of proof.  11 adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  12 abopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  13 When deciding upon its approach to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  14 If majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the determination of facts.  15 Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require in adopt a flexible and variable approach t	2	conclusions about the treatment of detainees held at	2	Pitchford concluded:
article 3 that is to say, torture, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et ectera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  as it acts fairly;  "2) Uniform application of the criminal standard of proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissibl	3	Brook House during the relevant period. Where there is	3	"1) The panel of a statutory public inquiry is not
degrading treatment or punishment and then make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et et etera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  The policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries	4		4	required to adopt any specific standard of proof so long
such recommendations as may seem appropriate.  Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et ectera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies, practices, et ectera, or cumulatively if those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered they detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  proof is most unlikely to be appropriate, even in inquiries involving grave conduct. However, this does not mean that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  "3) When deciding upon its approach to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full approach to the determination of facts.  "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries	5		5	• '
Point 1 of the terms of reference states the inquiry will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if those policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies or the implementation of those policies the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
will investigate "the treatment of complainants, including identifying whether there has been mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that the chair cannot express him/herself as being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  13		• • • •	· '	1 1 1
including identifying whether there has been mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  In policies and practices alone as amounting to  being 'sure' that something occurred if it chooses to adopt a flexible and variable and variable and variable to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  13 "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  14 "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  25 Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
mistreatment and identifying responsibility for any mistreatment."  12 mistreatment."  13 Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  11 adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof.  12 of proof.  13 "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  14 of proof.  15 which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  18 discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  19 "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  20 Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
mistreatment."  12 of proof.  13 Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require 14 investigation of methods, policies, practices, 15 et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable 16 instances of mistreatment. These issues are only 17 relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of 18 those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if 19 the policies or the implementation of those policies 20 were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that 21 they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered 22 the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to 23 the identified abuse.  16 of proof. 17 an inquiry should have regard to the task 18 which has been set for its terms of reference. As long 19 as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon 19 an approach to findings of fact which best suits 19 discharging the inquiry's terms of reference. 19 "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have 20 found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable 21 approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full 22 and nuanced approach to the determination of facts. 23 "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They 24 are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as 25 in policies and practices alone as amounting to 26 comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
Points 2 to 6 of the terms of reference require investigation of methods, policies, practices, et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  "3) When deciding upon its approach to the standard of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
investigation of methods, policies, practices, et cetera, that caused or contributed to identifiable instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  of proof, an inquiry should have regard to the task which has been set for its terms of reference. As long as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				-
the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures instances of mistreatment. These issues are only the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries		_		
instances of mistreatment. These issues are only relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  16 as he/she acts fairly, the chair is free to decide upon an approach to findings of fact which best suits discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  19 "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have 20 found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  23 "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  relevant to the article 3 assessment if the failure of the failure of the failure of the discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  19 "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  15) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				-
those policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  the policies, practices, et cetera, or cumulatively if discharging the inquiry's terms of reference.  19 "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  23 "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries		•		•
the policies or the implementation of those policies were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  "4) The majority of recent public inquiries have found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
were, by their very nature, of such a poor standard that they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  found it appropriate to adopt a flexible and variable approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
they would reach the high article 3 threshold, rendered the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  21 approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  22 approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  23 "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
the detained persons vulnerable, or more vulnerable, to the identified abuse.  It is our view that you should not identify failures in policies and practices alone as amounting to  and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  Because 32 and nuanced approach to the determination of facts.  They are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
the identified abuse.  23 "5) Expressions of suspicion are permissible. They  24 It is our view that you should not identify failures  25 in policies and practices alone as amounting to  26 comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
24 It is our view that you should not identify failures 24 are properly analysed not as findings of fact, but as 25 in policies and practices alone as amounting to 25 comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries				
25 in policies and practices alone as amounting to 25 comment permitted under section 24(1) of the Inquiries			24	
Page 2 Page 4	25		25	
		Page 2		Page 4

1	Act 2005."	1	In terms of the quality of the evidence required to
2	Sir Christopher Pitchford acknowledged that recent	2	prove such an allegation, European Court in Ananyev took
3	public inquiries have adopted a flexible and variable	3	into account the "objective difficulties" experienced by
4	approach to the standard of proof so as to enable a full	4	prisoners in collecting evidence to substantiate their
5	and nuanced approach to the determination of facts, as	5	claims about conditions in detention. It added that
6	I say. He said that most inquiries, including those	6	an applicant must, nevertheless, provide "an elaborate
7	concerned with homicide, have taken the civil standard	7	and consistent account of the conditions of his or her
8	of proof as their starting point. He relied in part on	8	detention, mentioning the specific elements Only
9	the approach in the Baha Mousa Inquiry.	9	a credible and reasonably detailed description of the
10	In that inquiry, Sir William Gage, who was the	10	allegedly degrading conditions of detention constitutes
11	chair, adopted "the flexible and variable standard of	11	a prima facie case of ill-treatment"
12	proof as applied in the Shipman Inquiry". He explained	12	So, chair, in light of those principles, we consider
13	his approach at paragraph 1.114 of the inquiry's report,	13	that the following approach to the standard of proof and
14	saying:	14	to the quality of the evidence should be followed by
15	" where in this report I use such expressions as	15	you.
16	'I am sure' or 'I have no doubt', I will have found	16	First, a variable and flexible approach to the
17	a fact to the criminal standard. When I state simply	17	standard of proof should be adopted, as was favoured in
18	'I find', the standard of proof will have been the	18	the Baha Mousa and Undercover Policing Inquiries.
19	ordinary civil standard of proof, namely, the balance of	19	Second, as in the Baha Mousa Inquiry, the starting
20	probabilities. Where it is obvious that I have found	20	point should be to apply the civil standard of proof
21	a fact, but have not used the words 'I am sure' or	21	in other words, "on the balance of probabilities"
22	'I find', the standard will have been the civil	22	when determining whether the alleged incidents of
23	standard. All other expressions, such as an expression	23	mistreatment did occur. This recognises the
24	of 'suspicion', will not be a finding of fact, but will	24	inquisitorial nature of inquiry proceedings as compared
25	indicate my state of mind in respect of the issue being	25	with legal proceedings that affect a person's rights,
	Page 5		Page 7
1	considered "	1	liabilities and obligations, and the fact that no
1 2	considered."  Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.	1 2	liabilities and obligations, and the fact that no
2	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.	2	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.
	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate	2 3	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is
2 3 4	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court	2 3 4	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of
2 3	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in	2 3 4 5	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.
2 3 4 5 6	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the	2 3 4 5 6	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so. Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you
2 3 4 5 6 7	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being	2 3 4 5 6 7	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of
2 3 4 5 6	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the	2 3 4 5 6	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of all evidence, including inferences that may flow from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and reasonably detailed".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of all evidence, including inferences that may flow from the facts and the parties' submissions. The European	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and reasonably detailed".  Finally, sixth, consideration must be given to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of all evidence, including inferences that may flow from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and reasonably detailed".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of all evidence, including inferences that may flow from the facts and the parties' submissions. The European Court said that, according to its established case law,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and reasonably detailed".  Finally, sixth, consideration must be given to the difficulties of detained persons in providing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of all evidence, including inferences that may flow from the facts and the parties' submissions. The European Court said that, according to its established case law, proof may follow from the coexistence of sufficiently	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and reasonably detailed".  Finally, sixth, consideration must be given to the difficulties of detained persons in providing corroborating or supporting evidence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of all evidence, including inferences that may flow from the facts and the parties' submissions. The European Court said that, according to its established case law, proof may follow from the coexistence of sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or of similar	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and reasonably detailed".  Finally, sixth, consideration must be given to the difficulties of detained persons in providing corroborating or supporting evidence.  Chair, in order to find an allegation credible, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of all evidence, including inferences that may flow from the facts and the parties' submissions. The European Court said that, according to its established case law, proof may follow from the coexistence of sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or of similar unrebutted presumptions of fact, adding that the level	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and reasonably detailed".  Finally, sixth, consideration must be given to the difficulties of detained persons in providing corroborating or supporting evidence.  Chair, in order to find an allegation credible, you might also wish to consider the following questions:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of all evidence, including inferences that may flow from the facts and the parties' submissions. The European Court said that, according to its established case law, proof may follow from the coexistence of sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or of similar unrebutted presumptions of fact, adding that the level of persuasion necessary for reaching a particular	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and reasonably detailed".  Finally, sixth, consideration must be given to the difficulties of detained persons in providing corroborating or supporting evidence.  Chair, in order to find an allegation credible, you might also wish to consider the following questions: first of all, how clear and detailed is the evidence of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of all evidence, including inferences that may flow from the facts and the parties' submissions. The European Court said that, according to its established case law, proof may follow from the coexistence of sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or of similar unrebutted presumptions of fact, adding that the level of persuasion necessary for reaching a particular conclusion and, in this connection, the distribution of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and reasonably detailed".  Finally, sixth, consideration must be given to the difficulties of detained persons in providing corroborating or supporting evidence.  Chair, in order to find an allegation credible, you might also wish to consider the following questions: first of all, how clear and detailed is the evidence of mistreatment?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of all evidence, including inferences that may flow from the facts and the parties' submissions. The European Court said that, according to its established case law, proof may follow from the coexistence of sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or of similar unrebutted presumptions of fact, adding that the level of persuasion necessary for reaching a particular conclusion and, in this connection, the distribution of the burden of proof, are intrinsically linked to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and reasonably detailed".  Finally, sixth, consideration must be given to the difficulties of detained persons in providing corroborating or supporting evidence.  Chair, in order to find an allegation credible, you might also wish to consider the following questions: first of all, how clear and detailed is the evidence of mistreatment?  Second, are there other similar unrebutted facts
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Chair, we invite you to take a similar approach.  The starting point in relation to the appropriate standard of proof, as stated in European Court jurisprudence is that in cases of ill-treatment in detention under article 3, the court should adopt the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt", or being sure. However, in the case of Ananyev v Russia, the European Court found that it has never been the court's purpose to borrow the approach of the national legal systems that use that standard. Its role is not to rule on criminal guilt or civil liability, but on contracting states' responsibility under the Convention. It adopts conclusions that are supported by the free evaluation of all evidence, including inferences that may flow from the facts and the parties' submissions. The European Court said that, according to its established case law, proof may follow from the coexistence of sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or of similar unrebutted presumptions of fact, adding that the level of persuasion necessary for reaching a particular conclusion and, in this connection, the distribution of the burden of proof, are intrinsically linked to the specificity of the facts, the nature of the allegations	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	participant in the proceedings has a "case" to prove.  Third, where, however, you are "sure" which is the criminal standard that an alleged incident of mistreatment did occur, it may be appropriate to say so.  Fourth, at the other end of the spectrum, where you are unable to reach a conclusion "on the balance of probabilities", it may, nevertheless, be appropriate to record a "possibility" or a "suspicion".  Fifth, to find a violation of article 3, there must be "sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or similar unrebutted presumptions of fact". The supporting evidence must be "elaborate and consistent mentioning the specific elements credible and reasonably detailed".  Finally, sixth, consideration must be given to the difficulties of detained persons in providing corroborating or supporting evidence.  Chair, in order to find an allegation credible, you might also wish to consider the following questions: first of all, how clear and detailed is the evidence of mistreatment?  Second, are there other similar unrebutted facts that have been established?

1	consistent with any other account the complainant has	1	arouses in the victim feelings of fear, anguish and
2	given, or with other evidence independent of his	2	inferiority, capable of humiliating and debasing. As
3	account?	3	was said in the case of Rooman v Belgium in the European
4	Fourth, what other evidence is there to support	4	Court, although the question whether the purpose of the
5	a complaint of mistreatment? In this regard, the	5	treatment is to humiliate or debase a victim is a factor
6	absence of evidence in support is not determinative.	6	to take into account, the absence of such a purpose
7	Fifth, what is the quality of that evidence?	7	cannot conclusively rule out a finding of a violation of
8	Sixth, is there any evidence that contradicts or	8	article 3.
9	rebuts the account? If so, what is the quality of that	9	In terms of vulnerability and mental illness, the
10	evidence?	10	case of Rooman sets out the principles to be followed,
11	Seventh, if rebuttal evidence ought to have existed	11	and they are these:
12	and doesn't for example, because there are missing	12	First, detainees are in a vulnerable position and
13	records what, if any, inferences can be drawn from	13	the authorities are under a duty to correct them.
14	their absence?	14	Second, detainees with mental disorders are more
15	Let me now move on, please, to what type of	15	vulnerable than ordinary detainees.
16	treatment can be considered as article 3 mistreatment.	16	Third, certain requirements of detained life pose
17	Article 3 speaks of "inhuman or degrading treatment or	17	a greater risk that their health will suffer,
18	punishment". The word "punishment" may be given its	18	exacerbating the risk that they suffer from a feeling of
19	ordinary meaning. European Court case law tends to	19	inferiority and are necessarily a source of stress and
20	focus more on the words "inhuman or degrading" while the	20	anxiety. In such circumstances, there must be increased
21	words "treatment or punishment" have attracted little	21	vigilance in reviewing whether article 3 has been
22	attention, but, by way of example, the European Court	22	complied with.
23	has found that the imposition of a disciplinary	23	Fourth, and finally, the assessment must also take
24	punishment by the segregation of prisoners who suffer	24	into consideration the possibility that a detainee may
25	from serious mental disturbance runs counter to the	25	be unable to complain coherently, or at all, about how
	Page 9		Page 11
1	magningments of article 2. It would therefore he areas	1	they are haine affected by any monticular treatment
	requirements of article 3. It would therefore be open	2	they are being affected by any particular treatment.
2	to you, chair, to find that it was "punishment", for	3	So, chair, with all of that in mind, the following
3 4	instance, if a detained person was moved to the CSU, the	4	non-exhaustive list of questions may assist you when making a determination about whether and what treatment
5	Care and Separation Unit, in Brook House, by the improper or deliberate misapplication of rules 40 or 42.	5	constitutes an article 3 breach.
6	What about "torture"? Before treatment or	6	First of all, was the treatment or punishment
7	punishment can be characterised as "torture", it must be	7	physical or verbal?
8	deliberate, inhuman treatment, causing very serious and	8	Second, what was the severity of the treatment or
9	cruel suffering. It has to "attain a minimum level of	9	•
10	severity", considering all the circumstances of the	10	punishment? Third, what was its duration?
	_		
11	case, such as the duration, the physical or mental	11	Fourth, was there any racist, religious or
12	effects of that treatment or punishment, and the age and state of health of the victim.	12	homophobic element to it?
13		13	Fifth, was there an intention to humiliate and
14	The important point to note is that a very high	14	degrade?
15	degree of physical suffering, and often humiliation	15	Sixth, what was the physical or mental effect of the
16	intentionally inflicted by someone acting officially, is	16	treatment or punishment?
17	needed to reach the minimum level of suffering in order	17	Seventh, if it was physical, did the detained person
18	to qualify as torture. An episode of relatively short	18	suffer injuries?
19	duration wouldn't likely reach the necessary level of	19	Eighth, if it was mental, was there mental suffering
20	suffering and humiliation to qualify as torture. If the	20	as a result?
21	treatment or punishment did not amount to torture, the	21	Ninth, was the detained person's state of physical
22	question then is whether the treatment was "inhuman or	22	or mental health such as to make him more vulnerable to
23	degrading".	23	the treatment or punishment?
24	It is "inhuman" if it causes intense physical or	24	Tenth, did the detained person's age make him
25	mental suffering. It is "degrading" if the treatment	25	particularly vulnerable to the treatment or punishment?
	Page 10		Page 12
	U		<u> </u>

1	And eleventh, bearing in mind all the circumstances	1	to try my absolute best.
2	of the case, three further sub-questions, as it were:	2	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
3	First of all, was it torture? Did it amount to	3	MS HARRISON: Can I say then in as we did in opening, we
4	deliberate, inhuman treatment causing very serious and	4	highlighted the two main tasks for the inquiry in its
5	cruel suffering, such that it obtained a minimum level	5	evidential phases. The first was to bring to light the
6	of severity considering all of the circumstances.	6	full facts of what happened at Brook House; identify the
7	Second, further or alternatively, was it inhuman	7	dangerous policies, practices, management and
8	treatment or punishment? Did it cause intense physical	8	arrangements that caused or contributed to mistreatment;
9	or mental suffering?	9	identify responsibility for any mistreatment to inform
10	And finally, third, further or alternatively, was it	10	what remedial course of action is necessary and prevent
11	degrading treatment or punishment? Did it arouse in the	11	its recurrence. That is of particular importance in
12	victim feelings of fear, anguish and inferiority,	12	this inquiry because, as we now know, there have been
13	capable of humiliating and debasing?	13	numerous past investigations, reviews and test cases,
14	So, chair, that is all I propose saying by way of	14	all of which have failed to achieve that critical goal.
15	closing remarks on behalf of counsel to this inquiry.	15	The second important task for the inquiry in its
16	You may now wish to invite the core participants to	16	evidential phases was to give the former detained
17	address you, beginning with counsel on behalf of D1527,	17	persons an important opportunity to confront those
18	D523, D2077, D1538, D313, D1914 and Reverend	18	responsible for their mistreatment and abuse and on
19	Nathan Ward.	19	an equal footing. It is an important part of
20	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Altman, I am grateful.	20	restorative justice to be able to question and hold to
21	Ms Harrison, I am grateful.	21	account not just the frontline staff who perpetrated
22	Closing statement by MS HARRISON	22	acts of violence, physical and mental abuse,
23	MS HARRISON: Chair, if I could clarify, as I did in	23	humiliation, medical neglect and disregard of their
24	opening, it is my intention to make submissions on the	24	suffering and denial of their human dignity, but also
25	systems and institutional failures, the generic issues	25	the absent, complicit and complacent senior managers
	Page 13		Page 15
1	that arise in the context of this inquiry. I do so on	1	running the centres and sitting in corporate offices of
2	behalf of all of the core participants represented by	2	G4S and the Home Office.
3	Duncan Lewis Solicitors and Bhatt Murphy Solicitors, but	3	The latter has always been a priority for the
4	my submissions will be followed by Ms Morris on behalf	4	individual core participants, who want to ensure that
5	of Reverend Nathan Ward. In terms of addressing the	5	the mistreatment and abuse that they experienced is not
6	criminal question for the individuals, whether there is	6	repeated. This has been at some personal cost for many
7	credible evidence in the case of mistreatment, and their	7	of them, but they have been willing to relive these
8	links to the systemic and institutional issues that	8	traumatic and life-changing experiences to achieve that
9	I will outline, that will be addressed first by	9	purpose. Putting their experience and their wishes at
10	Mr Goodman, on behalf of the Duncan Lewis core	10	the heart of this inquiry in these hearings as you,
11	participants, along with Mr Lee, and, finally, on behalf	11	chair, promised, has been achieved, but it now must be
12	of the individual core participants, represented by	12	your task to deliver that in respect of your findings
13	Bhatt Murphy Solicitors, that will be by	13	and recommendations, to ensure, as they wish, that
14	Ms Shu Shin Luh.	14	no one else suffers what they did whilst detained at
15	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Harrison.	15	Brook House.
16	MS HARRISON: I hope that we can conclude that within the	16	Medical Justice and Nathan Ward want the impunity
17	two hours we have been allocated.	17	that has marked the system for so long to end. They
18	THE CHAIR: Am I right in understanding we will hear from	18	know all too well, from direct knowledge of the
19	you for the first hour, and then, I assume, at that	19	institutions, and bitter experience, that the sacking of
20	point, we will maybe take our morning break and then we	20	a handful of custody officers, albeit guilty of grave
21	will pass to others who are going to represent	21	misconduct, did not beginning to identify or address the
22	individual clients?	22	root causes or contributory factors in the mistreatment
23	MS HARRISON: I think it is intended I will conclude my	23	that occurred and was allowed to go unchecked for so
24	submissions, then we will have the break, and then go on	24	long.
25	to I get the indication of the hour, and I am going	25	Previous abuse scandals at Oakington in 2005,
	- o o o- mo nom, and r am going		<i>5</i> ,
	Page 14	L	Page 16

1	Yarl's Wood in 2004, 2014 and 2015 at Medway, and of	1	of sight. This is how the regime operated on
2	course Mr Shaw's review in 2016 that identified	2	a day-to-day basis and what was the day-to-day
3	practices that were an affront to civilised society,	3	experience of those incarcerated within it. It has, of
4	none of this resulted in the change needed to prevent	4	course, been profoundly disturbing to witness repeated
5	the abuse scandal at Brook House in 2017.	5	physical abuse, the severe mental anguish and the denial
6	Those measures were still not in place to prevent	6	of human dignity. Both Owen Syred and Callum Tulley
7	inhumane conditions in Brook House in 2020, as the IMB	7	described alarming incidents of abuse well
8	report so graphically exposed, and they are certainly	8	before April 2017. It has been harrowing to hear the
9	not present in 2022 and at the time when intense	9	direct evidence of detainees who were brutalised by what
10	enforcement practices of the past will shortly resume to	10	Dr Paterson has described as the "corrupted" and "toxic"
11	pre-pandemic levels and incidence.	11	environment marked by violence, chaos, disrespect,
12	We commend the inquiry for the rigour with which it	12	disregard and callous indifference to fundamental rights
13	has sought to fulfil its functions commensurate with the	13	and human suffering. It has been equally disconcerting
14	importance of the rights at stake in article 3. Once	14	to listen to custody officers, who, even in oral
15	the inquiry went beyond the Panorama programme itself,	15	evidence, maintained patently untrue accounts or claimed
16	it has uncovered through unbroadcast BBC footage, CCTV,	16	no memory in the face of incontrovertible evidence of
17	body-worn and handheld camera footage, pages of	17	misconduct and cover-up and who have sought to deflect
18	transcripts and reams of documents and, of course, the	18	responsibility, even to Callum Tulley, accusing him of
19	written and oral testimony of individuals and the	19	misrepresenting them, inciting them or failing, himself,
20	extensive case summaries that Medical Justice was able	20	to report the misconduct.
21	to provide to the inquiry, that the Panorama programme	21	Several of these officers still work at Brook House
22	was not the end and limits of the abuse.	22	and whose misconduct was not caught on camera and has
23	This inquiry has uncovered shocking patterns of	23	only been fully exposed by the inquiry but they remain
24	inhumane and degrading treatment of detained persons,	24	in post. Some, like Mr Loughton and Mr Dix, have even
25	central to which is the overuse and misuse of force and	25	been promoted.
	Page 17		Page 19
1	segregation, often without lawful authority or	1	Ben Saunders, the director, adopted a not dissimilar
2	justification, and segregation used as punishment. The	2	approach to his responsibility for a fundamental failure
3	normalisation of the infliction of pain, suffering and	3	of management and oversight. He, too, blamed
4	humiliation, even whilst detained when naked, as we saw	4	Callum Tulley for not reporting abuse to him. Despite
5	in the case of D1234, or even when so emaciated the	5	his own obvious culpability, he was allowed to resign
6	person could barely hold his own body weight; D2159 is	6	and work elsewhere for another private contractor,
7	an example of that.	7	Mitie, involved in immigration enforcement.
8	In addition we have seen extensive evidence of the	8	In our system of justice, lessons are not learned
9	pervasive, violent, derogatory and debasing verbal	9	unless you are willing to confront and accept
10	abuse, and in addition, racism, vitriolic, casual and	10	misconduct, wrongdoing and failings that harm others.
11	institutional, underscored by an underlying lack of	11	Peter Neden and Jerry Petherick, both G4S senior
12	empathy, even when individuals are at their most	12	corporate managers did not accept their own culpability
13	distressed and vulnerable, even in life- or potentially	13	or responsibility for the dysfunctional senior
14	life-threatening situations.	14	management team at Brook House of which they were aware
15	Mr Collier has told us that even this material	15	from at least 2014, but at least they recognised that
16	relating to use of force is not complete. He identified	16	there must have been serious failure on the part of G4S
17	in, of the 93 cases of use of force during the period,	17	because this abuse and mistreatment occurred.
18	that there may well be other incidents of misuse of	18	Not so its managing director, Gordon Brockington,
19	force, but the paucity of documentary material, the	19	with his prepared script, his dissembling, evasion and
20	failure of oversight and investigation, the limits of	20	denials, his evidence alone exposes why G4S was not
21	the PSU complaints procedure, means that that full	21	a fit and proper company to have carried on with the
22	picture is still not, and will now never be, properly	22	contract after 2017 and should not now be entrusted with
23	made available to this inquiry.	23	public functions in the containment and care of
24	We can say then, without any doubt, this is not	24	prisoners or detainees.
25	a case of isolated incidents by isolated individuals out	25	The evidence of senior Home Office officials
	•		
	Page 18		Page 20
	<del></del>		<del></del>

a state body that a driven by political importances to administrative convenience. It religants as afigurating of definition to a virtual focusor in a contract that of orderinance to a virtual focusor in a contract that of orderinance to a virtual focusor in a contract that of orderinance to a virtual focusor in a contract that of orderinance to a virtual focusor in a contract that of confidence to a virtual focusor in a contract that of confidence to a virtual focusor in criticisms of its confidence to a virtual focusor in criticisms of its confidence to a virtual focusor in criticisms of its confidence to a virtual focusor in criticisms of its confidence to a virtual focusor in criticisms of its confidence in criticisms of its confidence in criticisms of its policies and product of civeree, Stephen Slaw.  10 That described a deprivation of safeguands to protect deduction, according to 2017 and it is till continuing. The institutional culture of hullying and intimidation, according to the adverse impacts on those it detains, and is appointed in civeree, Stephen Slaw.  11 In selectary earwher about its legal dulines and the top central field the production of the country in the contract of abuse and mistreatment of the top central field to a contract the repeat of abuse and mistreatment of country and the contract of abuse and mistreatment of country and the contract of abuse and mistreatment of country and the contract of abuse and mistreatment of country and the contract of abuse and mistreatment of country and calculation of the country and calculation and calculation of the country and calculation of the country				
administrative convenience. It religates safigurating of defainces to a virtual fonomete in a contract that of puts cost-cutting ever safety and care. It also confirmed the trute distinction is critical to the puts cost-cutting ever safety and care. It also confirmed the trute distinction is critical to the sections, failures of its policies and practices, whether by oversight bodies, judges, corrones, or its own appointed reviews. Stapher Shaw.  It is clearly cavalier about its legal duties and the apparently indifferent to ensuring the necessary changes to prevent the repeat of abuse and misteratment contract that backed in disgravold joint saffing levels, a hard single and innovation in staff manubes. He was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting contract that backed in disgravold joint saffing levels, a hard significant discutions, was all to the responsibility. It simply cannot be deliver a safe environment' and claimed that the rule 35  Plag 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no yostemic failure in 2017.  This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful deliver a safe environment' and claimed that the rule 35  Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no yostemic failure in 2017.  This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful deliver a safe environment' and claimed that the rule 35  Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no yostemic failure in 2017.  This is not real concern, the same pattern of wilful deliver a safe environment' and claimed that the rule 35  Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no yostemic failure in 2017.  1 the individual of Hone Office responsibility. It simply cannot the head over many weeks and it must not which Mr Rikey, even now, is apparently oblicious.  1 The institute of the inhumane conditions operating at the head over many weeks and it must form your recommendations.  1 Their artitude and analysis of the events at  1 deterior on place and policy and practices	1	Mr Cheeseman, Mr Schoenenberger and Mr Riley confirm	1	Fundamental remedial action needs to be taken and
diminished this imperative. If anything, it has only of detunes to a virtual formore in a contract that 5 puts cost-cutting over self-yand care. It also 6 puts cost-cutting over self-yand care. It also 6 put confirmed the utter disinterest in criticions of its 6 actions, failures of its policies and practices, whether 9 by oversight bodies, judges, corones, or its own 10 appointed reviewer, Stephen Shaw. 10 Me Michelle Brown, one of the longest-serving G4S manager is also continuing. She says at paragraph 12 the adverse impacts on those it detains, and is 12 or fire where the repeat of baues and mastreatment 14 to prevent the repeat of baues and mastreatment 15 occurring. 15 Phil Riley did not look much beyond limited 16 Phil Riley did not look much beyond limited 17 contractual twenking and increase in staff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting 18 a harsh regime and impoverished conditions would have 20 detaines as well as a complete collapse of the rule 35 process. 21 phil Riley, without invny, said that the Home Office 23 personal part of the reconciled with the evidence that the rule 35 process. 22 There is evidence of increased complaints over the 23 paragraphy lower of the responsibility. It simply cannot 4 denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot 5 be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has 6 head over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, 15 apparently oblivious. 11 the rungiry makes and it mast from your 12 recommendations. 22 the managers of the MB on the Home Office's response to the remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreament 12 exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the 18 determining entries function, to identify why mistreament 14 the numbers and increased 24 pages 24 but the was no highly makes and it matter flowers at 15 pages 25 process. 25 he and there was no highly read of the responsability of the reconsidering and implementing any recommendations that 16 the report manager of the responsability of the revents at	2	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		• •
of detainers to a virtual frottone in a contract that  for puts cost-cutting over safety and care. It also  confirmed the utter distributest in criticisms of its  sactions, failures of its policies and practices, whether  by oversight bodies, adaptes, cornoers, or its own  appointed reviewer, Stephen Shaw.  This clearly exadier about its legal duties and  the adverse impacts on those it detains, and is  apparently indifferent to ensuring the necessary changes  the province in the repeat of abuse and mistreatment  to prevent the repeat of abuse and mistreatment  for contractual towesking and increase in staff numbers. He  was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting  contract that backed in diagnosuly low staffing levels,  a hand regime and impoverished conditions would have  an impact on welfare. "May be other operations", he  go specialed, "but not welfared."  The IMPS 2021 report found high incidence of  vulnerability, mental liteses, self-harm and there is  a clear correlation between increased use of froce and  self-actions are well as a complete collapse of the rule 35  process.  Page 21  The incidence of increased complaints over the  use and missue of force. This is critical to the  inquiry's considerations because it shows without any  doubt that the key themese that have led to a cycle of  Page 23  This of real concern, the same pattern of wilful  denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot  be neconciled with the evidence that the inquiry's  sis apparently oblivious.  This is important because it is the minded and  attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for  considering and implementing any recommendations for  considering and implementing any recommendations for  considering and implementing any recommendations for  the inquiry makes and it must from your  recommendations.  Their attitude and analysis of the events at  the branch of real concern, the same pattern of wilful  defention of real process, and the proposition of the problem and an an acknowledgment:  "In ca	3			
Dr Hard described a deprivation of safeguards to confirmed the utter disinterest in criticisms of its a cations, fullers of its policies and practices, whether by oversight bodies, judges, coroners, or its own popointed reviewers. Stephen Shaw.  10 uppointed reviewers. Stephen Shaw.  11 It is clearly cavalier about its legal duties and 11 apparently indifferent to ensuing the necessary changes 14 to prevent the repeat of abuse and mistreatment 15 occurring.  16 Phil Riley did not look much beyond limited 15 contractual tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original comercuting 19 contract that baked in dangerously low staffing levels, a harsh regime and impoverished conditions would have 20 detained as a complete collapse of the rule 35 process. Page 21  10 apparently oblivious.  11 a place of the contractual tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original comercuting 19 contract that baked in dangerously low staffing levels, a harsh regime and impoverished conditions would have 20 detainces as well as a complete collapse of the rule 35 process.  12 Phil Riley, without irony, said that the Home Office 23 had "aken every step we could take proportionately to 24 deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35 process.  17 Page 21  18 yaystem had now been improved and even that there was no systemic finiture in 2017.  29 Systemic finiture in 2017.  20 Systemic finiture in 2017.  21 Page 23  22 Page 23  23 Page 24  24 page 24  25 deliver a safe environment, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office responsibility, 18 simply cannot 4 be responsible for 10 considerance that the inquiry has 6 heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  25 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office responsibility, 18 simply cannot 4 better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent human conditions occurring and which are the response which are the inquiry's support of	4			
actions, failures of its policies and practices, whether by oversight bodies, judges, coroners, or is own appointed reviewer, Stephen Shaw.  It is clearly eardiar about its legal duties and the adverse impacts on those it detains, and is apparently indifferent to ensuring the accessary changes.  It is clearly eardiar about its legal duties and the prevent the repeat of abuse and mistreatment cocurring.  Phil Riley did not look much beyond limited commutati tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting contract that baked in disagrously low staffing levels, an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he specially without irrory, said that the Home Office bad "taken every step we cruld take proportionately to deliver as afte environment" and chaimed that the rule 35  Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017.  3 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful definite for exponsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weaks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementation and policy and practices and abuse was allowed to reoceur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the determinent of the cu	5			
actions, failures of its policies and practices, whether by overeight bodies, judges, coroners, or its own opportunit roviewer, Stephen Shaw.  It is clearly cavalier about its legal duties and the adverse impacts on those it defains, and is apparently indifferent to ensuring the necessary changes to prevent the repeat of abuse and mistreatment to prevent the repeat of abuse of the repeat of th	6	puts cost-cutting over safety and care. It also		
by oversight bodies, judges, coroners, or its own appointed reviews. Stephen Shaw.  If it is clearly evaluate about its legal duties and the adverse impacts on those it detains, and is apparently indifferent to ensuing the necessary changes to prevent the repeat of abuse and mistreament coccurring.  Phil Riley, did not look much beyond limited contractual twenking and increases in stuff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting contractual twenking and increases in stuff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting contractual twenking and improversibed conditions would have an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he phil Riley, without irony, said that the Home Office deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35 deliver a safe environment and claimed that the rule 35 deliver a safe environment and claimed that the rule 35 be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious. Their attitude and analysis of the events at the inquiry makes and it must inform your response of the witness statement:  The IMBs 2021 report found high incidence of valuer and himse the server to managing the detainces."  The IMBs 2021 report found high incidence of valuer and himse testor to managing the detainces."  The is might a detain to ever the time of the responsibility of the repossibility, mental illness, self-harm and there is a clear correlation between increased use of force and self-ment in the second that the rule 35 process.  Phil Riley, without irony, said that the Home Office and flavor every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment and claimed that the rule 35  Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no system in almost very mach in play.  1 the solution of the responsibility of the simply connot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has for heart of the proper provi	7	confirmed the utter disinterest in criticisms of its	7	protect detainees from harm was a significant factor in
It is clearly evaluer about its legal duties and It does not not be to be seen to prevent the repeat of abuse and instructment to prevent the repeat of abuse and in more staff numbers. He to contractual tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He to substitute the following and abusive behaviour towards myself, staff and detaineds.  The IMB's 2021 report found high incidence of vulnerability, mental illness, self-harm and there is a clear correlation between increased use of force and segregation as the first resort to managing vulnerable detaineds as welfare. Maybe other operations <sup>1</sup> , he speculated, but not welfare.  Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017.  2 system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017.  3 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has a flowed to recour in 2017, again only even many years, and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  This is important because it is the mindest and attitude of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your ecommendations.  This is important because it is the mindest and albuse was allowed to recour in 2017, again only expensed and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  Their artitude and analysis of the events at the inquiry's remai	8			_
It is clearly cavalier about its legal duties and the adverse impacts on those it defaints, and is apparently indifferent to ensuring the necessary changes to prevent the repeat of abuse and mistreatment cocurring.  Phil Riley did not look much beyond limited contractual tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting contractual tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting contractual tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting contractual tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He as was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting contractual tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He as mingact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he phil Riley, without irony, said that the Home Office lad "aken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35  Page 21  System had now been improved and even that there was no system; failure in 2017. This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful defailed of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious. This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations. Their attitude and analysis of the events at Hoso khouse provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to recoear in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the delention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not be been admed from past abuse seandls and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action	9		9	
the adverse impacts on those it detains, and is apparently indifferent to ensuring the necessary changes to prevent the repeat of abuse and mistreatment occurring.  Phil Riley did not look much beyond limited recontractal tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original comer-curring contract that baked in diagrerously low staffing levels, a harm fegine and impoverished conditions would have an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he speculated, "but not welfare."  Phil Riley, without irrony, said that the Home Office thad "taken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35  Page 21  system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017.  This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has be read over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious. This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it not cour, why lessons have not been learned from past subuse scandials and even from this detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not be been learned from past abuse scandials and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another and accertain the inquiry effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.	10	appointed reviewer, Stephen Shaw.	10	
apparently indifferent to ensuring the necessary changes to prevent the repeat of abuse and mistreatment to to prevent the repeat of abuse and mistreatment to the repeat of abuse and mistreatment to the provincing.  Phil Riley did not look much beyond limited contractual twesking and increase in staff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original convertuing contract that baked in dangerously low staffing levels, a harsh regime and impoverished conditions would have an almage on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he provided in an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he provided in the repeat of the rule 35 process.  Phil Riley, without irony, said that the Home Office thad "taken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35 process.  Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017.  3 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office reponsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  3 This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  14 Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining ensuial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Mires and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not be been learned from past abuse scandials and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another and acumulative effect of their concerns amounted to the inhumane conditions occurry and which are response owners. In 1011, this population, did not prevent inhumane conditions oppora	11	,	11	managers is also continuing. She says at paragraph 12
to prevent the repeat of abuse and mistreatment occurring.  16 Phil Riley did not look much beyond limited contractual tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting contract that baked in dangerously low staffing levels, a harsh regime and impoverished conditions would have an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he speculated, "but not welfare".  22 speculated, "but not welfare".  23 Phil Riley, without irrony, said that the Horne Office had "taken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35 deliver a safe environment and claimed that the rule 35 a system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017.  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017.  1 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful definal of Horne Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has a spaperarily oblivious.  3 This is in protrant because it is the mindest and a tittudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  10 the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  11 Erio staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions operating at the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  12 Eros house many sear, including in 2017, still remain very much in play.  13 It is also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  14 Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to coccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the de	12		12	
bill Riley did not look much beyond limited contractal tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He was unable to accept that the original comer-cutting contract that baked in dangerously low staffing levels, a harsh regime and improverished conditions would have a phill Riley, without irony, said that the Home Office that "taken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35 deliver a safe environment and condition systemic failure in 2017. This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious. This is important because it is the mindset and a tittudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations. Their attitude and analysis of the events at the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations. Their attitude and analysis of the events at the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations. Their attitude and analysis of the events at the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations. Their attitude and analysis of the events at the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations. Their attitude and analysis of the events at the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another and acumulative effect of their concerns amounted to the long of this, if you persis."  The Home Office's response was:  "It is all about process. We have the right, we have the process, so there is plat, we have process, so there is plat, we have pro	13	apparently indifferent to ensuring the necessary changes	13	"I left in November 2020, as I still observed
16 Phil Riley did not look much beyond limited 17 contractual tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He 18 was unable to accept that the original comer-cutting 19 contract that baked in dangerously low staffing levels, 20 a harsh regime and impoverished conditions would have 21 an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he 22 speculated, "but not welfare". 23 Phil Riley, without irony, said that the Home Office 24 had "taken every step we could take proportionately to 25 deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35  26 Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no 2 systemic failure in 2017. 3 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful 4 denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot 5 be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has 6 head over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, 10 is apparently oblivious.  8 This is important because it is the mindset and 9 attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for 10 considering and implementing any recommendations that 11 the inquiry makes and it must inform your 12 recommendations. 13 Their attitude and analysis of the events at 14 Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's 15 remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment 16 and abuse was allowed to recour in 2017, again only 17 exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the 18 detention system, regime and policy and practices 18 analose was allowed to recour in 2017, again only 19 seen learned from past abuse scandals and even from this 20 one, five years on, and what effective remedial action 21 abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found 22 a shuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found 23 abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found 24 a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to 25 inhumane treatment of the entire population.	14		14	
vulnerability, mental illness, self-harm and there is a clear correlation between increased use of force and segregation as the first resort to managing vulnerable detaines as well as a contract that baked in dangerously low staffing levels, a harsh regime and impoverished conditions would have an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he speculated, "but not welfare".  Phil Riley, without irrory, said that the Home Office had "taken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35  Page 21  Page 21  Page 23  Page 23  Page 23  Page 23  Page 23  Page 23  It assues over many years, including in 2017, still remain very much in play.  It also shows that contractual numbers and increased the tree the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilfful denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has followed by the considering and implementing any recommendations.  This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your remaining crucial fination, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices association or, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another one, five years on, and what effective remedial action a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.	15		15	detainees."
a celar correlation between increased use of force and segregation as the first resort to managing vulnerable detainces as well as a complete collapse of the rule 35 process.  Phil Riley, without irony, said that the Home Office sequence of the rule 35 process.  Page 21 Page 21 Page 25  Page 31 It is so freal concern, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be been conciled with the evidence that the inquiry has been soccurring and which are the inquiry makes and it must inform your reconsidering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the determion system, regime and policy and policy and practices and a subse seandal in Brook House in 2000 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to 25 inhumane treatment of the entire population.	16	Phil Riley did not look much beyond limited	16	The IMB's 2021 report found high incidence of
contract that baked in dangerously low staffing levels, a harsh regime and impoverished conditions would have an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he speculated, "but not welfare." 22 speculated, "but not welfare". 23 Phil Riley, without irony, said that the Home Office had "taken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35 doubt that the key themes that have led to a cycle of Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017. 3 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful definited for the expensibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  8 This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  13 Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's to exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices and subse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  20 abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  21 acumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.	17	contractual tweaking and increase in staff numbers. He	17	vulnerability, mental illness, self-harm and there is
a harsh regime and impoverished conditions would have an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he speculated, "but not welfare."  Page 21 There is evidence of increased complaints over the bad "taken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35 deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35 deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35 doubt that the key themes that have led to a cycle of Page 21  Page 21  Page 23  Page 23  Page 21  Page 23  Page 23  It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  By and "taken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35 doubt that the key themes that have led to a cycle of Page 23  Page 21  Page 23  It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  By an abuse over many years, including in 2017, still remain very much in play.  It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  By an abuse over many years, including in 2017, still remain very much in play.  It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  By an abuse over many years, including in 2017, still remain very much in play.  It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the b	18	was unable to accept that the original corner-cutting	18	a clear correlation between increased use of force and
an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he speculated, "but not welfare".  23 Phil Riley, without irony, said that the Home Office had "taken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35  24 bad "taken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35  25 Page 21  26 Page 23  27 Page 23  28 Page 23  29 Page 23  20 Page 23  20 Page 23  21 abuse over many years, including in 2017, still remain very much in play.  21 At loss shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the reduit of force.  29 This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  20 There is evidence of increased complaints over the use and misuse of force. This is critical to the inquiry's considerations because it shows without any doubt that the key themes that have led to a cycle of Page 23  21 Page 23  22 There is evidence of increased complaints over the use and misuse of force. This is critical to the inquiry's consideration specture is shows without any doubt that the key themes that have led to a cycle of Page 23  22 Page 23  23 Abuse over many years, including in 2017, still remain very much in play.  24 It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  28 It is stark and important to recall the evidence of the inhumane conditions occurring at the inquiry's response. She said there was nothing, not even an acknowledgment:  29	19	contract that baked in dangerously low staffing levels,	19	segregation as the first resort to managing vulnerable
speculated, "but not welfare".  23	20	a harsh regime and impoverished conditions would have	20	detainees as well as a complete collapse of the rule 35
23	21	an impact on welfare. "Maybe other operations", he	21	process.
had "taken every step we could take proportionately to deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35  Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017.  3 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  8 This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  13 Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining rrucial function, to identify why mistreatment for and subse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another abuse exampled in humane treatment of the entire population.  24 a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  25 industry considerate in proved and the key themes that have led to a cycle of Page 23  26 abuse over many years, including in 2017, still remain overy much in play.  27 It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of the better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of the inotractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even wi	22	speculated, "but not welfare".	22	There is evidence of increased complaints over the
25 deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35  Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017. 2 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious. 2 This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  13 Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action cone, five years on, and what effective remedial action abuse seandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  2 doubt that the key themes that have led to a cycle of Page 23	23	Phil Riley, without irony, said that the Home Office	23	use and misuse of force. This is critical to the
Page 21  1 system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017. 2 systemic failure in 2017. 3 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has be read over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  8 This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  13 Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action one, five years on, and what effective remedial action abuse easandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  Page 23  abuse over many years, including in 2017, still remain very much in play.  It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breteding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the bretter-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breteding ground for e	24	had "taken every step we could take proportionately to	24	inquiry's considerations because it shows without any
system had now been improved and even that there was no systemic failure in 2017.  This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your the inquiry makes and it must inform your  Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action cannow be taken, particularly in the wake of another and acumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  abuse over many years, including in 2017, still remain very much in play.  It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  It is stark and important to recall the evidence of Mary Molyneux of the IMB on the Home Office's response to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane condition	25	deliver a safe environment" and claimed that the rule 35	25	doubt that the key themes that have led to a cycle of
2 systemic failure in 2017. 3 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful 4 denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot 5 be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has 6 heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, 7 is apparently oblivious. 8 This is important because it is the mindset and 9 attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for 10 considering and implementing any recommendations that 11 the inquiry makes and it must inform your 12 recommendations. 13 Their attitude and analysis of the events at 14 Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's 15 remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment 16 and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only 17 exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the 18 detention system, regime and policy and practices 19 sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not 20 been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this 21 one, five years on, and what effective remedial action 22 can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another 23 abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found 24 a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to 25 inhumane treatment of the entire population.  2 very much in play.  1 It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the betree-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  1 It is stark and important to recall the evidence of Mary Molyneux of the IMB on the Home Office's response to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to the time provides key evidence for the inquiry's 10 man I knew they had it, because we copied in our people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day weere giving evidence before the Home Affairs Se		Page 21		Page 23
2 systemic failure in 2017. 3 This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful 4 denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot 5 be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has 6 heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, 7 is apparently oblivious. 8 This is important because it is the mindset and 9 attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for 10 considering and implementing any recommendations that 11 the inquiry makes and it must inform your 12 recommendations. 13 Their attitude and analysis of the events at 14 Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's 15 remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment 16 and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only 17 exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the 18 detention system, regime and policy and practices 19 sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not 20 been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this 21 one, five years on, and what effective remedial action 22 can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another 23 abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found 24 a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to 25 inhumane treatment of the entire population.  2 very much in play.  1 It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the betree-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  1 It is stark and important to recall the evidence of Mary Molyneux of the IMB on the Home Office's response to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to the time provides key evidence for the inquiry's 10 man I knew they had it, because we copied in our people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day weere giving evidence before the Home Affairs Se	1	exetem had now been improved and even that there was no	1	abuse over many years, including in 2017, still remain
This is of real concern, the same pattern of wilful denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your  Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  It also shows that contractual numbers and increased better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  It is stark and important to recall the evidence of Mary Molyneux of the IMB on the Home Office's response to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the inquiry makes and it must inform your  11 Brook House in 2020. She identified a wholly inadequate response. She said there was nothing, not even an acknowledgment:  "I mean I knew they had it, because we copied in our people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day we were giving evidence before the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was a concern about safety, that there is going to be more of this, if you persist."  The Home O				
denial of Home Office responsibility. It simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  4 better-trained staff, even with a low population, did not prevent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  It is stark and important to recall the evidence of Mary Molyneux of the IMB on the Home Office's response broked ment and important to recall the evidence of Mary Molyneux of the IMB on the Home Office's response to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at Brook House in 2020. She identified a wholly inadequate response. She said there was nothing, not even an acknowledgment:  "I mean I knew they had it, because we copied in our people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day we were giving evidence before the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was a concern about safety, that there is going to be more of this, if you persist."  The Home Office's response was:  "It is all about process. We have the right, we have the		•		
be reconciled with the evidence that the inquiry has heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your  Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another a buse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found inhumane treatment of the entire population.  To provent inhumane conditions occurring and which are the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  It is stark and important to recall the evidence of Mary Molyneux of the IMB on the Home Office's response to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the inquiry makes and it must inform your  10 Mary Molyneux of the IMB on the Home Office's response to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the i		•		
heard over many weeks and to which Mr Riley, even now, is apparently oblivious.  This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your commendations.  Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another abuse we have raised."  the breeding ground for excessive and unlawful use of force.  It is stark and important to recall the evidence of Mary Molyneux of the IMB on the Home Office's response to the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the their notice	-			
7 is apparently oblivious. 8 This is important because it is the mindset and 9 attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for 10 considering and implementing any recommendations that 11 the inquiry makes and it must inform your 12 recommendations. 13 Their attitude and analysis of the events at 14 Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's 15 remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment 16 and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only 17 exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the 18 detention system, regime and policy and practices 19 sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not 20 been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this 21 one, five years on, and what effective remedial action 22 can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another 23 abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found 25 inhumane treatment of the entire population. 27 force.  8 It is stark and important to recall the evidence of 10 Mary Molyneux of the IMB on the Home Office's response 10 to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at 11 to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at 12 to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at 13 an acknowledgment: 14 Brook House in 2020. She identified a wholly inadequate 15 response. She said there was nothing, not even 16 an acknowledgment: 17 "I mean I knew they had it, because we copied in our 18 people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this 18 response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it 19 was received on the day we were giving evidence before 18 the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was 19 a concern about safety, that there is going to be more 20 of this, if you persist." 21 The Home Office's response was: 22 "It is all about process. We have the right, we 23 have the process, so there is just a total disconnect 24 and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and 25 the issues we have raised."				
This is important because it is the mindset and attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your 11 Brook House in 2020. She identified a wholly inadequate recommendations. 12 response. She said there was nothing, not even an acknowledgment: 13 an acknowledgment: 14 Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's 14 "I mean I knew they had it, because we copied in our remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment 15 people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day we were giving evidence before the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this 20 of this, if you persist." 21 The Home Office's response was: 22 can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another 23 abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found 24 a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population. 25 the issues we have raised."		·		
attitudes of men like these who will be responsible for considering and implementing any recommendations that the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  Mary Molyneux of the IMB on the Home Office's response to the timbun and who the home Office's response to the inhumane conditions operating at to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to the innumane conditions operating at to to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at to to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the totheir notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the totheir notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the totheir notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the totheir notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the totheir notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the totheir notice of the inhumane enditions operating at the totheir notice of the inhumane enditions operating at the totheir notice of the inhumane enditions operating at the totheir notice of the inhumane treatment of the events at the inquiry's response the house in 2020. She identified a wholly inadequate response. She said there was nothing, not even		•		
to their notice of the inhumane conditions operating at the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House in 2020. She identified a wholly inadequate response. She said there was nothing, not even an acknowledgment:  "I mean I knew they had it, because we copied in our people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day we were giving evidence before the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was a concern about safety, that there is going to be more of this, if you persist."  Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House in 2020. She identified a wholly inadequate response. She said there was nothing, not even an acknowledgment:  "I mean I knew they had it, because we copied in our people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day we were giving evidence before the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was a concern about safety, that there is going to be more of this, if you persist."  The Home Office's response was:		•		•
the inquiry makes and it must inform your recommendations.  Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another a buse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found inhumane treatment of the entire population.  Brook House in 2020. She identified a wholly inadequate response. She said there was nothing, not even an acknowledgment:  "I mean I knew they had it, because we copied in our people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day we were giving evidence before the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was a concern about safety, that there is going to be more of this, if you persist."  The Home Office's response was:  "It is all about process. We have the right, we have the process, so there is just a total disconnect and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and the issues we have raised."		•		•
recommendations.  Their attitude and analysis of the events at  Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's  remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment  and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only  exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the  detention system, regime and policy and practices  sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not  been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this  one, five years on, and what effective remedial action  can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another  abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found  a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to  inhumane treatment of the entire population.  12 response. She said there was nothing, not even  an acknowledgment:  13 an acknowledgment:  14 "I mean I knew they had it, because we copied in our  people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this  response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it  was received on the day we were giving evidence before  the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was  a concern about safety, that there is going to be more  of this, if you persist."  The Home Office's response was:  "It is all about process. We have the right, we  have the process, so there is just a total disconnect  and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and  the issues we have raised."				1 0
Their attitude and analysis of the events at Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  13 an acknowledgment:  "I mean I knew they had it, because we copied in our people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day we were giving evidence before the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was a concern about safety, that there is going to be more of this, if you persist."  The Home Office's response was:  "It is all about process. We have the right, we have the process, so there is just a total disconnect and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and the issues we have raised."				,
Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another a buse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found inhumane treatment of the entire population.  Brook House provides key evidence for the inquiry's remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day we were giving evidence before the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was a concern about safety, that there is going to be more of this, if you persist."  The Home Office's response was:  "It is all about process. We have the right, we have the process, so there is just a total disconnect and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and the issues we have raised."				
remaining crucial function, to identify why mistreatment and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  15 people, and then, I think, nearly six weeks later, this response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day we were giving evidence before the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was a concern about safety, that there is going to be more of this, if you persist."  The Home Office's response was:  "It is all about process. We have the right, we have the process, so there is just a total disconnect and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and the issues we have raised."		•		
and abuse was allowed to reoccur in 2017, again only exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  16 response comes in. I don't think it was coincidental it was received on the day we were giving evidence before the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was a concern about safety, that there is going to be more of this, if you persist."  21 The Home Office's response was: 22 "It is all about process. We have the right, we have the process, so there is just a total disconnect and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and the issues we have raised."				•
exposed by undercover reporting. Where and how the  detention system, regime and policy and practices  sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not  been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this  one, five years on, and what effective remedial action  can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another  abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found  a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to  inhumane treatment of the entire population.  17 was received on the day we were giving evidence before  the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was  a concern about safety, that there is going to be more  of this, if you persist."  The Home Office's response was:  "It is all about process. We have the right, we  have the process, so there is just a total disconnect  and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and  the issues we have raised."				
detention system, regime and policy and practices sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  18 the Home Affairs Select Committee. You know, it was a concern about safety, that there is going to be more of this, if you persist."  The Home Office's response was:  "It is all about process. We have the right, we have the process, so there is just a total disconnect and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and the issues we have raised."				•
sanctioned or allowed it to occur, why lessons have not been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  19 a concern about safety, that there is going to be more of this, if you persist."  21 The Home Office's response was:  22 "It is all about process. We have the right, we have the process, so there is just a total disconnect and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and the issues we have raised."				
been learned from past abuse scandals and even from this one, five years on, and what effective remedial action can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to inhumane treatment of the entire population.  20 of this, if you persist."  The Home Office's response was:  "It is all about process. We have the right, we have the process, so there is just a total disconnect and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and the issues we have raised."				
one, five years on, and what effective remedial action 21 The Home Office's response was: 22 can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another 23 abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found 24 a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to 25 inhumane treatment of the entire population. 21 The Home Office's response was: 22 "It is all about process. We have the right, we 23 have the process, so there is just a total disconnect 24 and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and 25 the issues we have raised."		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
can now be taken, particularly in the wake of another  abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found  a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to  inhumane treatment of the entire population.  22 "It is all about process. We have the right, we  have the process, so there is just a total disconnect  and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and  the issues we have raised."		•		
23 abuse scandal in Brook House in 2020 where the IMB found 24 a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to 25 inhumane treatment of the entire population. 28 have the process, so there is just a total disconnect 29 and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and 20 the issues we have raised."				•
24 a cumulative effect of their concerns amounted to 25 inhumane treatment of the entire population. 26 and not, in my view, acknowledgment of the problem and 27 the issues we have raised."		•		
25 inhumane treatment of the entire population. 25 the issues we have raised."				
Page 22 Page 24	23		23	are issues we have raised.
<u> </u>		Page 22		Page 24

g

That evidence is critical for this inquiry and for what it decides to do when identifying recommendations that can address this kind of recalcitrant resistance to recognising the damage and harm that immigration enforcement policies pursued have on vulnerable individuals.

We also know from the current healthcare contractor, PPG, that they cannot make remedial action on the system's failure in respect of safeguards without

direction and resources from the Home Office. Serco's Steve Hewer could give no assurance that another situation like that identified by the IMB in 2020 could not reoccur. That, he says, is only within the control of the Home Office.

Given this, the inquiry needs to identify
a fundamentally different approach to previous failed
investigations and reviews. Not because it is bold or
political, but because it is the only rational and
logical consequence of where the evidence has taken this
inquiry. Alternatives to detention are available and
must be found. Current policy fails, but must, in any
event, constrain the use of the power to detain within
clearly defined and strict limits. It must prevent its
exercise where the person is vulnerable -- in particular
by reason of a history of torture, trauma and mental

Page 25

illness -- once and for all. This is not a radical

paragraph 2 and 4 of the inquiry's terms of reference. In accordance with those terms, the inquiry is tasked not only with making findings of operational failures in individual cases, but also failures at a systems level and to ascertain whether those arrangements either caused or contributed to the operational breaches and can be changed to prevent recurrence.

The forms of harm under article 3.

Although counsel to the inquiry's article 3 note focuses on physical and verbal mistreatment, the inquiry is also, of course, concerned with mental mistreatment and suffering, including that which flows from naturally occurring physical or mental illness, where it is exacerbated by treatment in detention for which the authorities can be held responsible. This reflects the Grand Chamber's judgment referred to by Mr Altman in Rooman v Belgium. Thus the conditions of detention which subject a person to distress or hardship or compromise and exacerbate mental health, engage the state's responsibility under article 3 just as physical and verbal abuse.

Likewise, a failure to provide appropriate medical care and medical assistance whilst in custody engages the state's obligations under article 3 and the absence of either can subject an individual to inhuman or

## Page 27

conclusion, it was the finding and recommendations of Stephen Shaw in his 2016 review. It has been the recommendation of the HMIP since 2015 as well as that of numerous parliamentary committees and many witnesses to this inquiry. No civilised society should tolerate anything else.

The inquiry should also conclude that Brook House must not be used as an IRC. It should follow the conclusion of the HMIP that it is simply an inappropriate environment for administrative detainees and the expert evidence of Professor Bosworth which is, in fact, backed up by all medical evidence, the accounts of some G4S custody officers and senior staff and, of course, the experience of those detained there.

Looking, then, at the legal framework and the system's duty that we are here concerned with under article 3, article 3 requires states not only to prohibit and punish ill-treatment, but also to forestall its occurrence. It is insufficient merely to intervene after its infliction when the physical or moral integrity of human beings has already been irredeemably harmed. Whether the state does so through its policies, practices and arrangements at Brook House reflects

Page 26

degrading treatment.

We understand this to underpin paragraphs 4 and 5 of the terms of reference which must be assessed against the clinical consensus that mental illness cannot be effectively and appropriately treated in immigration detention, nor, as Mr Shaw found in 2016, can it be appropriately managed. That is why it has always been, and continues to be, an imperative for policy and practice to prevent detention of the mentally ill and to secure their prompt release and return. The Strasbourg jurisprudence cited by the counsel to the inquiry's notes concerns prisons, but it applies to this context, subject to one fundamental difference: that is that the question of the legality of the underlying detention and the option for release are not normally an issue in a prison case. The starting point for evaluating the minimum threshold of severity under article 3 is different whether detention arose from a discretionary power and where its exercise is unlawful because it is in breach of policy and safeguards to protect vulnerable people in detention.

If detention is unlawful, this is highly material to the assessment of whether there was a violation of article 3 for the period of the detention because the person is not suffering harm incidental to a legitimate

Institutional rusism has a special place in a article 3. Coursel to the inquiry's note does not specifically adheses the case law on institutional state of the specifically adheses the case law on institutional state of the specifically adheses the case law on institutional state of the specifically adheses the case law on institutional state of the specifically adheses the case law on institutional state of the specifically adheses the case law on institutional state of the specifically adheses the case law on institutional state of the specifically fifting lever considered a security risk, and the Home Office would use a policy of giving flend in the specifical state of the previous on its row and may constitute degrading to treatment in breach of article 3. Reasons is recognised to be a special form of affiort to human dignity; it will containly be an excertabling factor if mistrement of any kind occurs, as it did, we say, here, in the context of institutional rusism.  Tohumane treatment at the whole centre in 2017. Conditions of idention, can cumulatively cause such intensity of physicial and mental suffering and anguith that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without debterate physicial infinite and anguith that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment is without debterate physicial infinitentation, not just of individual detainnees, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the stitutional finite properties of the				
uricle 3. Counsel to the impuiry's note does not specifically address the case haw on institutional specifically address the case has on institutional specifically and the Home Office would use a policy of giving (them) something called a 'incrowal' window' without notice in the reach of attribute a degrading treatment in breach of article 3. Reachant is recognised to be a special form of afform to human dignity; it will certainly be an exacerbating factor if mistrament of any kind occurs, as it did, we say, here, in the context of institutional racism.  13	1	measure and which is inherent in lawful detention.	1	hear detainees being taken by and they would be shouting
specifically address the case law on institutional resim but it is plain that, where evidenced by cephicit, racis hanguage of the most offensive kind to explicit, racis hanguage of the most offensive kind to explicit, racis hanguage of the most offensive kind to exploying, this inherently undermines the dignity of streament in breach of article 3. Racism is recognised to the apsend on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the apsend form of afforts to human dignity; it will certainly be an exacerbating factor if mistreatment of any kind occurs, as it did, we say, here, in the correct of institutional racism.  Inhumane treatment at the whole centre in 2017. Conditions of destination, one cumulatively cause such intensity of physical and mental suffering and anguish that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without deliberate physical mistreatment, not just of individual detainees, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the IMPs report on the stratution in Brook House in 2020.  We invite the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stars, similarities in respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable  Page 29  Page 31  detainees, high incidents of self-harm; and causes of the rule 34 and 35 sateguards with the same harmful their written and oral evidence to the impuiry and we their written and oral evidence to the impuiry and we their written and oral evidence to the impuiry and we their written and oral evidence to the impuiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  (Fire alarm)  THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, Ms Harrison  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  Distriction of the conceive powerful, compelling exidence about how his experience at Brook House was cividence about how his experience at Brook House was a cridange at the sum of the conc	2	Institutional racism has a special place in	2	and screaming:
septicility rights plain that, where evidenced by explicit, racist language of the most offensive kind used here or the deregatory racial or acnophobic stereotyping, this inherently undermines the dignity of the person on its own and may constitute degrading treatment in brouch of article 3. Racism is recognised to be a special form of affront to human dignity; it will be added a lot of stress to us in general. I was given one its own and may constitute degrading to the terminoper of the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person one its own and may constitute degrading to the person of the own and its context of institutional racism.  13 of my kind occurs, as it did, we say, here, in the context of institutional racism.  14 context of institutional racism.  15 Inhumane treatment at the whole centre in 2017.  16 Conditions of detention, can cumulatively cause such intensity of physicial and mental suffering and anguish that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without delberatel physical mistreatment, not just of individual detainees, but of the whole detained without delberatel physical mistreatment, not just of individual detainees, but of the whole detained 21 population. This is clear from the MID's report on the 22 situation in Brook House in 2001.  23 We invite the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of Key features: high numbers of vulnerable 22 situation in Brook House in 2001.  24 detainees; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of 3 to sepand to self-abarm and cases of 3 to sepand to self-abarm and cases of 4 the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful 35 consequences—resort of chart flights and no-notice removals.  25 This was a link made by several of the witnesses in 4 their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  26 This was a link made by several of the witnesses in 4 their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in	3	article 3. Counsel to the inquiry's note does not	3	"This created an atmosphere of fear and stress
and the Homo Office would use a policy of giving (them) which added a lot of stress to us in general. I was given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the person on its own and may constitute the insuling and the Homo Office would use a policy of giving (them) something acided a hot of stress to us in general. I was given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of being removed at any point. It has to be a special form of a life in the constant apprehension of given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of the stress.  The was constitute in the surface and the stress of the stress in the conflict of the whole ocntre in 2017.  There was simply to break from the stress.  The was constitute in the stress and thought of the people suffering hearing and seeing incidents of twice people suffering hearing and seeing incidents of volence, self-hum. The without health of	4	specifically address the case law on institutional	4	because [they] would be taken at random times,
steerotyping, this inherently undermines the dignity of the steerotyping, this inherently undermines the dignity of the person on its own and may constitute degrading treatment in breach of article 3. Racism is recognised to be a special form of affront to human dignity; it will certainly be an exacerbuling factor if mistreatment of any kind occurs, as it did, we say, here, in the context of institutional racism.  15 Inhumane treatment at the whole centre in 2017.  16 Conditions of detention, can cumulatively cause such in intensity of physical and mental suffering and anguish that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without deliberate physical mistreatment, not just of individual detainees, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the tIMB's report on the situation in Brook House in 2020.  22 We invite the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear starts similarities in conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear starts similarities in consequences—resort to force and oppressive measures of the rule 34 and 35 safeguands with the same harmful consequences—resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights  10 Against the context of intense pressure of charter flights  11 CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to 10 Assistance of the individual decede, but his experience of these inhumane conditions and an absolute one-to-context and the context of the individual state.  11 Assistance in the context of intense pressure of charter flights  12 THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's evidence of the inquiry and we will need to individual's experience of these inhumane conditions and and basis we obscome a tension of the concision of the concision of the context of intense pressure of charter flights  10 DISS1, you may recall that DISS2 was one-thing and the demonstration in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and provided the demonstra	5	racism but it is plain that, where evidenced by	5	especially if [they] were considered a security risk,
stereotyping, this inherently undermines the dignity of the person on its own and may constitute degrading of the person on its own and may constitute degrading of the person on its own and may constitute degrading to the a special form of affront to human dignity; it to be a special form of affront to human dignity; it will certainly be an exacerbating factor if mistreatment of the whole centre in 2017.  I will certainly be an exacerbating factor if mistreatment of the whole centre in 2017.  I conditions of detention, can cumulatively cause such intensity of physical and mental suffering and anguish that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment in without deliberate physical instreatment, not just of individual detainees, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the IMPs report on the situation in Brook House in 2020.  We invite the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 hear stark similarities in respect of key features; high numbers of vulnerable that they can experiment of the whole declared to respect of key features; high numbers of vulnerable that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment in a consequence— resort to force and opportance of the point of developing a mental will be a consequence— resort to force and oppressive measures of the treatment of the winters of the point of developing a mental will be a consequence— resort to force and oppressive measures of the treatment of the winters of the point of developing a mental of the context of intense pressure of charter flights of the context of intense pressure of charter flights of the context of intense pressure of charter flights of the context of intense pressure of charter flights of the context of intense pressure of charter flights of the context of intense pressure of charter flights of the context of intense pressure of charter flights of the context of intense pressure of charter flights of the context of intense pressure of charter flights of the context of intense pressure of cha	6	explicit, racist language of the most offensive kind	6	and the Home Office would use a policy of giving [them]
the person on its own and many constitute degrading treatment in breach of article 3. Racism is recognised to the person of a firm to human dispute, it will certainty be an exacerbating factor if mistreatment of any kind occurs, as it did, we say, here, in the context of institutional racism.  Inhumane treatment at the whole centre in 2017.  Conditions of dectinion, can cumulatively cause such intensity of physical and mental suffering and anguish that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without deliberate physical mistreatment not just of individual detaines, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the BMPs report on the suited at the individual detaines, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the BMPs report on the according in Brook House for the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in the report of the features; high numbers of vulnerable page 29  1 detainces; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the threatment and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we in the evidence of these inhumane conditions in to raciss and m	7	used here or the derogatory racial or xenophobic	7	something called a 'removal window' without notice,
treatment in breach of article 3. Racism is recognised to be a special form of affiort to human dignity; it will be a special form of affiort to human dignity; it will be a special form of affiort to human dignity; it will be a special form of affiort to human dignity; it will be a special form of affiort to human dignity; it will be a special form of affiort to human dignity; it will be a special form of affiort to human dignity; it will be a special form of a special form of a special form of a special form of any kind occurs, as it did, we say, here, in the contects of institutional racism.  13	8	stereotyping, this inherently undermines the dignity of	8	which added a lot of stress to us in general. I was
to be a special form of affront to human dignity; it will certainly be an exacerbating factor if mistreatment of any kind occurs, as it did, we say, here, in the context of institutional racism.  Inhumane treatment at the whole centre in 2017. Conditions of dectainor, can cumulatively cause such intensity of physical and mental suffering and anguish that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without deliberate physical mistreatment and just of individual detainces, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the BMPs report on the string individual detainces, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the BMPs report on the string in properties of the population. This is clear from the BMPs report on the individual detainces, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the BMPs report on the string in Brook House for three months. He wintessed disturbed individual detainces, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the BMPs report on the string individual detainces, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the BMPs report on the string in Brook House for three months. He wintessed disturbed roll of the whole detained population. This is clear from the BMPs report on the string individual detainces, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the BMPs report on the string individual detainces, but of the whole detained to conditions in Brook House in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of key features: high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force detainces; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful detainces; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force suicidal risk; the routine u	9	the person on its own and may constitute degrading	9	given one. I felt under a constant apprehension of
vill certainly be an exacerbating factor if mistreatment of any kind occurs, as it did, we say, here, in the context of institutional racism.  Inhumane treatment at the whole centre in 2017.  Conditions of detention, can cumulatively cause such intensity of physical and mental suffering and anguish that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without deliberate physical mistreatment, not just of individual detainees, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the situation in Brook House in 2020.  We invite the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of key features; high numbers of vulnerable Page 29  Page 29  detainees; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force to respond to self-harm, and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful consequences — resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in (10.49 am)  (Fire alarm)  (A short break)  (A short break)  (A short break)  MS HARRISON: It was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  (A short break)  MS HARRISON: It was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  20 plast], you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House in a proper to the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and mitiated of those officers at Brook House of the medica can be some a breading ground for nexist and abusive words and deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has only intensified since.  Th	10	treatment in breach of article 3. Racism is recognised	10	being removed at any point. This type of environment is
of any kind occurs, as it did, we say, here, in the context of institutional racism.  Inhumane treatment at the whole centre in 2017. Conditions of detention, can cumulatively cause such intensity of physical and mental suffering and anguish that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without deliberate physical mistreatment, not just of individual detainees, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the situation in Brook House in 2020. We invite the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in 25 respect of key features; high numbers of vulnerable 25 respect of key features; high numbers of vulnerable 26 to respond to self-harm; and cases of 4 the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful 4 to context of intense pressure of charter flights and nn-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and nn-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in 6 their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to [10,57 am] (10,57 am) [10,57	11	to be a special form of affront to human dignity; it	11	toxic because there is no release from the stress.
You may recall that D1851 was unlawfully detained in Brook House for three months. He witnessed disturbed people suffering, hearing and seeing incidents of violence, self-harm, drug misuse, distress and chaos. He witnessed the same harmful or witness of the witnessed that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without deliberate physical mistreatment, not just of individual detainees, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the situation in Brook House in 2020.  We invite the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable Page 29  Page 29  detainces; high incidents of self-harm; and eases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful consequences - resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights of their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  If (Fire alarm)  THE CHAIR: Wa are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  If (10.49 am)  Ms HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience at Brook House state with the sure harman of a evidence to the inquiry and we well develop that in our closing submissions.  If the CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, Ms HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  D1831, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phose of detention, on the constitution of the seeing incidents of violence, self-harm, drug missue distress and chaos.  He witnessed the assault, as Mr Collier found, on his roommate, D390, by multiple officers in full PPE and was primed with a shield to the bed. Even though routine, it was nonetheless terrifying. Despite no pre-existing vulnerability, the cumulative effects caused his mental will and submission of vu	12	will certainly be an exacerbating factor if mistreatment	12	There was simply no break from the stress and it breaks
Inhumane treatment at the whole centre in 2017. Conditions of detention, can cumulatively cause such intensity of physical and mental suffering and anguish that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without deliberate physical mistreatment, not just of individual detainees, but of the whole detained 21 population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the situation in Brook House in 2020. 22 we invite the inquiry to find that the general 22 conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable 25 respect of key features: high members of vulnerable 26 suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force 37 to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of 48 the rule 34 and 35 anguards with the same harmful 59 consequences resort to force and oppressive measures 60 in the context of intense pressure of charter flights 50 and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in 50 their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  Ms Harrison.  Ms Ha	13	of any kind occurs, as it did, we say, here, in the	13	you inside."
16	14	context of institutional racism.	14	You may recall that D1851 was unlawfully detained in
timensity of physical and mental suffering and anguish that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without deliberate physical mistreatment, not just of individual detainees, but of the whole detained population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the situation in Brook House in 2020.  22 will wrive the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable Page 29  1 detainees; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safguards with the same harmful consequences—resort to force and oppressive measures in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  10 (Fire alarm)  11 (Fire alarm)  12 (A short break)  13 (A short break)  14 (10.49 am)  15 (A short break)  16 (10.57 am)  17 THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  18 He witnessed the assault, as Mr Collier foand, on his roommate, D30, by multiple officers in full PPE and was primed with a shield to the bed. Even though routine, it was nonetheless terrifying. Despite no pre-existing vulnerability, the cumulative effects caused his mental wallebing to eracte to the pent of developing a mental illness diagnosed as PTSD. Brook House broke his moral and physical integrity, it humiliated him and destroyed Page 31  1 bis dignity as a human being. He said it made him a different person, and he is not alone.  1 Turning then to the systems, breaches and institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the physical and mental mistreatment or abuse which created the influmane conditions at Brook House in 2017.  2 This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will need to leave, I am afraid.  10 A short break)  11 (Fire alarm)  12 (A sho	15	Inhumane treatment at the whole centre in 2017.	15	Brook House for three months. He witnessed disturbed
that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without deliberate physical mistreatment, not just of individual detaines, but of the whole detained 20 population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the situation in Brook House in 2020.  We invite the inquiry to find that the general 22 conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable 25 respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable 26 suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force 3 to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of 4 the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful 25 consequences resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights 27 and no-notice removals. This was a link made by several of the wittenses in the invitren and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions. [10] THE CHAIR: Thank you, A bit of excitement. Thank you, 18 Ms Harrison.  Ms Harri	16	Conditions of detention, can cumulatively cause such	16	people suffering, hearing and seeing incidents of
that they can constitute inhumane or degrading treatment without deliberate physical mistreatment, not just of individual detaines, but of the whole detained 20 population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the situation in Brook House in 2020.  We invite the inquiry to find that the general 22 conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable 25 respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable 26 suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force 3 to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of 4 the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful 25 consequences resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights 27 and no-notice removals. This was a link made by several of the wittenses in the invitren and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions. [10] THE CHAIR: Thank you, A bit of excitement. Thank you, 18 Ms Harrison.  Ms Harri	17	intensity of physical and mental suffering and anguish	17	violence, self-harm, drug misuse, distress and chaos.
without deliberate physical mistreatment, not just of individual detainees, but of the whole detained 20 population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the 21 situation in Brook House in 2020. 22 vulnerability, the cumulative effects caused his mental 23 wellbeing to erode to the point of developing a mental 24 conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in 25 respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable 25 respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable 26 middle suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force 2 suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force 3 to rosequences – resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights 2 and no-notice removals. 25 middle the inhumane conditions at 18 from 4 middle the inhumane conditions at 18 from 4 middle the inhumane conditions at 18 from 4 middle the inhumane conditions at 18 from 2017. 25 middle the inhumane conditions at 18 from 2017 middle the inhumane conditions at 18 from 2018 middle the middle and no-notice removals. 3 middle the inhumane conditions at 18 from 2017 middle the inhumane conditions at 2017 middle the inhumane conditions	18		18	He witnessed the assault, as Mr Collier found, on his
20 individual detainees, but of the whole detained 21 population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the 22 situation in Brook House in 2020. 23 We invite the inquiry to find that the general 24 conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in 25 respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable 26 Page 29 27 Page 31  1 detainces; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of 2 suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force 3 to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of 4 the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful 5 consequences — resort to force and oppressive measures 6 in the context of intense pressure of charter flights 7 and no-notice removals. 8 This was a link made by several of the witnesses in 9 their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we 10 will develop that in our closing submissions. 11 (Fire alarm) 12 THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to 13 [ave, I am afraid. 14 (10.49 am) 15 (A short break) 15 (A short break) 16 (10.57 am) 17 THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, 18 Ms HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's 20 experience of these inhumane conditions. 21 D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first 22 phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling 23 evidence about how his experience at Brook House was 24 crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very 25 stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 26 bostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in 27 in the context of intense pre-existing 28 vulnerability, the cumulative effects caused his mental 29 wellbeing to credo to the bed. Even thouse in valerability valerability, valerability, valerability, when cannot a territed to the bed. Even thouse in valerability valerability and reflects caused his mental incleased wellbeins inderable will evaled in indeptive of the send to the self-harm indicates flave wellbeins mental will evale position of a brist of the said in made him and destroyed  1 bis dignity as a human bei	19		19	
population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the studion in Brook House in 2020.  We invite the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable  Page 29  Page 31  detainees; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful consequences – resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  (Fire alarm)  (Io.49 am)  Key Harrison.  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  In this was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  In the secondary of the inquiry and we will need to leave, I am afraid.  Mas Harrison.  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  Diastinution flactors that we consider are at the heart of the context of intense pressure of charter flights and non-notice removals.  Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in 200 still year of the singuity and heart of the context of intense pressure of charter flight non-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement with the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House Removal Centre.	20	individual detainees, but of the whole detained	20	
situation in Brook House in 2020.  We invite the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable  Page 29  Page 31  detainees; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful consequences - resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  (Fire alarm)  (Fire alarm)  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (10.49 am)  As HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  Balance of the sinquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 25 most content to point and physical integrity, it humulitated him and destroyed and eliferatory, and freat integrit	21	population. This is clear from the IMB's report on the	21	
we invite the inquiry to find that the general conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable  Page 29    Page 31    detainces; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful to consequences - resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.   This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.   10	22		22	
conditions in 2017 and 2020 bear stark similarities in respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable  Page 29  Dage 31  detainees; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful consequences – resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (10.57 am)  THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, Ms Harrison.  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  DI851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He saled in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  detainees; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of a different person, and he is not alone.  1 bis dignity as a human being. He said it made him and destroyed  a different person, and he is not alone.  1 Turning then to the systems, breaches and institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes of contributory factors leading to the institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading	23	We invite the inquiry to find that the general	23	
Page 29  detainees; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful consequences - resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (10.57 am)  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  DISS1, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently	24		24	
Page 29  Page 31  detainees; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the tone to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the route of the real state of the causes of consequences - resort to force and oppressive measures in the consext of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  (Fire alarm)  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (10.49 am)  (10.57 am)  THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, Ms Harrison.  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  DI851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  Page 31  his dignity as a human being. He said it made him a different person, and he is not alone.  Turning then to the systems, breaches and institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the heart of t	25	respect of key features: high numbers of vulnerable	25	-
detainees; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful consequences resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  (Fire alarm)  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to (10.57 am)  (A short break)  (A short break)  (Bay Harrison.  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  His dignity as a human being. He said it made him a different person, and he is not alone.  Turning then to the systems, breaches and institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the physical and mental mistreatment or abuse which created the inhumane conditions at Brook House in 2017.  First, we do emphasise the policy context and the hostile environment. Stephen Shaw recognised, in 2005, in his investigation into racism and mistreatment at Oakington, that the combination of the coercive powers over foreigners involved in immigration enforcement with the attitude towards asylum seckers and other would-be immigrants of some sections of the media can become a breeding ground for racist and abusive words and deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has only intensified since.  The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political		1 7 8		
to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful consequences — resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  Triis was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (I0.49 am)  (A short break)  (I0.57 am)  THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently		Page 29		Page 31
to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful consequences resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (I0.49 am)  (A short break)  THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  DI 851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first problem of the context of intense pressure of charter flights of the causes or contributory factors leading to the physical and mental mistreatment or abuse which created the inhumane conditions at Brook House was continuous experience at Brook House was created the inhumane conditions and attitudes of the sustems, breaches and institutional factors that we consider are at the heart of the causes or contributory factors leading to the physical and mental mistreatment or abuse which created the inhumane conditions at Brook House in 2017.  First, we do emphasise the policy context and the hostile environment. Stephen Shaw recognised, in 2005, in his investigation into racism and mistreatment at  Oakington, that the combination of the coercive powers over foreigners involved in immigration enforcement with the attitude towards asylum seekers and other would-be immigrants of some sections of the media can become a breeding ground for racist and abusive words and deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has only intensified since.  The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House Rem	1	detainees; high incidents of self-harm; and cases of	1	his dignity as a human being. He said it made him
the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful consequences resort to force and oppressive measures in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  First, we do emphasise the policy context and the hostile environment. Stephen Shaw recognised, in 2005, in his investigation into racism and mistreatment at Characteristic powers  Charact	2	suicidal risk; the routine use of segregation and force	2	a different person, and he is not alone.
5 consequences resort to force and oppressive measures 6 in the context of intense pressure of charter flights 7 and no-notice removals. 8 This was a link made by several of the witnesses in 9 their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we 9 their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we 11 (Fire alarm) 12 THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to 13 leave, I am afraid. 14 (10.49 am) 15 (A short break) 16 (10.57 am) 17 THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, 18 MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's 19 experience of these inhumane conditions. 10 The SHARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's 20 experience of these inhumane conditions. 21 D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first 22 phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling 23 evidence about how his experience at Brook House was 24 crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very 25 stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 26 of the causes or contributory factors leading to the physical and mental mistreatment or abuse which created the inhumane conditions at Brook House was 26 of the inhumane conditions at Brook House was 27 the inhumane conditions and mental mistreatment or abuse which created the inhumane conditions at Brook House was 28 of the inhumane conditions and mental mistreatment or abuse which created the inhumane conditions at Brook House and the inhumane conditions and mental mistreatment or abuse which created the inhumane conditions at Brook House and friend the inhumane conditions and mental mistreatment of a very 29 of emphasise the policy context and the hostile environment. Stephen Shaw recognised, in 2015.  This inhumane conditions and mistreatment of a brook House was 20 over foreigners involved in immigration enforcement with the attitude towards asylum seekers and other would-be in the first payer of foreigners involved in immigration enforcement with the attitude towards asylum seekers and other would-be in the first payer of for	3	to respond to self-harm; and the complete dysfunction of	3	Turning then to the systems, breaches and
in the context of intense pressure of charter flights and no-notice removals.  This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  First, we do emphasise the policy context and the hostile environment. Stephen Shaw recognised, in 2005, in his investigation into racism and mistreatment at Oakington, that the combination of the coercive powers over foreigners involved in immigration enforcement with the attitude towards asylum seekers and other would-be immigrants of some sections of the media can become a breeding ground for racist and abusive words and deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has only intensified since.  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  phase of this inquiry and we hostile environment. Stephen Shaw recognised, in 2017.  First, we do emphasise the policy context and the hostile environment. Stephen Shaw recognised, in 2005, in his investigation into racism and mistreatment at Oakington, that the combination of the coercive powers over foreigners involved in immigration enforcement with the attitude towards asylum seekers and other would-be immigrants of some sections of the media can become a breeding ground for racist and abusive words and deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has only intensified since.  The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House Removal Centre.  Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostil	4	the rule 34 and 35 safeguards with the same harmful	4	institutional factors that we consider are at the heart
This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  The CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (10.49 am)  (10.57 am)  THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's evidence about how his experience at Brook House was stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  the inhumane conditions at Brook House in 2017.  First, we do emphasise the policy context and the hostile environment. Stephen Shaw recognised, in 2005, in his investigation into racism and mistreatment at Oakington, that the combination of the coercive powers over foreigners involved in immigration enforcement with the attitude towards asylum seekers and other would-be immigrants of some sections of the media can become a breeding ground for racist and abusive words and deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has only intensified since.  The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House was evidence about how his experience at Brook House was 23 Brook House Removal Centre.  Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	5	consequences resort to force and oppressive measures	5	of the causes or contributory factors leading to the
This was a link made by several of the witnesses in their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (A short break)  (A short break)  THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  Right for the conditions and attitudes of those officers at hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	6	in the context of intense pressure of charter flights	6	physical and mental mistreatment or abuse which created
their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we will develop that in our closing submissions.  (Fire alarm)  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (A short break)  (A short break)  THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  hostile environment. Stephen Shaw recognised, in 2005, in his investigation into racism and mistreatment at  Oakington, that the combination of the coercive powers over foreigners involved in immigration enforcement with the attitude towards asylum seekers and other would-be immigrants of some sections of the media can become a breeding ground for racist and abusive words and deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has only intensified since.  The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House Removal Centre.  Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	7	and no-notice removals.	7	the inhumane conditions at Brook House in 2017.
will develop that in our closing submissions.  (Fire alarm)  THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (I0.49 am)  (A short break)  (I0.57 am)  THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, Ms Harrison.  He gave powerful, compelling experience of these inhumane conditions.  D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House Removal Centre.  Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and hu	8	This was a link made by several of the witnesses in	8	First, we do emphasise the policy context and the
THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (10.49 am)  (A short break)  (I0.57 am)  THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  11 Oakington, that the combination of the coercive powers over foreigners involved in immigration enforcement with the attitude towards asylum seekers and other would-be immigrants of some sections of the media can become a breeding ground for racist and abusive words and deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has only intensified since. The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House Removal Centre.  Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	9	their written and oral evidence to the inquiry and we	9	hostile environment. Stephen Shaw recognised, in 2005,
THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to leave, I am afraid.  (10.49 am)  (A short break)  (A short break)  (Interpretation of the media can become and the properties of the media can become as a breeding ground for racist and abusive words and deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has only intensified since.  The CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed as the attitude towards asylum seekers and other would-be immigrants of some sections of the media can become a breeding ground for racist and abusive words and deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has only intensified since.  The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	10	will develop that in our closing submissions.	10	in his investigation into racism and mistreatment at
leave, I am afraid.  (10.49 am)  (A short break)  (A short break)  (10.57 am)  THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you,  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's  experience of these inhumane conditions.  D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first  phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling  evidence about how his experience at Brook House was  crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very  stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  13 the attitude towards asylum seekers and other would-be immigrants of some sections of the media can become  a breeding ground for racist and abusive words and  deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has only intensified since.  The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at  Brook House Removal Centre.  Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	11	(Fire alarm)	11	Oakington, that the combination of the coercive powers
14 (10.49 am) 15 (A short break) 16 (10.57 am) 17 THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, 18 Ms Harrison. 19 MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's 20 experience of these inhumane conditions. 21 D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first 22 phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling 23 evidence about how his experience at Brook House was 24 crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very 25 stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 26 the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	12	THE CHAIR: We are not aware of a test, so we will need to	12	over foreigners involved in immigration enforcement with
15 (A short break) 16 (10.57 am) 17 THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, 18 Ms Harrison. 19 MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's 20 experience of these inhumane conditions. 21 D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first 22 phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling 23 evidence about how his experience at Brook House was 24 crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very 25 stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 26 deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has 27 only intensified since. 28 The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows 29 and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed 20 at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and 21 the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced 22 phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling 23 evidence about how his experience at Brook House was 24 crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very 25 stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 26 hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	13	leave, I am afraid.	13	the attitude towards asylum seekers and other would-be
15 (A short break) 16 (10.57 am) 17 THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, 18 Ms Harrison. 19 MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's 20 experience of these inhumane conditions. 21 D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first 22 phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling 23 evidence about how his experience at Brook House was 24 crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very 25 stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 26 deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has 27 only intensified since. 28 The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows 29 and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed 20 at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and 21 the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced 22 phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling 23 evidence about how his experience at Brook House was 24 crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very 25 stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 26 hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	14	(10.49 am)	14	immigrants of some sections of the media can become
16 (10.57 am) 17 THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, 18 Ms Harrison. 19 Ms HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's 20 experience of these inhumane conditions. 21 D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first 22 phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling 23 evidence about how his experience at Brook House was 24 crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very 25 stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 26 deeds. Whatever the position in 2005, that context has 27 only intensified since. 28 and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed 29 at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and 20 the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced 21 from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at 22 Brook House Removal Centre. 23 Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of 25 hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	15			
THE CHAIR: Thank you. A bit of excitement. Thank you, Ms Harrison.  MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  17 only intensified since. 18 The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House Removal Centre.  Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	16		16	
Ms Harrison.  It is use of charter flight no-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  Ms Harrison.  18 The use of charter flight no-notice removal windows and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House Removal Centre.  Brook House Removal Centre.  Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	17		17	_
MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's experience of these inhumane conditions.  D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  19 and aggressive policies of immigration enforcement aimed at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House Removal Centre.  Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	18	•	18	-
20 experience of these inhumane conditions. 21 D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first 22 phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling 23 evidence about how his experience at Brook House was 24 crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very 25 stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 20 at making the lives of the undeserving unbearable and 21 the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced 22 from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at 23 Brook House Removal Centre. 24 Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of 25 hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	19	MS HARRISON: I was going to refer to one individual's	19	
D1851, you may recall, gave evidence in the first phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 21 the demonising political rhetoric, cannot be divorced from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House Removal Centre.  24 Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	20		20	
phase of this inquiry. He gave powerful, compelling evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  22 from the conditions and attitudes of those officers at Brook House Removal Centre.  23 Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	21		21	
evidence about how his experience at Brook House was crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very stressful and negative environment. He would frequently  23 Brook House Removal Centre.  24 Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	22		22	
crushing. He talked in his witness statement of a very 24 Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of 25 stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 26 hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	23		23	Brook House Removal Centre.
stressful and negative environment. He would frequently 25 hostility as opposed to dignity and humanity already in	24		24	Reverend Ward gave evidence of a message of
Page 30 Page 32	25		25	
Page 30 Page 32		D 20		D 22
		Page 30		Page 32

1	play in 2014, and other witnesses have given testimony	1	vulnerable detainees.
2	highlighting it as well, including Lee Hanford,	2	The disconnect between policy and practice.
3	Professor Bosworth and Dr Brodie Paterson.	3	The inquiry's clinical expert, Dr Hard, concluded
4	Second, the safeguards systemically fail. It is	4	there was a complete systems failure of the safeguards.
5	plain from the evidence received by the inquiry that the	5	Where they did operate, they were dysfunctional.
6	safeguards to protect ordinary and vulnerable people	6	Sandra Calver, then the current head of healthcare, and
7	from mistreatment in detention are not fit for purpose	7	Dr Oozeerally, the current lead GP, still at
8	and continue to be flagrantly and openly breached. This	8	Brook House, gave evidence these were systemic
9	state of affairs has persisted in spite of repeated	9	deficiencies across the detention of state and that they
10	recommendations by multiple bodies, reports and reviews.	10	are continuing.
11	A key task of the inquiry is to make clear findings and	11	Those failures include GP appointments under rule 35
12	recommendations that can finally bring this to an end.	12	becoming completely disconnected from their statutory
13	The Adults at Risk policy, the centrepiece of the	13	and safeguarding purpose. Rule 35 reports not being
14	response to Shaw is structurally deficient as	14	done at the first opportunity, we know now that only one
15	an effective safeguard and we now know intentionally so.	15	rule 35 assessment a day is being undertaken at
16	It removed the strong presumption against detention,	16	Brook House. That is an effective abandonment of the
17	it removed the assumption that those who were vulnerable	17	rule and its statutory purposes. We know, and it has
18	are at risk of harm and required evidence to be provided	18	been repeatedly referred to, that the process rarely
19	leading to actual harm before release is considered.	19	results in a rule 35(1) report, even though that is the
20	The policy reintroduced by the back door the notion of	20	one that is most likely to secure release and,
21	satisfactory management that Stephen Shaw heavily	21	shockingly, there has been no rule 35(2) reports ever
22	criticised and found an affront to civilised values.	22	done at Brook House.
23	Mr Cheeseman did not dispute this, no Home Office	23	Dr Hard properly described this as shocking.
24	witness could explain how a policy purporting to	24	The majority of rule 35(3)s do not contain the
25	strengthen protections for vulnerable detainees has, in	25	relevant information on impact and so the Home Office
	g <sub>F</sub> ,	=	Total with announced on impure with the received
	Page 33		Page 35
1	fact, achieved the opposite and why no remedial action	1	refuses to release. Even if all these hurdles are
2	has since been taken following Mr Shaw's second review	2	overcome, the Home Office released statistics on
3	in 2018 and the repeated exhortations of the Chief	3	rule 35(3) remain woeful and inadequate.
4	Inspector of Borders on a number of occasions and in	4	None of the officials or even the medical
5	recent reports.	5	professionals appear to recognise the gravity of their
6	There was no independent advocacy provision to	6	dereliction of duty to those in care or the consequent
7	facilitate people with serious mental illness, whose	7	risk of serious harm through exacerbation of mental
8	capacity is impaired, to participate in decision making,	8	illness and trauma, exactly the kind of harm that
9	to challenge detention and segregation. That had been	9	•
10	found by the High Court in the case of VC which has		article 3 is intended to avoid and to protect. The
10	been referred to on a number of occasions in this	10	alternatives proposed of part Cs and ACDT have all been
12	inquiry and in the evidence of Naomi Blackwell who	11	roundly rejected as acceptable alternatives by Dr Hard.
13	- ·	12	The fact that they were also rejected by the High Court
13	had ruled that this state of affairs was a breach of the Equality Act 2010 for disabled persons and unlawful.	13	in 2017, again is another indication of the way in which
15		14	the Home Office disregards legal judgments and its legal
	That was in 2018, but still no remedy. Mr Cheeseman	15	obligations.
16 17	recognised it was necessary but provided no explanation	16	Critical, then, is the evidence from Dr Hard and
17 18	for why that systemic failure continued.	17	Dr Bingham about the interrelationship between these
18	The actions taken against the Gatwick Detainees	18	systems failures and the mistreatment that occurred at
	Welfare Group and Naomi Blackwell, one of its former	19	Brook House and can reoccur now. They both said and
20	caseworkers for facilitating VC's access to legal	20	this also is the medical evidence of Professor Katona
21	representation to bring the article 3 breach to an end	21	that it is impossible to separate the systemic failures
22	is a salutary insight in the extent to which G4S and	22	of the safeguards from the mistreatment of detainees.
23	Home Office managers, Mr Dix and Mr Gasson actively	23	These failures meant that vulnerable people were not
24	deterred oversight and scrutiny, even when key to	24	released and were kept in an environment known to have
25	exposing mistreatment and in respect of the most	25	a serious negative impact on mental health for
	Page 34		Page 36
	U	1	υ

1 1 indeterminate periods and suffering a level of harm that not designed for the specific risks and needs of the IRC 2 2 engages article 3 of the Convention. demograph, a high proportion of whom suffer from 3 3 In many individual cases, it is also combined with post-traumatic stress disorder, anxieties and other 4 the treatment of symptoms of deterioration -- such as 4 mental illness arising from a history of torture or 5 distress, self-harm and suicidality -- as refractory or 5 ill-treatment. 6 manipulative behaviour, leading to segregation imposed 6 Many custody officers explained how they were 7 as a punishment, and to the use of force as a routine 7 completely ill-equipped to cope, both with the harsh 8 8 response. Chillingly, because, Dr Hard explained, much environment and, in particular, to respond to the 9 9 high-levels of vulnerability and mental illness. of the default use of force and containment in this 10 context is for convenience and because he said there is 10 That fact led to a process of desensitisation, where 11 nothing else that can be done, that is the position that 11 the resort was to methods such as use of force and 12 Medical Justice and the Royal College of Psychiatrists 12 segregation without proper consideration of the 13 have explained for a very long time. 13 individuals' vulnerability. 14 Dr Bingham called this a "perfect storm" for abuse 14 Evidence of systemic misuse of the power to 15 and ill-treatment to occur and reoccur. Dr Hard agreed. 15 segregate under rule 40 without lawful authorisation and 16 16 There is a clear correlation between this systems as a punishment has been identified by the inquiry and, 17 failure and the incidence of ill-treatment. 17 of course, there is the widespread, unlawful, de facto 18 Fourth, the prisonisation of Brook House is another 18 segregation on E wing and the CSU, operated outside of 19 institutional factor that leads to, and led to, risk and 19 the constraints of rule 40. What was also identified in 20 actual mistreatment. We know that Brook House was 20 this context as 100 per cent unacceptable, according to 21 designed as a category B prison and, for all those who 21 Dr Hard, was the complicity that doctors and nurses at 22 visit it, or are held within it, or work within it, it 22 Brook House played in approving, and at times 23 is a prison in all but name. Little, if anything, can 23 sanctioning, the use of force, restraints and 24 be done to remedy its harsh, brutal features. Mr Bhui 24 segregation. Dr Oozeerally did not seem to understand 25 25 his role; Dr Hard and Dr Bingham highlighted the clear reiterated in his evidence the long-standing position Page 37 Page 39 1 that it is an inappropriate environment for 1 conflict of dual loyalties of the worst kind, allowing 2 administrative detainees. 2 Home Office priorities to override the doctor's primary 3 The Home Office itself understood the regime to be 3 duty of care to his patients and a fundamental 4 inconsistent with the ethos and requirements of 4 safeguarding role of medical practitioners failed in 5 a relaxed immigration detention under rule 3, but 5 Brook House. 6 cutting corners and cost saving was prioritised over 6 This context leads to key aspects of institutional 7 7 welfare and dignity. The poor physical state of the culture in which use and misuse of force led to 8 cells, the squalid unclean conditions, the lack of 8 mistreatment. Desensitisation and dehumanisation are 9 9 natural light and poor ventilation, the recklessly the hallmarks of the culture that operated at 10 introduced three-man cells with open toilets 10 Brook House. Faced with acute levels of vulnerability 11 inadequately screened failed to respect the privacy and 11 and distress, in the absence of tools or know-how in how 12 dignity of the men held there. The centre was chaotic, 12 to deal with it, the inevitable response, 13 noisy and riddled with spice, a situation out of 13 Professor Bosworth said, was for custody officers to 14 control, and even involving staff bringing drugs into 14 become desensitised. 15 the centre. 15 In that context, the macho-aggressive culture, that 16 16 we have heard so much of, flourished, normalised and In that context, a critical issue for this inquiry 17 is the cross-application of prison policies and methods 17 dominated. It was not a subculture among core groups or 18 such as ACDT, segregation and the use of force, through 18 cliques, it was the dominant culture, because, as 19 control and restraint methods, that are properly 19 Callum Tulley and Owen Syred explained, it was able to 20 described as "prisonisation" by Professor Bosworth, and 20 inculcate new staff members, was engendered through 21 are strongly criticised by her as inappropriate and 21 intimidation, bullying and fear, able to mould others 22 22 and to normalise complicity and the silence of others. wrong. 23 These prison policies and measures were, and still 23 The compelling evidence of Mr Syred on this topic and 24 24 are, coercive, custodial, risk management tools aimed at his experience when challenging racism is well known to 25 controlling and managing high-risk prisoners. They are 25 the inquiry. It is key evidence, underscoring the Page 38 Page 40

1	nature of the dominant culture of dehumanisation that	1	We say that when one considers the key factors
2	was at play.	2	identified by the Macpherson Inquiry as hallmarks of
3	It was evidenced in a number of different ways: the	3	institutional racism, they are all at play at
4	ubiquitous the widespread derogatory and abusive	4	Brook House. One critical factor that he identified is
5	language normalised as everyday banter; and, despite its	5	the failure of the organisation to unequivocally
6	violence and debasing content, the use of racist	6	recognise, acknowledge and accept the problem.
7	language. All illustrated the extent to which	7	No official within the Home Office, no person within
8	dehumanised attitudes and practices were embedded within	8	G4S, has begun to identify and recognise the
9	the service culture, creating a context of impunity and	9	significance of the widespread evidence of racism.
10	providing the conditions for mistreatment, abuse and	10	Anyone who maintains the idea of isolated individuals or
11	racism to thrive.	11	the "bad apple" trope is only providing evidence to this
12	As Professor Bosworth observed, when staff switched	12	inquiry that a key feature of institutional racism is
13	off from the distress of detainees, this inevitably led	13	still at play and operating amongst those responsible
14	to dehumanisation. The detainees themselves described	14	for this system.
15	how they were treated as less than human, as animals and	15	What, then, are the recommendations that the inquiry
16	criminals. Despite its gravity, self-harm was	16	should make?
17	characterised as attention-seeking and manipulative,	17	The inquiry knows from our opening that the
18	calculated to avoid removal and requiring a coercive	18	organisation Medical Justice, like the British Medical
19	response, not a trigger for review of detention and	19	Association and many others, have called for an end to
20	release.	20	immigration detention. Professor Bosworth concurs. The
21	Healthcare was not immune to desensitisation and	21	evidence uncovered by this inquiry has only confirmed
22	dehumanisation. Even their clinical training did not	22	the validity and moral imperative of that view. Indeed,
23	equip them to cope with the environment at Brook House.	23	the current Chief Inspector of Borders has himself
24	This was exemplified by the evidence of Jo Buss, who	24	recently recommended that the Home Office undertake
25	explained her response to the derogatory comments made	25	a proper evidence-based investigation into the need for
	Page 41		Page 43
1	by officers in the presence of D1527, in a state of	1	immigration detention at all. The ICIB pointed to
2	acute vulnerability, that it simply washed over her like	2	evidence that reporting to immigration officers is
3	banter, "You become immune".	3	95 per cent effective and made other recommendations for
4	This indicates the extent to which there was	4	compliance to be further improved. There is a viable
5	a corrupted, institutional culture and one that there is	5	policy alternative to detention, and policy questions
6	no evidence has been fundamentally identified, addressed	6	are firmly within the terms of reference of this
7	and rooted out.	7	inquiry. If, and in any event, policies must operate
8	Finally, and in that context, there is the evidence	8	effectively to constrain the exercise of this power, and
9	of institutional racism. Professor Bosworth's view on	9	to prevent its exercise, where the detained person is
10	that is clear. She concludes that the seeds are sown in	10	vulnerable, in particular by reason of a history of
11	the very nature and function of immigration detention,	11	torture and trauma and mental illness.
12	just as Mr Shaw had warned in 2005, that, unchecked,	12	Policy and statutory time limits already operate for
13	IRCs are a breeding ground for racist and abusive word	13	pre-departure accommodation, as explained in the
14	and deed.	14	evidence of Ms Ginn at paragraph 150, the Family Returns
15	Evidence of pervasive racism was identified in G4S	15	Policy and the detention of children and pregnant women,
16	staff in the Mubenga inquest in 2003, and in Yarl's Wood	16	other vulnerable groups, already have strict
17	undercover reporting in 2015. It is not new, and it is	17	restrictions on the circumstances and the time for which
18	ever-present. This means that the inquiry needs to	18	a person can be detained. Those policies have brought
19	identify what measures were in place to address this	19	to an end the extreme consequences of harm and suffering
20 21	critical issue in the institutional culture. It took	20	that are the hallmarks of the policy and context that we
	forms of stereotyping as well as the overt racist	21	are considering.
22 23	language that the inquiry will be familiar with from	22	Again, we say this is not a radical proposition. It
23	officers like John Connolly, Graham Purnell and	23	is where the evidence takes you. It is the conclusions
25	Sam Gurney, and which was said directly to the detainee D643.	24	of Mr Shaw, the ICIB, the HMIP, the Home Affairs Select
23	D010.	25	Committee, the Joint Committee On Human Rights, the
	Page 42		Page 44
	<u> </u>		U

1	British Medical Association and many others, and it was	1	suggestions to improve accountability of G4S corporate
2	even the evidence of Dr Oozeerally that detention at	2	managers and Home Office officials. The culture of
3	Brook House should be no longer than a week.	3	impunity must be addressed.
4	In the meantime, it is plain that there is a need	4	Challenging institutional culture at all levels is
5	for urgent measures to correct the complete deprivation	5	a challenging task. It requires the kind of
6	of safeguards identified by Dr Hard. Pre-detention	6	wide-ranging review and measures recommended by the
7	screening has been repeatedly urged upon the Home Office	7	Macpherson Inquiry and adapted to the present context,
8	by independent oversight bodies and NGOs like	8	again, in the witness statement of Ms Ginn on behalf of
9	Medical Justice, and in this inquiry by Dr Hard and	9	Medical Justice.
10	Dr Oozeerally. It has shown to be effective in the	10	Finally, this inquiry should conclude that
11	context of family removals process, so that all factors	11	Brook House must not be used as an IRC going forward.
12	such as medical conditions or vulnerability, that point	12	It should follow the conclusion of the HMIP that it is
13	against detention, are identified before detention takes	13	simply an inappropriate environment for administrative
14	place and avoids the harm occurring.	14	detainees, and the expert evidence of
15	Decisive urgent steps are required to address the	15	Professor Bosworth, which reflects the medical wider
16	wholesale failure to implement rules 34 and 35	16	medical evidence, the accounts of G4S custody officers
17	safeguards, as you pointed out, chair, these are	17	and senior staff, and of course the experience of those
18	currently putting vulnerable individuals at risk of	18	detained there.
19	actual harm. Additional resources need to be urgently	19	Last, we request this of the inquiry: this inquiry
20	made available so that GP appointments within the first	20	should have an implementation phase, as others such as
21	24 hours are capable of fulfilling the rule 35 and	21	the Laming and Soham Inquiries have done. It should
22	rule 34 purpose. Rule 35 appointments need to be	22	reconvene to ascertain what has happened in the interim
23	automatic and the delays must be eliminated.	23	to implement its recommendations. This was raised in
24	Opening an ACDT because of risk of harm should	24	a letter to the inquiry as long ago as 8 November 2019
25	result in a rule 35(2) report and consideration of	25	by my instructing solicitors at Duncan Lewis.
	Page 45		Page 47
1	a rule 35(1) report and, if issued, lead to prompt	1	Mr Riley's evidence makes it all the more pressing,
2	release. Segregation due to self-harm and suicide risk	2	because of the deferral of any action pending as
3	should, likewise, trigger a rule 35 report and release.	3	a result of the Nationality and Borders Bill currently
4	This cannot wait until publication of the inquiry's	4	before parliament. That Bill will have wide-ranging
5	report. It needs to happen urgently. Chair, you should	5	implications for detention, not least the reintroduction
6	consider interim findings and recommendations on rule 34	6	of a detained fast track for asylum seekers, previously
7	and 35 and the Adults at Risk policy. We have seen	7	held to be unlawful and suspended, precisely because of
8	a letter sent by the NHS and jointly with the	8	the failure of the safeguards of rule 34 and 35 to
9	Home Office reminding healthcare professionals of the	9	identify those who are vulnerable.
10	terms of rule 35 and 34. We say that is woefully	10	Professor Bosworth said, in this context, "We go
11	inadequate in light of the evidence that this inquiry	11	round and round in circles". She was correct. This
12	has heard. We know that those healthcare professionals	12	inquiry must break the circle. It will be more
13	do not understand rule 34 and 35, and critically, it is	13	effective in doing so if Home Office officials and its
14	a question of resources; nothing has come from the	14	contractors understand that they will be effectively
15	Home Office to indicate that they either understand or	15	called to account for their action and, of course,
16	know, or are willing to address, the underlying problems	16	inaction in response to this inquiry's findings and its
17	that mean that those safeguards will continue to fail	17	recommendations.
18	and individuals will continue to be at risk of serious	18	Those concentric circles should never again be
19	harm.	19	allowed to lead back to the hell that was Brook House in
20	Detailed recommendations have been made on many	20	2017.
21	topics of importance to this inquiry in the Medical	21	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ms Harrison.
22	Justice Reports and in the position statements of the	22	This seems a convenient point to take our break and
23	Royal College of Psychiatrists. We will expand on those	23	then we will continue with the submissions. So we will
24	in our written submissions but commend them to you.	24	return at 11.40. Thank you very much.
25	Detailed submissions have also been made for	25	(11.26 am)
	D 46		D 40
	Page 46		Page 48

1	(a short break)	1	inquiry has heard evidence of the exact same, or
2	(11.42 am)	2	similar, issues continuing at Brook House during the
3	THE CHAIR: Ms Morris, thank you.	3	relevant period. Therefore, the evidence shows no
4	MS MORRIS: Chair, I will address you now on behalf of	4	improvement between 2014 and 2017, notwithstanding two
5	Reverend Nathan Ward.	5	things: first, the abuses at Medway STC being exposed in
6	THE CHAIR: Thank you.	6	the intervening period, and the Medway Improvement Board
7	Closing statement by MS MORRIS	7	highlighting serious issues with leadership,
8	MS MORRIS: Reverend Ward had this to say at paragraph 14 of	8	organisational behaviours and culture as causal of the
9	his first witness statement:	9	issues at Medway STC in its advice to the Secretary of
10	"Ultimately, however, after many years of trying to	10	State for Justice; second, Reverend Ward's own
11	make a change, I felt I just could not cope with	11	whistleblowing, as set out in his first statement and,
12	continuing to work for G4S. I realised that by	12	just to name a few names of people and organisations he
13	remaining in the system, I was perpetuating an unjust,	13	raised concerns with, he raised concerns with
14	inhumane system which I would now describe as barbaric."	14	Duncan Partridge, Ben Saunders, Deborah Western,
15	Reverend Ward's perception of the system as unjust,	15	Steph Phillips, Jerry Petherick, Kent Police and the
16	inhumane and barbaric is exactly what the evidence in	16	Home Affairs Select Committee.
17	this inquiry has shown the system to be.	17	So since 2017 and to the present day, at best, there
18	In opening, on behalf of Reverend Ward, I provided	18	has been some tweaking around the edges. At worst, the
19	a few examples of his experience of working for G4S at	19	very same fundamental issues as were occurring prior to
20	Gatwick IRCs. Those include: unlawful uses of force, in	20	2017, in Reverend Ward's experience, are continuing to
21	other words, assaults; a culture of racism,	21	this day at Brook House, and not just Brook House, in
22	institutional racism, including the use of cultural	22	other parts of the immigration detention estate.
23	stereotypes and generalisations and clear evidence of	23	There is no sign of any real or substantial change.
24	an "us and them" mentality.	24	By way of reminder, it is the lack of accountability and
25	Furthermore, there was evidence of completely	25	sanctions to date that was Reverend Ward's primary
	Page 49		Page 51
1	inadequate healthcare provision, unsuited to the needs	1	reason for participating in the inquiry and why he
2	of the detained population. Reverend Ward described the	2	considers it important. I will come back to what he
3	assaults and abuse as shown on Panorama as a gross	3	said in his first statement at paragraphs 309 and 310 as
4	manifestation of an institutional and corrupt toxic	4	quoted in opening. He said:
5	culture. His views and experience of working for G4S,	5	"I strongly believe that things will not
6	borne out by the evidence heard in this inquiry, is that	6	fundamentally change unless people are held to account
7	the behaviour of staff was perpetuated by the system in	7	at all levels of the system and serious consequences
8	which they were working. A system in which abuse could	8	occur for the individuals and the corporate bodies.
9	be meted out to detainees with impunity, in the absence	9	I do not understand how G4S could continue being the
10	of fear of consequences, due to silence and cover-up	10	contract provider for almost three years after the
11	directly caused by the culture of dehumanisation and	11	Panorama broadcast, which included a two-year extension
12	"othering".	12	and, equally, why any contract could continue to be run
13	The toxic, masculine and bullish culture of which	13	with G4S after the Medway and Brook House reporting.
14	Reverend Ward spoke has been further illuminated by the	14	I also do not understand how managers within G4S, with
15	other evidence which this inquiry heard. Such a toxic	15	oversight for these centres, or on site, like
16	culture even filtered down through to the training on	16	Ben Saunders, Steve Skitt, Jules Williams or Steve Dix
17	use of force. Reverend Ward stated in his evidence that	17	were not dismissed but were able to continue in their
18	he had complained about the training on control and	18	roles or take up posts elsewhere. I also do not
19	restraint more than anything else, as it was seen as	19	understand how senior civil servants, responsible for
20	central to the running of Brook House, which he viewed	20	these contracts, such as Paul Gasson or
21	as wrong and which perpetuated a negative,	21	Mr Schoenenberger, and for detention services generally,
22	macho-aggressive culture which has been shown, by the	22	have not been disciplined but remained in post."
23	evidence this inquiry has heard, to have been pervasive	23	Until concerted action is taken, and is seen to be
24	across Brook House.	24	taken, complaints made will be ignored, or more likely
25	Reverend Ward's resignation was in 2014, and yet the	25	won't be made at all because people will have no
			• •
	Page 50		Page 52

		1	
1	confidence in the system.	1	HA (Nigeria) v The Secretary of State for the Home
2	Reverend Ward asked this question:	2	Department [2012] EWHC 979 (Admin) at paragraph 70(f)
3	"How, then, could you, chair, be confident that any	3	and that he was detained without ensuring his mental
4	further tweaks will lead to the real and significant	4	health, history of torture and suicidality were properly
5	change that is required?"	5	assessed and considered.
6	He says you can have no confidence whatsoever, as	6	Such measures as were in place were not used
7	history and the evidence has shown that minor tweaks	7	effectively to diagnose and properly treat and manage
8	don't stop mistreatment and abuse, and they don't change	8	his condition see MD v Secretary of State for the
9	the toxic culture. Reverend Ward says that the changes	9	Home Department [2014] EWHC 2249 (Admin) at 142.
10	that are required involve a dismantling of the whole	10	These aspects of his detention will be addressed
11	immigration detention system. His view is that to do	11	further in written submissions. In the short time
12	anything less than the significant changes that are	12	available for this oral submission, I propose only to
13	required will allow the corrupt and toxic institutional	13	outline why the ill-treatment he endured amounted to
14	culture of abuse, bullying, disrespect and	14	torture.
15	dehumanisation as it was in 2017, and indeed 2014 and	15	Paragraph 20 of CTI's note to the inquiry, which we
16	prior to that, the system that Reverend Ward had no	16	heard orally from Mr Altman earlier says that, in order
17	choice but to leave, to continue.	17	to make a finding of torture, there must be deliberate
18	Such a barbaric system has no place in our society	18	and human treatment causing very serious and cruel
19	and Reverend Ward hopes that the outcome of this inquiry	19	suffering. That is accepted. However, the gloss at
20	is swift and systemic change for the sake of humanity.	20	paragraph 21 of the note, that torture involves a very
21	Thank you for listening.	21	high degree of physical suffering, is too narrow. Acts
22	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ms Morris.	22	causing severe mental suffering, that cause no physical
23	Mr Goodman?	23	injury can amount to torture see Ireland v UK (2018)
24		24	67 EHRR SE1 and El-Masri v Macedonia (2013) 57 EHRR 25,
25		25	at paragraph [202].
	Page 53		Page 55
	1 100		Tage of
1	Closing statement by MR GOODMAN	1	A fortiori, where the mistreatment involves both
2	MR GOODMAN: Chair, on behalf of D1527, D1538, D2077 and	2	physical and mental suffering, it can amount to torture.
3	D1914, may I thank you, chair, and all the inquiry team	3	Ascertaining whether 1527 has been tortured in line
4	for the work that has gone into the investigation of	4	with the definition in the Torture Convention as to
5	mistreatment in Brook House.	5	which see my opening statement involves asking the
6	I begin with D1527's case.	6	following six questions:
7	Before this inquiry started, the Professional	7	Firstly, should you, chair, consider each individual
8	Standards Unit had already found, in its report of	8	act of abuse in isolation to determine whether each
9	22 February 2018, that D1527 was degraded, reflecting	9	individual act amounts to torture or should you consider
10	the language of degrading treatment in article 3 ECHR	10	the combination of abuse over the whole ten-week
11	and had made a number of findings that amounted to	11	detention? I shall explain why it is the combination.
12	inhuman treatment see <cjs001107>.</cjs001107>	12	Was the pain and suffering inflicted intentionally?
13	It is abundantly clear on the evidence that he was	13	Was there infliction of severe pain or suffering,
14	subjected to inhuman and degrading treatment, as well as	14	physical and/or mental?
15	to procedural breaches of article 3. Those breaches are	15	Fourth, was pain or suffering inflicted for the
16	intrinsically connected to the failure of the law,	16 17	purpose of intimidating or coercing him or was it based
17	policy and operational safeguards that should have	18	on any discrimination of any kind?
18	ensured that, as a vulnerable young man, he was not	19	Fifth, was pain or suffering inflicted by a public official?
19	detained at all or that he was released expeditiously,	20	
20	once wrongly detained, or that he was cared for while in	20 21	And sixth, was the pain or suffering inherent in, or incidental to, a lawful sanction?
21 22	detention.	21 22	So taking the first question: should the chair treat
	D1527's case has always been that there was both	23	the acts in isolation or as a whole?
23	a systemic and operational failure to identify, protect	24	Assessing whether a detainee was subject to torture,
24 25	and monitor him as a vulnerable detainee in breach of the positive duties arising from article 3 see	25	or indeed inhuman or degrading treatment, involves
23	the positive duties arising from article 3 see	23	or moced initialism of degrading deathern, involves
	Page 54		Page 56

1	assessing the treatment in detention as a whole over the	1	goes on to explain factors relevant from the Istanbul
2	full ten weeks of D1527's detention. Whether treatment	2	Protocols to which I refer the inquiry.
3	amounted to torture cannot be properly answered on	3	These observations can also be read across to the
4	consideration of a series of discrete acts artificially	4	incident on 4 May. However, if, contrary to D1527's
5	dislocated from one another and likely to omit	5	primary position, you, chair, consider that, taken
6	consideration of the cumulative effects.	6	alone, those incidents of mistreatment do not amount to
7	This approach, which I commend to the inquiry, is	7	torture, it then falls to be considered whether the
8	supported by legal authority, in Selmouni v France	8	in-combination effects of the whole detention amount to
9	(2000) 29 EHRR 403, the allegation was of torture in	9	torture, just as in the case of Ireland, Selmouni and
10	circumstances in which Mr Selmouni was subject to	10	El-Masri I have cited.
11	a series of assaults and victimised in a series of	11	D1527's experience of torture involved a combination
12	bullying acts by police see paragraph [103]. At	12	of both acts of deliberate, violent, physical
13	[104], the European Court noted that the events were not	13	mistreatment and deliberate, psychological abuse, on the
14	confined to any one period of police custody and it	14	one hand, but also non-intentional factors, including
15	held, at 105, that the court was satisfied that the	15	being falsely imprisoned, the conditions of detention,
16	physical and mental violence considered as a whole	16	the failure to manage his mental illness and
17	committed against the applicant's person caused severe	17	vulnerability, his self-harm, food and fluid refusal,
18	pain and suffering and was particularly serious and	18	his suicidality, and those factors set the context for,
19	cruel.	19	and aggravate the severity of, the individual acts of
20	Such conduct must be regarded as acts of torture for	20	deliberate violence.
21	the purposes of article 3 of the Convention.	21	So the second question: was there an act or acts
22	Similarly, in Ireland v UK (2018) 67 EHRR SE1, the	22	which were intentionally inflicted? The primary act in
23	European Court considered whether five disorientation	23	question is the detention as a whole. The detention as
24	techniques used in Northern Ireland in interrogations	24	a whole was undoubtedly a deliberate act by the state,
25	consisting of wall standing, hooding, exposure to noise,	25	and the simple answer to the first question posed by the
23	consisting of wan standing, nooding, exposure to noise,	23	and the simple answer to the first question posed by the
	Page 57		Page 59
	<u>~</u>		U
1	alone donorrotion and donorrotion of food and drink	,	<u> </u>
1	sleep deprivation and deprivation of food and drink	1	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was
2	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is	2	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of
2 3	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination	2 3	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at
2 3 4	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep	2 3 4	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical
2 3 4 5	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such,	2 3 4 5	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May
2 3 4 5 6	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but	2 3 4 5 6	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the
2 3 4 5 6 7	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach	2 3 4 5 6 7	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).  That said, chair, turning to 1527's case, 1527 does	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was evidently intentional, and that has never been denied.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).  That said, chair, turning to 1527's case, 1527 does invite you to determine that the incidents on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was evidently intentional, and that has never been denied. Indeed, it was accompanied by threats such as "I am
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).  That said, chair, turning to 1527's case, 1527 does invite you to determine that the incidents on 25 April 2017 and on 4 May amounted to torture even when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was evidently intentional, and that has never been denied. Indeed, it was accompanied by threats such as "I am going to put you to sleep, you fucking piece of shit,"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).  That said, chair, turning to 1527's case, 1527 does invite you to determine that the incidents on 25 April 2017 and on 4 May amounted to torture even when taken in isolation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was evidently intentional, and that has never been denied. Indeed, it was accompanied by threats such as "I am going to put you to sleep, you fucking piece of shit," and other insults by onlookers, such as "Are you a man
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).  That said, chair, turning to 1527's case, 1527 does invite you to determine that the incidents on 25 April 2017 and on 4 May amounted to torture even when taken in isolation.  Professor Katona's evidence in his first statement,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was evidently intentional, and that has never been denied. Indeed, it was accompanied by threats such as "I am going to put you to sleep, you fucking piece of shit," and other insults by onlookers, such as "Are you a man or a mouse?", mocking him for being a "child" or a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).  That said, chair, turning to 1527's case, 1527 does invite you to determine that the incidents on 25 April 2017 and on 4 May amounted to torture even when taken in isolation.  Professor Katona's evidence in his first statement, which is <bhm000030> at paragraph 50, is that, on</bhm000030>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was evidently intentional, and that has never been denied. Indeed, it was accompanied by threats such as "I am going to put you to sleep, you fucking piece of shit," and other insults by onlookers, such as "Are you a man or a mouse?", mocking him for being a "child" or a "baby" in Nathan Ring's case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).  That said, chair, turning to 1527's case, 1527 does invite you to determine that the incidents on 25 April 2017 and on 4 May amounted to torture even when taken in isolation.  Professor Katona's evidence in his first statement, which is <bhm000030> at paragraph 50, is that, on viewing the strangulation incident involving D1527, the</bhm000030>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was evidently intentional, and that has never been denied. Indeed, it was accompanied by threats such as "I am going to put you to sleep, you fucking piece of shit," and other insults by onlookers, such as "Are you a man or a mouse?", mocking him for being a "child" or a "baby" in Nathan Ring's case.  Mr Paschali described his use of the choke hold as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).  That said, chair, turning to 1527's case, 1527 does invite you to determine that the incidents on 25 April 2017 and on 4 May amounted to torture even when taken in isolation.  Professor Katona's evidence in his first statement, which is <bhm000030> at paragraph 50, is that, on viewing the strangulation incident involving D1527, the mistreatment and threat to kill appears to have had</bhm000030>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was evidently intentional, and that has never been denied. Indeed, it was accompanied by threats such as "I am going to put you to sleep, you fucking piece of shit," and other insults by onlookers, such as "Are you a man or a mouse?", mocking him for being a "child" or a "baby" in Nathan Ring's case.  Mr Paschali described his use of the choke hold as a response to being frustrated by D1527's behaviour,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).  That said, chair, turning to 1527's case, 1527 does invite you to determine that the incidents on 25 April 2017 and on 4 May amounted to torture even when taken in isolation.  Professor Katona's evidence in his first statement, which is <bhm000030> at paragraph 50, is that, on viewing the strangulation incident involving D1527, the mistreatment and threat to kill appears to have had a profound emotional reaction and psychological</bhm000030>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was evidently intentional, and that has never been denied. Indeed, it was accompanied by threats such as "I am going to put you to sleep, you fucking piece of shit," and other insults by onlookers, such as "Are you a man or a mouse?", mocking him for being a "child" or a "baby" in Nathan Ring's case.  Mr Paschali described his use of the choke hold as a response to being frustrated by D1527's behaviour, even the concocted explanation by Mr Paschali that he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).  That said, chair, turning to 1527's case, 1527 does invite you to determine that the incidents on 25 April 2017 and on 4 May amounted to torture even when taken in isolation.  Professor Katona's evidence in his first statement, which is <bhm000030> at paragraph 50, is that, on viewing the strangulation incident involving D1527, the mistreatment and threat to kill appears to have had a profound emotional reaction and psychological consequences for D1527 that induced an intensive</bhm000030>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was evidently intentional, and that has never been denied. Indeed, it was accompanied by threats such as "I am going to put you to sleep, you fucking piece of shit," and other insults by onlookers, such as "Are you a man or a mouse?", mocking him for being a "child" or a "baby" in Nathan Ring's case.  Mr Paschali described his use of the choke hold as a response to being frustrated by D1527's behaviour, even the concocted explanation by Mr Paschali that he was seeking to gain compliance is itself an admission of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	amounted to torture. The Commission's opinion is recorded at paragraph 133 of the court's determination as being that, considered separately, acts such as sleep deprivation or restrictions on diet might not, as such, be regarded as treatment contravening article 3, but that, in combination, the practices amounted to a breach of article 3.  The court conducted its inquiry on the basis of the in-combination effects and the overall impact of being detained. Consideration of in-combination impacts can also be seen in the court's assessment of the three-day extraordinary rendition in Hajrulahu v Macedonia (2018).  That said, chair, turning to 1527's case, 1527 does invite you to determine that the incidents on 25 April 2017 and on 4 May amounted to torture even when taken in isolation.  Professor Katona's evidence in his first statement, which is <bhm000030> at paragraph 50, is that, on viewing the strangulation incident involving D1527, the mistreatment and threat to kill appears to have had a profound emotional reaction and psychological</bhm000030>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	definition of torture is, yes, the detention was intentionally inflicted. There were also a series of deliberate acts within that detention. There were at least three deliberate acts of unlawful, physical violence against him, on 24 April, 25 April and 4 May and, as the Professional Standards Unit found, the 24 April incident degraded him. While he was on constant watch his head was banged against a table, by DCO Sanders, who later brags about the incident. The following day, again, as found by the PSU, on 25 April, the use of force filmed by Mr Tulley involving him, Mr Paschali, Clayton Fraser, Charlie Francis and Jo Buss breached article 3. The so-called "choke hold" was evidently intentional, and that has never been denied. Indeed, it was accompanied by threats such as "I am going to put you to sleep, you fucking piece of shit," and other insults by onlookers, such as "Are you a man or a mouse?", mocking him for being a "child" or a "baby" in Nathan Ring's case.  Mr Paschali described his use of the choke hold as a response to being frustrated by D1527's behaviour, even the concocted explanation by Mr Paschali that he

Page 58

		1	
1	Mr Collier's view was properly that Mr Paschali's	1	He then asks for D1527's trousers and says he will
2	actions were deliberate, the experience was then	2	give them back later, and on the footage we see officers
3	followed by maintaining him unlawfully and deliberately	3	guiding him downstairs, cuffed. Again, an officer says,
4	in isolation.	4	"You will do what I tell you to do, okay, and when we
5	Then, on 4 May, D1527 endured a psychotic episode on	5	let go of everything, okay, if you start to do what you
6	the suicide netting, in which he was mocked and taunted	6	did last time, self-harming constant, then obviously
7	by officers and detainees alike. Half an hour later, he	7	your behaviour will dictate how long you stay there for.
8	had calmed down and DCM Dix came to the room with	8	It makes sense?"
9	several other DCOs. The records show that is	9	There is no doubt that this outlawry, on 4 May,
10	<cjs001026> that the intention was a clearly</cjs001026>	10	under the guise of rule 40, was planned and intentional.
11	premeditated one to remove him from association and was	11	Mr Dix admitted as much in his written report and oral
12	clearly unlawful.	12	evidence. The footage confirms the intention was to
13	"I spoke to D1527 about his behaviour and the	13	punish or impose some perverted sense of discipline on
14	consequences of his actions", says Mr Dix at	14	him for his self-harming activities. He was subject to
15	<hom000251>. In the terms of the UOF report use of</hom000251>	15	deliberate use of removal from association. It is
16	force report <cjs005530>:</cjs005530>	16	apparent from the Home Office correspondence of
17	"Upon arrival, I saw detainee D1527 on the	17	28 March 2022 that is <hom0332161> and G4S</hom0332161>
18	first-floor netting. I explained, due to his behaviour,	18	correspondence of 22 March <cjs0074121> that this</cjs0074121>
19	he would need to comply and go to the CSU on rule 40.	19	was also unlawful.
20	He said no. I explained, if he refused, then,	20	D1527 was the subject of numerous recorded,
21	potentially, as a consequence of his actions, force	21	deliberate insults, mocking and humiliation and names,
22	could be used."	22	verbal abuse. They don't need to be explored or further
23	And, again, in oral evidence, Mr Dix's evidence was:	23	repeated. He was subject to deliberate psychological
24	"At the time, obviously, when someone is on the	24	torment, Mr Dix telling him the extent of time in
25	netting, then obviously the procedure was to get them to	25	isolation depending on his behaviour, and
	Page 61		Page 63
	U		O
1	go to rule 40. I am not sure if it was a policy, it	1	Nurse Karen Churcher tormenting him by saying that he
2	was, you know, due to the fact of the level of	2	was being detained longer because he was self-harming,
3	disruption caused on the netting and the wing."	3	racist insults and denial of religious rights, and
4	The process of physically removing him to E wing	4	deliberate acts of concealment of the events in the
5	involves significant levels of violence and it was	5	paperwork.
6	obviously deliberate.	6	Looking, then, at the question of whether this
7	On arrival at E wing, D1527 was then subjected to	7	caused severe pain or suffering, physical or mental,
8	further deliberate mistreatment, a full strip search,	8	this question is assessed on a relative basis and it
9	which in and of itself breached G4S policy, which	9	depends on the circumstances, the age of them and the
10	reserves it for cases of intelligence a detainee is	10	mental health of the victim see Ireland v UK,
11	hiding an elicit item. The body-worn camera footage,	11	paragraph [162].
12	UOF 114.17 captures the footage at the point he is being	12	The effect here for your consideration, chair, is
13	relocated to E Wing, and we hear, again, DCM Dix	13	the accumulation of suffering in making an assessment,
14	stating:	14	whether it meets the severe threshold. That is
15	"When we leave the room, someone is going to watch	15	critical.
16	you. Okay? If we leave this room and you start	16	For example, D1527 does not suggest that, taken in
17	self-harming, like you've done before and obviously like	17	isolation, the events of 21 April or the events of
18	you do, the obviously that, your behaviour dictates what	18	24 April amount to torture, albeit they amount to
19	happens in your future. Okay? No one wants that.	19	inhuman and degrading treatment.
20	Okay? If you stay calm but I told you, the way you	20	On 24 April, he attempted suicide using a ligature.
21	have gone about things jumping on the netting is not	21	He was removed from association without proper legal
22	the right way. So you should have spoken to a manager.	22	authority, put on constant watch where his head was
23	But your problem is you go from okay to lose the plot in	23	banged against a table by the officer responsible for
24	two or three seconds and that's what has landed you in	24	constant watch.
25	trouble."	25	As Dr Hard explained in the evidence:
	Page 62		Page 64
			- "5" " '

		1	
1	"Being put in isolation would then have exacerbated	1	<hom002917>.</hom002917>
2	and increased any detainee's thoughts of self-harm and	2	He continued to refuse food, his sense of
3	suicide, particularly where accompanied by abuse of this	3	powerlessness multiplied and, when confronted with
4	kind."	4	evidence, the Home Office refused to release him.
5	While all of that which happened amounted, taken	5	The fourth question: was the mistreatment inflicted
6	alone, to inhuman treatment, it is accepted it doesn't	6	for the purpose of intimidating or coercing him or was
7	amount to torture, but those experiences on 24 April and	7	it based on any discrimination? The unlawful detention
8	earlier on the 21st, when he was told his own self-harm	8	was designed to coerce him to leave the country. The
9	is prolonging his detention, an experience which led to	9	acts of violence, once detained, were inflicted to
10	him attempting suicide that day, are highly relevant to	10	intimidate or coerce D1527. The use of the threat,
11	assessing whether his treatment in combination amounted	11	"I am going to fucking put you to sleep" was designed to
12	to torture. The suicide attempts he made on 25 April	12	intimidate him. The intimidatory impact, we have seen,
13	were not some random, isolated event; they followed at	13	induces a panic attack on the footage. Mr Paschali's
14	least two preceding suicide attempts and were triggered	14	own defence, that he adopted the choke hold to gain
15	by, and consequent upon, the E wing isolation which had	15	compliance, is, even on his own account, intimidatory
16	exacerbated his suicidality. On this day, the same	16	and, indeed, coercive.
17	pattern followed: further verbal abuse, extreme physical	17	Similarly, as set out already, the use of removal
18	abuse, further humiliation and isolation in E wing and	18	from association on 4 May can be seen to be riddled with
19	further exacerbating his suicidality and sense of	19	language of officers, particularly DCM Dix, setting up
20	powerlessness. His only recourse, at this point, was	20	their own ad hoc laws, which he was told he must comply
21	food refusal, which he deployed.	21	with. All of these threats and exertions of force were
22	By 4 May, we see the punishment for jumping on the	22	evidently being used as forms of coercion and
23	netting, for his behaviour. In this context, he is then	23	intimidation.
24	violently removed into isolation. 4 May was enacted	24	Fifth: was the treatment inflicted by public
25	then as a living flashback, a reiteration and repeat of	25	officials? There is no issue about that. All of the
	Page 65		Page 67
1	the abuse of previous weeks. It could not have been	1	wrongs were from Home Office, medical and G4S officials.
2	better designed to terrorise him, to exacerbate his	2	Sixth: was the pain and suffering inherent or
3	suicidality, self-harm and what, by then, had been	3	incidental to a lawful sanction? No. The evidence is
4	diagnosed as his PTSD. The repeated nature and duration	4	clear there was no lawful sanction for any of this.
5	of the psychological terrorisation cannot be ignored in	5	D1527 was not lawfully detained, he should not have been
6	assessing the severity of the impact on D1527 and	6	there. Once detained, he should have been released,
7	whether it amounted to torture.	7	within, at most, 48 hours pursuant to the proper
8	Indeed, on the late, disclosed footage, Mr Dix is	8	operation of rules 34 and 35. The complete failure of
9	heard to say that D1527 is taken to E wing, "but	9	that system meant he was not. The inquiry doesn't have
10	obviously your behaviour will dictate how long you stay	10	to speculate on that because the High Court came to the
11	here for. Makes sense?". It is impossible not to hear	11	view he should be released on 13 June, even on the
12	the echo of the double bind Karen Churcher had imposed	12	limited information available to it.
13	on him two weeks earlier, in telling him that his own	13	There was no authority for the trespasses to the
14	self-harm would cause him to be detained longer. The	14	person while he was detained. The rule 40 removal from
15	cycle of despair where self-harm occasions abuse that	15	associations it is quite clear were all not properly
16	occasions more self-harm was both tortuous and	16	authorised at the right level and not for purposes
17	torturous.	17	within the ambit of rules 40 to 42. The correspondence
18	In assessing the severity of harm and whether it	18	from the Home Office clarifies the only people who could
19	amounts to torture, the inquiry looks to the subjective	19	authorise rule 40 were Paul Gasson, as delegate of the
20	experience and that involves looking at the totality of	20	Secretary of State, or the manager, Ben Saunders.
21	the treatment. The inquiry must also have regard to	21	Arguably, after 18 July, after D1527 left detention
22	what happened after 4 May in the following five weeks.	22	when the DSO came into force, there were other delegates
23	In Dr Thomas's report on 21 May, she described:	23	in cases of urgency, but not relevant to his case.
24	"By that point, he was attempting suicide near	24	Dr Hard was, in any event, of the view that quite
25	daily, with a high likelihood of success."	25	apart from the lack of personal authority, the routine
	Page 66		Page 68
	<u> </u>		U

		1	
1	use of rule 40 for purposes which were not legitimate	1	as level 3 in the Adults at Risk policy within internal
2	was evident across the evidence base to the inquiry.	2	Home Office documentation and, in February 2017, his
3	The pain-inducing techniques were clearly not	3	detention, proposed detention, was, in fact, rejected by
4	lawful, as Mr Collier said in evidence in relation to	4	the detention gatekeeper on grounds that there was no
5	4 May.	5	removal directions he was a safeguarding level 3 case.
6	So in conclusion, for these reasons, chair, you are	6	However, shortly after this, the Home Office
7	invited to find that individual incidents and the	7	arranged a charter flight and decided to recategorise
8	treatment as a whole met the severity and the conditions	8	his status under the Adults at Risk policy as level 2,
9	for a finding that D1527 was tortured.	9	so as to allow him to be detained prior to the charter
10	Almost all of what happened to D1527 could, and	10	flight. He ended up cuffed in a van, transported to
11	would, have been avoided if the legal requirements of	11	Brook House on 6 April. A familiar pattern of the
12	rules 34 and 35 or the Adults at Risk policy had been	12	failure of the rule 35 process ensued and D2077 began
13	observed. There is an urgent need to address the system	13	refusing to eat, in this case, by way of hunger strike,
14	of failures, as there is on rule 40, where Mr Dix,	14	before shortly afterwards sewing his lips together.
15	a chief protagonist in the misuse of that rule, remains	15	This then entailed his removal from association for five
16	in position with greater authority and, as he and	16	days, no rule 35 assessment followed. After much work
17	Steve Hewer have both confirmed, defiance of the law	17	by his lawyers and the intervention of a medical report
18	continues in that regard too.	18	from a Medical Justice doctor, he was released on
19	D1527 therefore emphasises the following requests:	19	21 April.
20	firstly, that interim recommendations are made urgently.	20	His is a case in which, following the first
21	There are people in detention now subject to the same	21	detention, he had been identified as a torture victim
22	system failures and neglect to which the core	22	and as level 3. There is a glimpse here of how a system
23	participants in this inquiry were subject.	23	of screening vulnerable detainees could operate, so as
24	On this, which is, in fact, the fifth anniversary of	24	to prevent the heinous detention of vulnerable people.
25	D1527's detention in Brook House, there has been no	25	However, when the imperative to remove him pressed,
	Page 69		Page 71
1	direct apology, no compensation, no formal recognition	1	the integrity of the Adults at Risk policy and the
2	of wrongdoing by any wrongdoer to him. You are asked,	2	system around it was compromised and, in truth, this is
3	chair, to recommend the Secretary of State personally	3	another case of how the mere existence of policies and
4	apologise to him. That might offer some form of	4	rules is no guarantee the Home Department will comply
5	psychological restorative.	5	with the law.
6	And, lastly, you are asked to acknowledge that D1527	6	D2077 asks the inquiry find there was a clear breach
7	is not "a piece of shit", but a human being entitled to	7	of the procedural duties to anticipate and safeguard
8	dignity as such. That he was subject to torture is	8	against article 3 mistreatment. This is a case in which
9	a stigma which should lie against the Home Department as	9	the system failures led to an horrendous experience in
10	a spur for reform.	10	detention of a vulnerable torture victim who should
11	I turn next to D2077. His submissions will be taken	11	never have been detained. It was inhuman and degrading
12	shortly for current purposes. You will recall, chair,	12	treatment and the inquiry is asked to so find.
13	he is a recognised refugee from Iran, who fled after	13	I turn next to D1538. D1538 was detained at
14	multiple incidents of torture related to his	14	Brook House during the relevant period on two separate
15	Christianity. He suffers from PTSD and has a serious	15	occasions: 1 June 2017 to 14 June 2017; and, again,
16	history of self-harm.	16	27 June to 15 July 2017.
17	The key feature of his case is that he had been	17	No adequate rule 34 process, no rule 35 assessment
18	detained at Tinsley House in 2016, where a rule 35(3)	18	undertaken at Brook House, despite him asking for one
19	report confirmed he had mental and physical symptoms	19	see <dl000231>, page 37, and a report was undertaken</dl000231>
20	consistent with an account of torture, including being	20	later at Harmondsworth, which led to an assessment that
21	whipped in detention in Iran, and it was recorded he was	21	he was a level 2 Adult at Risk <cjs007239>. D1538</cjs007239>
22	suffering flashbacks in detention and, as a consequence,	22	found the environment and general conditions at
23	on 21 June, the Home Office agreed to release him.	23	Brook House to be stressful and humiliating. In his
24	In November 2016, he attempted suicide, partly as	24	evidence to the inquiry, he emphasised the prolonged
25	a result of his fear of being detained. He was marked	25	lock-ins, the lack of adequate medical attention, the
	Page 70		Page 72

1	lack of privacy when using the toilet, the cramped,	1	suicide; staff were callous and negligent and
2	smelly, noisy conditions which he found very scary.	2	indifferent to the suffering of his suicidal cellmate or
3	He found the inability to communicate with interpreters	3	his own trauma.
4	stressful, and there were delays in accessing legal	4	He was subjected to two episodes of unlawful
5	advice.	5	segregation imposed without authorisation and as
6	The impact of detention on him was to leave him "in	6	punishment.
7	a constant state of not knowing and uncertainty", in his	7	Individually, and cumulatively, the incidents of
8	words. He said he did not know when he was leaving, or	8	physical and verbal abuse, as well as the impact of
9	if he was leaving, and where he would be going. He says	9	conditions at Brook House and the lack of adequate care,
10	Brook House is like a "forgotten prison with forgotten	10	caused him pain, suffering, anguish, distress and trauma
11	prisoners".	11	over and above that which is incidental to lawful
12	Against this background, D1538 experienced, firstly,	12	detention, and breached article 3.
13	unlawful use of force, and assault on 3 June, when DCO	13	He also relies on a breach of the investigative
14	Instone-Brewer, unreasonably denied 1538 the use of	14	duty, in the inaccurate and dishonest reporting of these
15	a computer and instigated a verbal altercation with him.	15	incidents and the failure to investigate.
16	DCO Fiddy intervened, dangerously pushing 1538 twice in	16	Then finally, chair, on D1914, you will recall he is
17	the area of his neck and head. Not an approved	17	a Romanian national who was detained for four months in
18	technique.	18	Brook House Immigration Removal Centre.
19	Second, D1538 was then, as a punishment, transferred	19	You are asked to find that, as a whole, his
20	to segregation without authorisation from the	20	detention in Brook House constituted inhuman treatment
21	Home Office and without justification in breach of	21	or degrading treatment. Alternatively, that various
22	rule 40.	22	incidents amounted to such treatment and that in his
23	Third, on 6 June 2017, D1538 was attacked by another	23	case, too, procedural duties to anticipate and obviate
24	detainee, D197. DCO Ryan Bromley and DCO Nick London	24	such treatment were breached, as were investigative
25	restrained D1538, and then DCM Steve Farrell grabbed	25	duties thereafter.
	Page 73		Page 75
1	D1538's head and neck. Footage shows the use of force	1	D1914 should never have been detained. He had won
2	was unlawful. All three officers provided inaccurate	2	an appeal against extradition on the basis of his
3	use of force forms and dishonestly claimed the restraint	3	article 8 rights. He is an EU national with a wife and
4	was to prevent 1538 from hitting his head on nearby	4	child in the UK, and yet, in defiance of that finding,
5	cabinets. DCO Bromley said to Callum Tulley four days	5	the Home Office detained him on 30 March, 12 days prior
6	after the incident, that DCM Farrell had taken	6	to even making a further deportation order served on
7	"[D1538's] head clean off", referring to the grab of his	7	11 April. After many horrors, the Home Office appeared
8	head and neck. D1538 was again taken to E wing to "cool	8	before the Immigration Tribunal, unable to offer any
9	off", which amounted to unlawful de facto segregation,	9	explanation as to why, on the appeal against the
10	not authorised under rule 40.	10	deportation order to D1914's the approach to
11	On 28 June 2017, Darren Tomsett said to 1538 he	11	article 8 family life rights should be any different to
12	"looked gay". D1538 was fearful of the reaction of	12	that taken by the Divisional Court of the High Court in
13	others and was proven right when other detainees mocked	13	relation to extradition.
14	him for days afterwards. On 4 July 2017, he witnessed	14	His case is another one where, administratively, the
15	his cellmate, D865, attempt to kill himself by tying	15	detention was a pointless exercise, serving not to
16	a ligature and hanging it from a TV bracket. He was	16	achieve any end related to immigration control, other
17	scared and traumatised by this experience, which has had	17	than to deform a man's life.
18	a lasting impact on him.	18	Once detained, he should have been released on
19	The breach of article 3 duty in this case.	19	medical grounds; he was not. The Home Office record of
20	Firstly, the systems duty. He was exposed to	20	the decision to detain him described the pains in his
21	mistreatment by reason of systemic failures and the	21	chest which were, in fact, associated with a serious
22	corrupt and toxic institutional culture of abuse.	22	heart condition as "feigned illness". That he was three
23	And of the operational duty, D1538 was subject to	23	times hospitalised whilst in detention and was awaiting
24	assaults; homophobic abuse; witnessed a highly	24	a heart operation spoke otherwise, albeit not to the
25	distressing and traumatising incident of attempted	25	Home Office's ears.
			_
	Page 74		Page 76

this case, the Horse Office works to the detention  centre ductor, Dr Chaudhary, shortly after he was  delatined, usking for that declor to contimn that he was  fit to be detained and fit to fly. In a breach of  patient condificationly, the doctors, without authority  from the patient, informed the Horse Office he was indeed  fit for both. And, on 12 April, De Oozeeally also  asserted he was fit to fly and be detained. He remained  in detention.  On 27 May 2021, Dr Coozeeally again compromised  medical ethies and deemed that D1914 was fit to fly and  to be detained, addright fish time, that he was "happy for  control and restraint to be used".  This time, that bread are in though and other evidence that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer,  meaning to one DCO, The disc, he dies'; twas  a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with  a serious beart condition.  On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use  of force, exchestrated ugain by Steve Dx, pursuant to  a shit of the standard of the form of this statement:  This times of rived to be scare his transforcation  of force, exchestrated ugain by Steve Dx, pursuant to  a shit on the was decreated by the control and restraints of the unabrative decreated by the control and restraints of the unabrative decreated by the control and restraints of the district of the proper of the full this thin the was to the proper unabrated to a fully-kitted use  of force, exchestrated ugain by Steve Dx, pursuant to  a bload of the proper unabrated by the control of the proper of the proper of the proper unabrated to the full own of the proper of the prope				-
detained, asking for that doctor to confirm that he was fit to be detained and fits 10 yf. in a breach of parient condificinitility, the doctor, without authority from the patient, infermed the Home Office he was indeed fit for berk. And, on 12 Agni, De Concernally also assorted he was fit to thy and he detained. He remained in detention.  On 27 May 2021, Dr Coxcernally again compromised medical ethics and deemed that D1914 was fit to fly and to be detained, udding this time, that he was "happy for control and restraint to be used".  This time, that their forbe had a crucial bearing because it has been seen in Gook and a crucial bearing to be a detained using this time, that he was "happy for control and restraint to be used".  This time, that their forbe had a crucial bearing to because it has been seen in Gook and a crucial bearing to be a seen it has been seen in Gook and the state of t	1	In his case, the Home Office wrote to the detention	1	suicidality, is expressed clearly in this unlawful and
fit to be detained and fit to fly. In a breach of parient confidentialty, the doctor, without authority from the patient, informed the Home Office he was indeed fit for both. And, on 12 April, Dr Oozerenlly also asserted the was fit to fly and be detained. He remained in detention.  On 27 May 2021, Dr Oozerenlly again compromised medical chies and decamed that D1914 was fit to fly and to be detained, adding this time, that he was "happy for control and restraint to be used".  This time, that brief note had a crucial bearing because it has been seen in footage and other evidence that officers regarded this as a medical disclamer, menning to one DCO, "If he dies, he dies"; it was a licence to use impropriste force against a man with a a serious heart condition.  On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kined use collection of the was fit to fly and be detained, addition, the new hospitalised three times for his heart condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused before, he adentify the services of the statement:  a blatant misuse of rule 40 to secure his translocation to be wing prior to removal the following day. Not only to be was there no proper authority for this removal from sociation, in that it was not authorised by the  Page 77  1 Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose [ legitimised by rule 40 itself.] The severity of the my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe.  1 Hought Imigh be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death."  1 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions.  1 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions.  1 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions, There, he was duly humilitated by a stry search, and made to sit in plastic purpose and make the besided problem conduct. It led determine to the course of determine on a finally managed to	2	centre doctor, Dr Chaudhary, shortly after he was	2	unnecessary use of isolation by the outlaws that
5 patient confidentiality, the doctor, without authority 6 from the patient, informed the Home Office he was indeed 7 fit for both. And, on 12 Agril, Dr Oxecently also 8 asserted he was fit to fly and he defaired. He remained 10 in detention. 10 On 27 May 2021, Dr Oxecently again compromised 11 medical ethics and deemed that D1914 was fit to fly and 12 to be detained, adding this time, that he was rhappy for 13 courted and restraint to be used? 14 This time, that herier forte had a emeial bearing 15 because it has been seen in footage and other evidence 16 that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, 17 mening to one DCO, "He does, he dies," it was 18 a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with 18 a serious beart condition. 20 On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use 21 of force, orchestrated again by Sieve Dax, pursuant to 22 a bilatar insistes of risk of the day, he does, the dies," it was 18 a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with 19 a serious heart condition. 21 to fly was fitten to removal the following day. Not only 22 was there no proper authority for this removal from 23 two fitten on proper authority for this removal from 24 sessociation, in that it was not authorised by the  Page 77  10 Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose 2 legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the 2 psychological impact of the unlawful violence against 4 him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: 5 "It felt like they were climbing all over me — on 2 my arms, my back, on my bead. I was shouting and 3 duly humiliated by a stip search, and made to si in 4 plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would 5 rather die than go on like this.  4 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and 12 growing from his medical conditions. There, he was 13 duly humiliated by a stip search, and made to si in 14 plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would 15 rather die than go on like this.  4 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and 15 growing f	3	detained, asking for that doctor to confirm that he was	3	operated as officers in Brook House.
from the patient, informed the Homo Office he was indeed from the patient, informed the Homo Office he was indeed from hand, on 12 April, Dr Oxozenally again sestered he was fit to fly and be detained. He remained in determion.  7 D1914. On 27 May 2021, Dr Oxozenally again compromised his esteries he was fit to fly and to be detained, adding this time, that he was "happy for 12 control and restraint to be used".  13 Control and restraint to be used".  14 This time, that brief note had a crucial bearing 15 because it has been seen in footage and other evidence 16 that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, 17 meaning to one DCO, "If he dies, he dies"; it was 18 a licence to use inappropriate froce against a man with 19 a serious heart condition.  20 On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use 21 of force, orchestrated again by Steve Dax, pursuant to 22 a blatant missues of rule 40 to secure his translocation 23 to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only 24 was there no proper authority for this removal from 25 msociation, in that it was not authorised by the 26 my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and 27 howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe. 28 ling half-maked and 29 my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and 29 were severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at 3 duly humiliated by a rule Ali man be expended in the removal 3 duly humiliated by a rule was decided to a time 3 duly humiliated by a rule procure of the unlawful violence against 3 duly humiliated by a rule procure of the secure of	4	fit to be detained and fit to fly. In a breach of	4	As it transpired, he was not removed from the UK on
asserted he was fit to fly and be detained. He remained in detention.  On 27 May 2021, Dr. Ocozeenlly again compromised medical ethics and deemed that D1914 was fit to fly and to be detained, adding this time, that be for not handeuffs, the DCOs were incursed. Some of the footage were have seen shows efficient serving to him by recisive pitchess such as "traveller". Dan Lake stignatises him on the basis of a misunderstanding of the control and restraint to be used".  13 control and restraint to be used".  14 This time, that be for not had a crucial bearing because it has been seen in footage and other evidence that officers regerfed this as a medical disclaimer, meaning to one DCO, "If be diss, he diss," it was a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a serious heart condition.  25 On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use of force, orehestrated again by Steve Dix, pursuant to to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only was there no proper authority for this removal from association, in that it was not authorised by the 25 association, in that it was not authorised by the 25 association, in that it was not authorised by the 26 this in sepressed at puragraph 151 of his statement:  1 Tie tit like they were elimbing all over me – on howing in pain. I was struggling to breathe.  2 I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt live us looking at day humiliated by a strip search, and made to still and the plastic pants. He recalls that he felt live he would agroaning from his medical conditions. There, he was day humiliated by a strip search, and made to still a rather de than go on like this.  16 Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this contain, the text his was foot and the plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to a stallar.  27 The verdence of Dr Hard, as to the im	5	patient confidentiality, the doctor, without authority	5	28 May, a sensible pilot apparently standing between the
asserted he was fit to fly and be detained. He remained in detention.  On 27 May 2021, Dr Oxeerally again compromised medical ethics and deemed that D1914 was fit to fly and to be detained, adding this time, that he was "happy for to control and restraint to be used."  This time, that brief note had a revital bearing the control and restraint to be used."  This time, that brief note had a revital bearing the control and restraint to be used."  This time, that brief note had a revital bearing the control and restraint to be used."  This time, that brief note had a revital bearing the control and restraint to be used."  This time, that brief note had a revital bearing the control and restraint to be used.  This time, that brief note had a revital bearing that the describes a proper described that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, meaning to one DCO, "If he dies, he dies,"; it was a lat a serious heart condition.  The meaning to one DCO, "If he dies, he dies,"; it was a ball and he describes, at puragraph 190 of his witness statement, that, at that point, he no longer wanted to live a balland he describes, at puragraph 190 of his witness statement, that, at that point, he no longer wanted to live, a king before, he attempted to take his own life, taking before, he attempted to take his own life, taking the described the shocking amount of blood in his cell.  The was able no not authorised by the described the shocking amount of blood in his cell.  Page 77  Page 79  Page	6	from the patient, informed the Home Office he was indeed	6	Home Office and its attempts to cause further harm to
9 footage we have seen shows officers referring to him by 10 On 27 May 2021, Dr Ozocerally again compromised 11 medical ethics and deemed that D1914 was fit to fly and 12 to be detained, adding this time, that he was "happy for 23 control and restraint to be used". 14 This time, that brief note had a crucial bearing 15 because it has been seen in footage and other evidence 16 that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, 17 meaning to one DCO, "If he dies, he dies"; it was 18 a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with 18 a serious heart condition. 19 On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use 20 of force, orchestrated again by Steve Dis, pursuant to 21 a blant misuse of rale do lo secure his translocation 22 to Experiment of the University for this removal from 23 to Eving prior to removal the following day. Not only 24 was there no proper authority for this removal from 25 association, in that it was not authorised by the 26 legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the 27 library of State, it was also not for a purpose 28 legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the 29 my and the serves and pranagraph 151 Of his streament. 20 my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and 21 howing in pain. I lwas struggling to breathe. 22 legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the 23 polychological impact of the unlawful violence against him the servessed at pranagraph 151 Of his streament. 25 "It felt like they were climbing all over me on my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and howing in pain. I was struggling to breathe. 26 I chought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at dark. 26 I have a saken in handcuffs to E wing, half-rasked and graming from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sti in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would 11 region and provided that the was undressed in the removal 12 concision, the technique being deployed including a r	7	fit for both. And, on 12 April, Dr Oozeerally also	7	D1914. On his return to detention, his wrists bruised
10 On 27 May 2021, Dr Ozocerally again compromised medical chies and deemed that D1914 was fit to fit and to be detained, adding this time, that he was "happy for control and restraint to be used".  12 This time, that brief note had a carvial bearing because it has been seem in footage and other evidence that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, meaning to one DCO. 'The disc, he diss'; it was a second that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, meaning to one DCO. 'The disc, he diss'; it was a second to the compropriate force against a nam with a scrious heart condition.  20 On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use of force, orn-beatined again by Steve Dix, pursuant to a balant misuse of rule 40 to secure his translocation to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only 24 was there no proper authority for this removal from association, in that it was not authorised by the  Page 77  1 Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the papsychological impact of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement.  5 "It felt like they were climbing all over me - on on own, may, my back, on why head, I was shouting and howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe.  11 He was hospitalised three times for his heart condition.  12 described the shocking arm distributed use of the describes, at paragraph 190 of his witness statement, that, at that point, he to longer wated to be discribed the shocking arm distributed use of force, orn-heartmed again by Steve Dix, pursuant to 24 there is no justification while in detention. On 5 July, he was refissed bail and he describes, at paragraph 190 of his witness statement, that, at that point, he colored that the following day. Not only 21 described the shocking arm himself before, he attempted to take his own lift, taking 25 tables and cutting himself with a nzor. DCO Tulley described by a second of the manufal violence against and probably and probably and pr	8	asserted he was fit to fly and be detained. He remained	8	from handcuffs, the DCOs were incensed. Some of the
medical ethics and deemed that D1914 was fit to fly and to be detained, adding this time, that he was "happy for control and restraint to be used".  This time, that brief note had a crucial bearing because it has been seen in floatage and other evidence that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, meaning to one DCO, "If he dies, he dies"; it was a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a since heart condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused to the was a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a since heart condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused to different bearing to meaning to one DCO, "If he dies, he dies"; it was a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a since the dies, he dies"; it was a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a series heart condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused to live, and all the less was first condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused to live, and all the less was first, and an de heaserins, a paragraph 190 his wimess statement, that, at that point, he no longer wanted to live, and all nebes we having tried to harm himself as a feroid nebes and the was a live, and all the less was first, the was above the himself of the miss defined and heaserins, and part condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused to live, and all the was hospitalised three times for his winters.  The sum and the was a first	9	in detention.	9	footage we have seen shows officers referring to him by
to be detained, adding this time, that he was "happy for control and restraint to be used."  This time, that breif note land a crucial bearing because it has been seen in footage and other evidence that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, meaning to one DCO, "The dies, he disc"; it was a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a serious heart condition.  Do that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use of force, orchestrated again by Steve Dix, pursuant to a blatant misuse of rule 40 to secure his translocation. 23 to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only was there no proper authority for this removal from association, in that it was not authorised by the page 77  Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the payerhological impact of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: "It felt like they were climbing all over me on my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe. I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was duly humilated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pans. He reculs has the fell like he would frame the death."  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of faultly. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decire the fact that he was underseed in the removal content of the techniques being deployed including a risk of faultly. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decire the fact that he was underseed in the removal content of the beautiful to worse the feelings of self-harm and the describes how Brook House has had a lasting the describes how Brook House has had a lasting the describes how Brook House has had a lasting the describes how Brook House has had a lasting the describes how Brook House has had a lasting the describes how Brook House has had a lasting the describes how B	10	On 27 May 2021, Dr Oozeerally again compromised	10	racist epithets such as "traveller", Dan Lake
control and restraint to be used".  This time, that brief note had a crucial bearing because it has been seen in footage and other evidence that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, meaning to one DCO, "If he dies, he dies"; it was a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a serious heart condition.  On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use of force, orchestrated again by Steve Dix, pursuant to to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only was there no proper authority for this removal from to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only was there no proper authority for this removal from sassociation, in that it was not authorised by the  Page 77  Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the psychological impact of the ullawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  "If fell like they were elimbing all over me - on my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe.  "If fell like they were limbing all over me - on my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe.  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that the was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of solution being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and	11	medical ethics and deemed that D1914 was fit to fly and	11	stigmatises him on the basis of a misunderstanding of
This time, that brief note had a crucial bearing because it has been seen in footage and other evidence that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, meaning to one DCO, "If he dies, he dies"; it was a licence to use imappropriate force against a man with a serious heart condition.  10 On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use of force, orchestrated again by Steve Dix, pursuant to a blatant misuse of rule 40 to secure his translocation to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only was there no proper authority for this removal from 23 association, in that it was not authorised by the Page 79  1 Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the 1 him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  5 "If felt like they were elimbing all over me - on my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and home of the unlawful physical abuse on payenological impact of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  5 "If felt like they were elimbing all over me - on my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and home describes, at the part of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  5 "If felt like they were elimbing all over me - on my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and propose and unlawful physical abuse on the like the word official channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Office.  1 In his case, part C swere issued on 11 April, 19 April, 27 May, 28 May, 3 June, 5 July, 6 July, 7 July and 13 July. When he belatedly and finally managed to obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, nearly three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally completed a rule 35 report, and, although it still took a fairly long time to process, it was that document which led to his release just in time for his heart operation in August.  10 Mc Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practice, about which ed to	12	to be detained, adding this time, that he was "happy for	12	his criminal record, saying, "He doesn't rape kids, he
because it has been seen in footage and other evidence that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, manifered that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a scious heart condition.  18 a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a serious heart condition.  20 On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use of force, orchestrated again by Steve Dix, pursuant to a blatant misuse of rule 40 to secure his translocation to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only association, in that it was not authorised by the page 77  1 Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the psychological impact of the unlawful violence against him serpressed to the shocking and howing in pain. I was struggling to breathe.  1 Ithought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death."  11 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was dualsh."  12 In plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rarder die than go on like this.  13 Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous and unlawful phymanaged to obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, andry three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally completed a rule 35 system mandated by law, and for which official channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Office.  1 In his case, part C swere issued on 11 April, 19 April, 27 May, 28 May, 3 June, 5 July, 6 July, 7 July and 13 July. When he belatedly and finally managed to obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, early three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally completed a rule 35 report, and, though it still took a fairly long time to process, it was that document which led to his release just in time for his heart operation in August.  1 In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman treatment ove	13	control and restraint to be used".	13	kills them".
that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer, meaning to one DCO, "If he dies, he dies"; it was a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a serious heart condition.  On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use of force, orchestrated again by Steve Dix, pursuant to a blatant misuse of rule 40 to secure his translocation to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only was there no proper authority for this removal from association, in that it was not authorised by the  Page 77  Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the speychological impact of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  The felt like they were climbing all over me—on my arms, my back, no my head. I was shouting and howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe.  I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death.  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-nack and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this cocasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk ocasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk ocasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fastality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  Ball and he describes, at path al, although to ham himself to barm himself before, he attempted to lake his wind a latting history, had, although never having and to beacrible statement, tal, at that point, he no long the hair liby, addition, all though of the hand with a nature. Do To Unity describes he had never he made th	14	This time, that brief note had a crucial bearing	14	He was hospitalised three times for his heart
statement, that, at that point, he no longer wanted to live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and, although never having tried to harm himself live, and although never having tried to harm himself live, and although never having tried to harm himself live, and although never having tried to harm himself live, and although never having tried to harm himself live, and although never having tried to harm himself live, and live, and although never having tried to harm himself live and live, and although never having tried to harm himself live here. The live here is no justification for their c	15	because it has been seen in footage and other evidence	15	condition while in detention. On 5 July, he was refused
a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with a serious heart condition.  On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use of force, orchestrated again by Steve Dix, pursuant to a blastant misuse of rule 40 to secure his translocation to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only was there no proper authority for this removal from association, in that it was not authorised by the  Page 77  Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the psychological impact of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: If thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felf I was looking at death."  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groming from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather dic than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shocking amount of blood in his cell.  Both Dr Chaudhary and Dr Oozeerally sought to defend the medical ethics of disclosing his medical data, but there is no justification for their conduct. It led directly to dangerous and unlawful physical abuse on  Page 79  27 May. His case also exhibits the dangerous practice, about which both doctors openly boasted, of replacing the rule 35 system mandated by law, and for which official channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Office.  In his case, part C swere issued on 11 April,  19 April, 27 May, 28 May, 3 June, 5 July, 6 July, 7 July and 13 July. When he belatedly and finally managed to obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, nearly three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally toropa	16	that officers regarded this as a medical disclaimer,	16	bail and he describes, at paragraph 190 of his witness
a serious heart condition.  On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use of force, orchestrated again by Steve Dix, pursuant to a blatant misuse of rule 40 to secure his translocation to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only was there no proper authority for this removal from association, in that it was not authorised by the  Page 77  Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the special impact of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  "It felt like they were climbing all over me - on my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe.  I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death."  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and	17	meaning to one DCO, "If he dies, he dies"; it was	17	statement, that, at that point, he no longer wanted to
On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use of force, orchestrated again by Steve Dix, pursuant to a blatant misuse of rule 40 to secure his translocation to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only association, in that it was not authorised by the 25 association, in that it was not authorised by the 26 legitimised by rule 40 tistelf. The severity of the 3 psychological impact of the unlawful violence against 4 him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: 5 "It felt like they were climbing all over me on 6 my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and 7 howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe. 8 I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was 9 very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in 4 plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would 15 rather die than go on like this. 16 Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous 17 practices deployed in the use of the shocking amount of blood in his cell. 20 described the shocking amount of blood in his cell. 21 described the shocking amount of blood in his cell. 22 both Dr Chaudhary and Dr Oozearilly sought to defend the medical ethics of discolar, but there is no justification for their conduct. It led directly to dangerous and unlawful physical abuse on Page 79  1	18	a licence to use inappropriate force against a man with		
described the shocking amount of blood in his cell.  Both Dr Chaudhary and Dr Ozecerally sought to defend the medical ethics of disclosing his medical data, but there is no justification of their conduct. It led directly to dangerous and unlawful physical abuse on  Page 77  Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the 3 psychological impact of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  "It felt like they were climbing all over me on my arms, my back, on my head. It was shouting and howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe.  I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death."  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in pastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practice, about which both doctors openly boasted, of replacing the rule 35 system mandated by law, and for which official channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Office.  In his case, part Cs were issued on 11 April, 19 April, 27 May, 28 May, 3 June, 5 July, 6 July, 7 July and 13 July. When he belatedly and finally managed to obtain a rule 35 aponitment on 17 July, nearly three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally completed a rule 35 report, and, although it still took a fairly long time to process, it was that document which led to his release just in time for his heart operation in August.  In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman treatment over the course of detention and to degrading treatment over the course of detention, whose severity is marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely impriso	19	a serious heart condition.	19	before, he attempted to take his own life, taking
a blatant misuse of rule 40 to secure his translocation to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only was there no proper authority for this removal from association, in that it was not authorised by the Page 77  1 Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the psychological impact of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  5 "It felt like they were climbing all over me - on for my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe.  8 I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death."  11 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and grousing from his medical conditions. There, he was dispanted by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  16 Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practice, about which both doctors openly boasted, of replacing the rule 35 system mandated by law, and for which official channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Office.  17 In his case, part Cs were issued on 11 April, and 13 July. When he belatedly and finally managed to obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, nearly three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally consistent over the course of detention and to degrading treatment over the course of detention, whose severity is marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the being detained, of not being released.  12 were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  13 detained by a strip search, and made to sit in packed by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being deta	20	On that day, he was subjected to a fully-kitted use	20	57 tablets and cutting himself with a razor. DCO Tulley
to E wing prior to removal the following day. Not only was there no proper authority for this removal from association, in that it was not authorised by the Page 77    1	21		21	
was there no proper authority for this removal from association, in that it was not authorised by the Page 77  1 Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the 3 psychological impact of the unlawful violence against 4 him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: 4 him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: 5 "It felt like they were climbing all over me on 6 my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and 6 howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe. 8 I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was 9 very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at 10 death." 10 death." 10 duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in 14 plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would 15 rather die than go on like this. 16 Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous 17 practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal 20 were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to 15 staff. 24 The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of 15 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 15 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 15 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 15 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 15 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 15 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 15 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 15 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 15 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 15 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 16 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 17 isolation and the pass a direct result not of being detained, but of being felasely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detaines from detentio	22	a blatant misuse of rule 40 to secure his translocation	22	Both Dr Chaudhary and Dr Oozeerally sought to defend
25 association, in that it was not authorised by the Page 77  1 Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose 2 legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the 3 psychological impact of the unlawful violence against 4 him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: 5 "It felt like they were climbing all over me on 6 my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and 7 howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe. 8 I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was 9 very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at 10 death." 11 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and 12 groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was 13 duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in 14 plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would 15 rather die than go on like this. 16 Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous 17 practices deployed in the use of the shields on this 18 occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk 19 of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier 20 decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal 21 from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE 22 were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to 23 staff. 24 The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of 25 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and	23			
Page 77  Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the psychological impact of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: "It felt like they were climbing all over me on my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe. I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death."  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would frather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and  12 Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose about which both doctors openly boasted, of replacing the rule 35 system mandated by law, and for which official channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the official channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the nofficial channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the rule 35 system mandated by law, and for which official channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the nofficial channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the rule 35 system mandated by law, and for which official channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the se				
1 Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose 2 legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the 3 psychological impact of the unlawful violence against 4 him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: 4 him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: 5 "It felt like they were climbing all over me on 6 my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and 7 howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe. 8 I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was 9 very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at 10 death." 10 death." 11 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and 12 groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was 13 duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in 14 plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would 15 rather die than go on like this. 16 Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous 17 practices deployed in the use of the shields on this 18 occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk 19 of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier 20 decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal 21 from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE 22 were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to 23 staff. 24 The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of 25 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 26 dath which led to both doctors openlly boasted, of replacing about which both doctors openly boasted, of replacing the rule 35 system mandated by law, and for which of fiscal fasher which ded to official channels as designed to protex in the for which of sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Offical channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Offical fasher.  1	25	association, in that it was not authorised by the	25	directly to dangerous and unlawful physical abuse on
1 Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose 2 legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the 3 psychological impact of the unlawful violence against 4 him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: 4 him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement: 5 "It felt like they were climbing all over me on 6 my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and 7 howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe. 8 I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was 9 very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at 10 death." 10 death." 11 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and 12 groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was 13 duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in 14 plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would 15 rather die than go on like this. 16 Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous 17 practices deployed in the use of the shields on this 18 occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk 19 of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier 20 decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal 21 from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE 22 were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to 23 staff. 24 The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of 25 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 26 dath which led to both doctors openlly boasted, of replacing about which both doctors openly boasted, of replacing the rule 35 system mandated by law, and for which of fiscal fasher which ded to official channels as designed to protex in the for which of sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Offical channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Offical fasher.  1		Page 77		Page 79
legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the psychological impact of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  "It felt like they were climbing all over me on howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe. I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death."  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous for fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  Legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the mis expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  a bout which both doctors openly boasted, of replacing the rule 35 system mandated by law, and for which official channels are designed, with their own system of sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Office.  In his case, part Cs were issued on 11 April, 19 April, 27 May, 28 May, 3 June, 5 July, 6 July, 7 July and 13 July. When he belatedly and finally managed to obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, nearly three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally completed a rule 35 report, and, although it still took a fairly long time to process, it was that document which led to his release just in time for his heart operation in August.  In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman treatment over the course of detention, whose severity is marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of				Ü
psychological impact of the unlawful violence against him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  The felt like they were elimbing all over me on sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Office.  Thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death."  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of is a fairly long time to consider the fact form association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and	1	Secretary of State, it was also not for a purpose	1	
him is expressed at paragraph 151 of his statement:  "It felt like they were climbing all over me on  my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and  howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe.  I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was  to death."  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was  duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in  plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would  rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous  practices deployed in the use of the shields on this  occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk  of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier  decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal  from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE  were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to  staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of  isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and	2	legitimised by rule 40 itself. The severity of the	2	
5 "It felt like they were climbing all over me on 6 my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and 7 howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe. 8 I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was 9 very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at 10 death." 11 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and 12 groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was 13 duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in 14 plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would 15 rather die than go on like this. 16 Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous 17 practices deployed in the use of the shields on this 18 occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk 19 of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier 20 decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal 21 from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE 22 were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to 23 staff. 24 The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of 25 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 26 Home Office.  7 In his case, part Cs were issued on 11 April, 19 April, 27 May, 28 May, 3 June, 5 July, 6 July, 7 July 20 and 13 July. When he belatedly and finally managed to 21 obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, nearly 22 three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally 23 three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally 24 three months after being at rule 35 appointment on 17 July, nearly 25 sending part C forms to a different branch of the Home Office.  16 In his case, part Cs were issued on 11 April, 26 Home Office.  17 In his case, part Cs were issued on 11 April, 28 19 April, 27 May, 28 May, 3 June, 5 July, 6 July, 7 July 29 and 13 July. When he belatedly and finally managed to obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, nearly 20 three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally managed to with three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally managed to poperation in August.  15 In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman treatment over the cour	3			•
6 my arms, my back, on my head. I was shouting and 7 howling in pain. I was struggling to breathe. 8 I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was 9 very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at 10 death." 10 obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, nearly 11 He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and 12 groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was 13 duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in 14 plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would 15 rather die than go on like this. 16 Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous 17 practices deployed in the use of the shields on this 18 occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk 19 of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier 20 decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal 21 from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE 22 were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to 23 staff. 24 The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of 25 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and				•
In his case, part Cs were issued on 11 April,  I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death."  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  In his case, part Cs were issued on 11 April, 19 April, 27 May, 28 May, 3 June, 5 July, 6 July, 7 July and 13 July. When he belatedly and finally managed to obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, nearly three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally completed a rule 35 report, and, although it still took a fairly long time to process, it was that document which led to his release just in time for his heart operation in August.  In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman treatment over the course of detention and to degrading treatment over the course of detention, whose severity is marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death."  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  I thought I might be dying. The pain in my chest was 19 April, 27 May, 28 May, 3 June, 5 July, 6 July, 7 July and 13 July. When he belatedly and finally managed to obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, nearly three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally completed a rule 35 report, and, although it still took a fairly long time to process, it was that document which led to his release just in time for his heart operation in August.  In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman treatment over the course of detention and to degrading treatment over the course of detention, whose severity is marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
very severe. At that moment, I felt I was looking at death."  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  Years obtain a rule 35 appointment on 17 July, nearly three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally completed a rule 35 report, and, although it still took a fairly long time to process, it was that document which led to his release just in time for his heart operation in August.  In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman treatment over the course of detention and to degrading treatment over the course of detention, whose severity is marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				•
death."  He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal decried the fact that he was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and self-at the vas undressed in the removal in solation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and self-at the was undreased in the removal in solation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and self-at the was undreased in the removal in solation and to being detained, but of the describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
He was taken in handcuffs to E wing, half-naked and groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and in the staff.  In three months after being detained, Dr Oozeerally finally completed a rule 35 report, and, although it still took a fairly long time to process, it was that document which led to his release just in time for his heart operation in August.  In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman treatment over the course of detention and to degrading treatment over the course of detention and to degrading is marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
groaning from his medical conditions. There, he was  duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in  plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would  rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous  practices deployed in the use of the shields on this  occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk  of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier  decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal  from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE  were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to  staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of  isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and  completed a rule 35 report, and, although it still took  a fairly long time to process, it was that document  which led to his release just in time for his heart  operation in August.  In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman  treatment over the course of detention and to degrading  treatment over the course of detention, whose severity  is marked by the impact it had in rendering him  suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill  himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of  being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the  breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable  detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
duly humiliated by a strip search, and made to sit in  plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would  rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous  practices deployed in the use of the shields on this  occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk  of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier  decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal  from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE  were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to  staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of  isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and  a fairly long time to process, it was that document  which led to his release just in time for his heart  operation in August.  In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman  treatment over the course of detention and to degrading  treatment over the course of detention, whose severity  is marked by the impact it had in rendering him  suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill  himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of  being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the  breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable  detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
plastic pants. He recalls that he felt like he would rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and  which led to his release just in time for his heart operation in August.  In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman treatment over the course of detention and to degrading treatment over the course of detention, whose severity is marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
rather die than go on like this.  Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous  practices deployed in the use of the shields on this  occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk  of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier  decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal  from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE  were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to  staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of  isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and  operation in August.  In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman  treatment over the course of detention and to degrading  treatment over the course of detention, whose severity  is marked by the impact it had in rendering him  suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill  himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of  being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the  breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable  detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
Mr Collier gave evidence as to the dangerous practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and  In D1914's case, he was subjected to inhuman treatment over the course of detention and to degrading treatment over the course of detention, whose severity is marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of not being released. He describes how Brook House has had a lasting		•		Į.
practices deployed in the use of the shields on this occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and  treatment over the course of detention and to degrading treatment over the course of detention, whose severity is marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
occasion, the techniques being deployed including a risk of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and  treatment over the course of detention, whose severity is marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
of fatality. Having viewed the CCTV footage, Mr Collier decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and  si marked by the impact it had in rendering him suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of not being released. He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
decried the fact that he was undressed in the removal from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and suicidal. Indeed, he very nearly managed to kill himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
from association and concluded that handcuffs and PPE were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to staff.  The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and  himself as a direct result not of being detained, but of being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
were unnecessary as there was no physical threat to  staff.  being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the  breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable  the evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of  isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and  being falsely imprisoned, and then, as a result of the  breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable  detainees from detention, of not being released.  He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
23 staff. 23 breakdown of systems designed to protect vulnerable 24 The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of 24 detainees from detention, of not being released. 25 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 25 He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
The evidence of Dr Hard, as to the impact of 24 detainees from detention, of not being released. 25 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 26 He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
25 isolation being to worsen the feelings of self-harm and 25 He describes how Brook House has had a lasting				
		_		_
Page 78 Page 80				5
		Page 78		Page 80

-		_	
1	impact on his mental health and that he continues to	1	For context, this is the 45th day that this inquiry
2	feel low. Particular factors in his mistreatment were:	2	has sat. It is 131 days since phase 1 of the inquiry
3	the unlawful decision making by the Home Office in	3	started back in November of last year. That in itself
4	detaining him; the absence of any screening mechanism to	4	seems a long time ago.
5	ensure relevant factors were taken into account about	5	You heard live evidence, chair that, D643 served in
6	his health, and indeed immigration position, before or	6	the British Army, in Kosovo, Bosnia and Iraq, and first
7	during detaining him; the medical practices of	7	began to experience the symptoms of post-traumatic
8	Dr Chaudhary and Dr Oozeerally in deeming him fit to be	8	stress disorder PTSD in 2007, after returning from
9	detained and fit to fly and fit to be subject to force,	9	service in Iraq where he had seen friends and colleagues
10	failing to comply with their duties under rules 34 and	10	die in horrendous circumstances. He made an attempt on
11	35; the routine, unlawful use of removal from	11	his life in 2011, and spent three weeks in hospital
12	association by officers, particularly Steve Dix, who	12	before being discharged from the army in 2012. You also
13	neither enjoyed authority for such matters nor used it	13	heard he was awarded compensation from the Ministry of
14	for lawful purposes; and the absence of any monitoring	14	Defence as a result of the debilitating effects of his
15	or checks and balances capable of picking up on the	15	PTSD.
16	rampant outlawry exhibited in this case.	16	D643's case is, in many respects, the embodiment of
17	The inquiry is invited to find that he was subjected	17	all of the systemic failings in Brook House that this
18	to inhuman and degrading treatment both within the	18	inquiry has heard about. Just a few examples.
19	individual incidents and in his overall detention.	19	He suffered racist abuse from officers, including
20	There was a procedural systemic and operational failure	20	when he was so ill from food poisoning that he had
21	to identify and protect and monitor D1914 as	21	passed out in his cell, being woken to hear
22	a vulnerable detainee in breach of the duties arising	22	Graham Purnell, a G4S officer, saying to him, "Why don't
23	under article 3.	23	you go home, you fucking nigger, why are you pretending
24	Thank you.	24	that you are sick?". He was mocked by other officers,
25	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr Goodman.	25	including DCMs Andrew Lyden and Steve Webb, who told him
	Page 81		Page 83
1	Mr Lee?	1	he was pretending to be sick to avoid his removal from
2	Closing statement by MR LEE	2	the country. On other occasions, he heard an officer
3	MR LEE: Thank you, chair, I shall be addressing you in	3	say, "Why don't these blacks go back to their country?"
4	closing concerning D643.	4	and "All the blacks are the same".
5	Before I begin, just on behalf of D643, I would like	5	He describes a culture of disbelief from both guards
6	to thank you, chair, counsel and solicitors to the	6	and healthcare, a description wholly consistent with
7	inquiry legal team, and all of the support staff, for	7	other evidence that has emerged during this inquiry and
8	bringing this inquiry together with such care and such	8	that you, chair, have seen and heard. He describes
9	hard work. I will address you slightly later on about	9	officers mocking and laughing at detainees who were
10	what it meant to D643 to be able to come and give live	10	mentally unwell, watching detainees in states of
11	evidence to the inquiry.	11	distress and laughing at them. Again, this is wholly
12	D643 spent a total of 558 days in Brook House over	12	consistent with footage that has been examined and other
13	the course of four separate occasions. On the fourth	13	accounts of the toxic culture at Brook House. He
14	occasion, he was detained for 504 consecutive days. He	14	described officers stating that detainees were
15	was detained in Brook House for the entire relevant	15	pretending to be ill to avoid deportation, when, in
16	period that the inquiry is concerned of and for	16	fact, they were in profound mental health distress.
17	substantial periods before and after it.	17	He also describes a culture of complacency and
18	He was never removed. He remains in the UK and he	18	indifference towards bullying and abuse from other
19	was paid substantial damages by the Home Office in	19	detainees, and how he would be subject to homophobic and
20	respect of his unlawful detention in Brook House.	20	racist abuse. The guards would do nothing to intervene
		21	and sometimes even join in.
21	No one has ever apologised to him.	21	
	No one has ever apologised to him. 503 consecutive days in administrative detention is	21 22	He was subject to disproportionate use of force on
21			He was subject to disproportionate use of force on at least two occasions. He was subjected to a rule 40
21 22	503 consecutive days in administrative detention is	22	
21 22 23	503 consecutive days in administrative detention is a scarcely believable amount of time. In and of itself,	22 23	at least two occasions. He was subjected to a rule 40
21 22 23 24	503 consecutive days in administrative detention is a scarcely believable amount of time. In and of itself, chair, you may consider that it shows that something	22 23 24	at least two occasions. He was subjected to a rule 40 removal from association that was clearly illegal, and

1	cruelties, such as being refused toilet roll and other	1	medico-legal report that triggered it in his medical
2	essential items, having post pushed under the cell door	2	record upon entry to Brook House on 21 December 2016.
3	in the dead of night so that men would wake up to see it	3	That careless, indifferent cruelty was to become the
4	and fret that it was bad news about a removal flight or	4	theme of his lengthy detention at Brook House. It was
5	a decision on their immigration status. He talked of	5	a shocking failure from the outset to comply with
6	the frustration of men not being able to contact their	6	rule 34 and rule 35 of the Detention Centre Rules. It
7	lawyers because of poor internet connection and other	7	was a shocking breach of the duty of care to
8	inadequate communication facilities.	8	a vulnerable detainee.
9	But, chair, it was his treatment by healthcare staff	9	Chair, rules 34 and 35 of the Detention Centre Rules
10	that has had the deepest impact on him and that is, on	10	have been on the books for over 20 years. It is simply
11	any analysis, deeply shocking.	11	unbelievable that those in charge of healthcare at
12	In context, in many respects, D643 had huge	12	Brook House did not apply them properly. They are not
13	advantages over many of the other detainees: he is	13	despite what some corporate witnesses have said,
14	an articulate man; he spent 11 years in the British	14	complicated. They amount to a few sentences. They are
15	Army; he speaks fluent English and understands how to	15	the rules. To fail to apply one of the few safeguards
16	operate in a hierarchical, structured and process-driven	16	that vulnerable detainees had to protect them is
17	environment; he had experienced detention in other IRCs,	17	inexcusable and unforgivable.
18	and in prison, and he had even been tasked by the	18	Let's not forget that the Home Office watched with
19	British Army to assist with the detention of people in	19	folded arms as month after month, year after year passed
20	Iraq.	20	and no rule 35(2) reports were issued and barely any
21	Despite all of this, he experienced catastrophic	21	rule 35(1) reports came through. Did this not pique
22	failures of care at every turn, beginning with the	22	anyone's curiosity as to what might be happening?
23	failures by the doctors to give him a proper physical	23	Apparently not.
24	and mental health examination on entry, failure to take	24	Sandra Calver and Dr Oozeerally gave evidence that
25	the most basic of steps to check his previous medical	25	the Home Office never once raised any concerns about the
20	and most cause of steps to enter my previous measure.		
	Page 85		Page 87
1	records when he was inducted, and a complete failure to	1	lack of those rule 35 reports. Why? I think we know
2	identify, diagnose and to attempt to treat his mental	2	the answer.
3	health problems, including his complex combat-related	3	Dr Hard gave evidence that the treatment, or lack of
4	PTSD.	4	it, of D643 indicated both a systemic failure in the
5	D643 was man who he liked to keep notes, to write	5	screening process and the application of the rule 34 and
6	things down, to keep a record. He diligently tried to	6	35 processes, and was indicative to be accepted of
7	follow the correct procedures, he made complaint after	7	a lack of a system to identify and cross-refer to
8	complaint, after complaint, about his treatment and the	8	previous medical history.
9	lack of engagement by healthcare staff. Those	9	Dr Hard also agreed that if someone like D643, who,
10	complaints either disappeared into the ether or took so	10	as I said, spoke fluent English, he was articulate, he
11	long to considered as to be entirely useless.	11	was able to identify precisely what he required to treat
12	It must have been like shouting into a void.	12	his PTSD, having received that treatment before, if he
13	You have heard that when D643 entered Brook House on	13	could not obtain the treatment he required, it would be
14	that fourth occasion, despite having had three previous	14	practically impossible for someone, who did not share
15	health inductions and having been diagnosed with PTSD	15	those advantages, to get adequate treatment.
16	while he was in the army, subsequently whilst in prison,	16	It is worth pausing to think what that means. It
17	and in another IRC, there was simply no mention of PTSD	17	means it is likely that hundreds of detainees, during
18	in his health screening records.	18	the relevant period, and before and after, whose names
18	Despite having informed Brook House healthcare on	19	we will never know, and whose stories will never be
		20	told, suffered in similar ways.
20	previous documented occasions when he was there about	20	To suggest that what we have seen in this inquiry
21	this diagnosis, and of the previous treatment he needed	21 22	amounts to a series of isolated incidents is, with the
22	and had received, and having, just two weeks previously,	22 23	amounts to a series of isolated incidents is, with the greatest respect, utter nonsense.
23	prior to his induction, had a rule 35(1) report issued	23	D643 describes being particularly upset at the
24		1.4	DOTO DESCRIVES DELING DALLICULARLY UDSEL AL LIE
24	at the Verne on the basis of his PTSD, there was no		
24 25	at the Verne on the basis of his PTSD, there was no mention of that diagnosis, the rule 35(1) report or the	25	callous indifference of Drs Chaudhary and Oozeerally,

1	callous indifference, you may find, chair, which is	1	was, in fact, released.
2	wholly corroborated by the evidence you have seen in	2	D643 informed healthcare on numerous occasions that
3	this inquiry. The examples are many, but I shall	3	he was feeling suicidal and he had been identified by
4	mention, because of the time restraints, just four.	4	members of the healthcare team as having suicidal
5	On 12 June 2017, Dr Chaudhary confirmed to the	5	ideations on four other separate occasions. No rule 35
6	Home Office in a letter that D643 was fit to be detained	6	report was ever produced.
7	and fit to fly, and that was despite not examining D643,	7	Dr Hard gave evidence that it was inevitable that
8	not referring to any of his mental health difficulties	8	the detention of a man like D643 for an indefinite
9	and not having even seen him for three months. No doubt	9	period, day after long day, week after long week, asking
10	the good doctor was just giving the customer, the	10	for help for his mental distress and receiving none in
11	Home Office, what he knew they wanted.	11	return, would damage him. The damage was long lasting.
12	In July 2017, D643 tried to give healthcare three	12	Indeed, it continues. D643 ended his witness statement
13	separate medico-legal reports commissioned by his	13	by stating:
14	solicitors that confirmed he was not fit for detention.	14	"When I was released from detention, I was referred
15	The doctors refused to look at them.	15	by my GP to receive treatment from a psychiatrist at
16	Pausing there, it is, of course, not enough simply	16	a mental health hospital. My faith in medical
17	to point the finger at the two careless doctors. Those	17	professionals had been so shaken by the treatment I had
18	medical reports were provided to the Home Office, yet	18	received in the Brook House healthcare that I was
19	detention review after detention review kept authorising	19	extremely anxious. I did not feel able to trust the
20	detention.	20	psychiatrist on meeting her. It was as though I was
21	In January 2018, D643 tried to tell Dr Chaudhary	21	waiting for her to disbelieve me or to act in a hostile
22	that he was suicidal and needed help, but was turned	22	manner that I had been customed to at Brook House.
23	away and told he could not help him. Of course, it goes	23	I was unable to move past my fear that she would turn
24	without saying that no rule 35(2) report was even	24	out to be like the healthcare staff and doctors at
25	contemplated.	25	Brook House and, as a result, I did not feel able to
	Page 89		Page 91
	rage or		rage 91
1	In February 2018, D643 went to Dr Oozeerally again	1	attend any further sessions with her. Even now, after
2	and attempted to get help on the basis that his mental	2	four years later, I do not feel that I have fully
3	health was deteriorating. Again, no help was proffered	3	recovered from the treatment I was subjected to at
4	and D643 was told that the doctor had no time to waste	4	Brook House. I still suffer from flashbacks, in
5	on him. Again, it goes without saying that no rule 35	5	particular in relation to the use of force incidents
6	report was produced.	6	outlined above and the way I was treated by the
7	Finally, on 12 March 2018, despite all that had gone	7	healthcare professionals, in particular Dr Chaudhary and
8	before, despite the medico-legal reports, the obvious	8	Dr Oozeerally."
9	mental health distress and the length of his detention,	9	In hindsight, nobody has, or could, defend the
10	Dr Oozeerally wrote to the Home Office stating that D643	10	detention of D643 in Brook House. He has received
11	was fit for detention, fit to fly, and was getting	11	damages for unlawful detention, but he has never
12	adequate care.	12	received an apology or an indication as to what period
13	This was despite the fact that he had not examined	13	the Home Office accept was unlawful.
14	D643, and D643 was not, in fact, receiving any care at	14	Karen Churcher gave evidence that it was not
15	all from healthcare at this time. It was careless	15	an environment where it was possible, or even
16	cruelty.	16	appropriate, to attempt to give trauma-based therapy,
17	Finally, and just ten days later, on 22 March 2018,	17	and this must have been known from the outset.
18	in a stunning and absurd volte face, Dr Chaudhary wrote	18	Sandra Calver gave evidence the detainees did not
19	to the Home Office and informed them that D643 was	19	have access to appropriate psychiatric treatment and
20	indeed in need of specialist PTSD treatment which was	20	that detention centres were not the appropriate
21	not available in detention, and he was, therefore, not	21	environment to promote recovery from mental ill-health.
22	fit to be detained. That was 457 days since D643 had	22	Everyone from the Royal College of Psychiatrists to
23	entered Brook House with a previous diagnosis of complex	23	Dr Hard, and to even the former DCOs that you've heard
24	combat-related PTSD. It was careless cruelty of the	24	from, agree that it is not a suitable place for a man
25	worst kind. It would even be another 47 days before he	25	with PTSD or other mental health difficulties.
	Page 90		Page 92

1	The Home Office are the apparently the only people who	1	about that. Thank you very much.
2	disagree.	2	MS LUH: I will do my best to keep to that.
3	You have heard that it is not just that recovery is	3	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
4	impossible for those with PTSD, Dr Hard and others	4	Closing statement by MS LUH
5	confirmed that detainees are positively harmed by being	5	MS LUH: I make these submissions on behalf of D801, D1275,
6	detained in those circumstances. And so it was with	6	D1713, D2158 and D1473. On behalf of them, I thank the
7	D643.	7	chair, counsel and solicitors to the inquiry for giving
8	Finally, chair, what does D643 ask of the inquiry?	8	them a voice in this inquiry.
9	As I mentioned, he is profoundly grateful to have been	9	If I can just say at the outset, as a shortcut, that
10	given an opportunity to give evidence.	10	each one of them was subjected to a regime which Dr Hard
11	He has emphasised repeatedly to his legal team that	11	described as "completely deprived of safeguards". It
12	the simple act of being listened to, of being taken	12	was inevitable that they would experience mental
13	seriously, of being given an opportunity to put on the	13	suffering of the kind prohibited by article 3 and in
14	record what happened to him, is of immense value to him.	14	particular, in the circumstances where none of them knew
15	He is profoundly grateful to Callum Tulley for shining	15	when the situation was going to end, it was, for them
16	a light into this dark episode of his life.	16	the detention was, for them, interminable.
17	As for recommendations, we will go into more detail,	17	If I can take you to D801 first, everything that the
18	chair, in our written submissions, but, briefly, the	18	Home Office knew about D801 should have, but did not,
19	system of indefinite detention harms people; it is	19	prevent him from being detained on 1 March. The
20	cruel. The system of detaining the mentally ill and the	20	Home Office knew that he suffers psychotic depression,
21	vulnerable harms people; it is cruel.	21	PTSD, and had attempted to overdose twice in the
22	It does not matter what the corporate logos are on	22	community. The Home Office had medical evidence that
23	the uniforms or what banal corporate values are	23	a previous period of detention in 2015 contributed to
24	displayed on posters on the walls, the system brutalises	24	this and, had they bothered to look at the reports, they
25	those that are expected to work in it, it harms those	25	patently show that he was an Adult at Risk, level 3, the
	Page 93		Page 95
1	who are detained within it, and it rewards the careless	1	highest level, and that he would be harmed if
2	cruelty of those who displayed indifference to D643's	2	redetained.
3	suffering again and again. Tinkering with the machinery	3	There was no fixed date for removal, and he was not
4	of this cruelty will not end it. Nothing short of	4	a public protection concern case. Therefore, he should
5	a radical change will ensure what happened to D643 and	5	not have ever been in Brook House in 2017.
6	the other men you have heard from will not happen again.	6	Dr Hard's critique of the treatment of D801 in
7	As for Brook House itself, Brook House is simply	7	detention speaks for itself. He said in oral evidence
8	a symptom, a morbid symptom of a sick system,	8	that, although not physically assaulted by staff or
9	a category B prison that is not a category prison,	9	verbally abused, leaving D801 in detention for this
10	a 72-hour removal centre that is nothing of the sort.	10	period of time of a total of 34 days caused him to
11	It is a place of harm, it is a place of shame, and it	11	suffer ill-treatment because none of the safeguards that
12	should be shut for good.	12	were meant to function to remove him from detention
13	Perhaps it should be turned into a museum, chair,	13	worked.
14	and future generations can visit it, read the	14	D801 was a really good example, Dr Hard said, of
15	testimonies of the men who were shut up in it, watch the	15	a complete inattention of the understanding of the
16	footage that triggered this inquiry in the first place,	16	purpose of the rules and the imperative to relay that
17	and shake their heads in wonder as to how it ever came	17	information to the Home Office at the earliest
18	to this.	18	opportunity with a mechanism that would have meant
19	Thank you, chair.	19	a review of detention was undertaken at that point in
20	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Lee.	20	time.
21	I wonder whether we actually take our lunch now	21	At every opportunity, the safeguards failed. There
22	I am so sorry, Ms Luh, do you are you able to give me	22	was no rule 35(1), (2) or (3) raised throughout the
23	an indication of how long you are likely to need?	23	entirety of his detention until the very last day, when
24	MS LUH: I had planned on only being 20 minutes.	24	a rule 35(1) was completed by Dr Chaudhary, only because
25	THE CHAIR: Let's go ahead and do that then. I'm sorry	25	Dr Belda, the IRC psychiatrist, said unequivocally that
	Page 94		Page 96

		1	
1	D801 was not suited for detention.	1	know how to seek help. His severe mental health issues
2	All the signs of this was apparent long before	2	were unidentified, managed or treated at all at
3	Dr Belda made that statement on 31 March 2017. D801 was	3	Brook House, and this was despite recurring health logs,
4	someone that the Home Office and healthcare knew	4	citing his bizarre and sometimes aggressive behaviour
5	required treatment that was unavailable in detention.	5	and incoherent answers to questions. Even the Iranian
6	Dr Belda told them so on day two, but this did not cause	6	consulate raised concerns with the Home Office about his
7	the Home Office to recognise that this was a seriously	7	strange behaviour. Instead, and frequently, D1275's
8	unwell man who, as someone on a proper application of	8	behaviour was seen as refractory and was managed by
9	the Adults at Risk policy, should not remain in	9	segregation for extended periods of time. At
10	detention. There was no contemplation of other	10	Brook House, he was repeatedly referred to the mental
11	alternatives to detention, namely, release into the	11	health team and repeatedly discharged from that team's
12	community when a hospital transfer was declined a week	12	case load. No one bothered to do the basic checks to
13	later.	13	find out why he had missed so many appointments.
14	Instead, D801 was managed unlawfully, contrary to	14	Karen Churcher and Sandra Calver were both resolved to
15	good psychiatric care, in de facto segregation on	15	say that attendance at medical appointments was a matter
16	E wing, subject to ACDT the whole time, at the	16	of patient's choice, irrespective of vulnerabilities.
17	beginning, on constant watch. You have heard a lot of	17	His non-attendance was described in terms of wasted
18	evidence of how this is not treatment, and did nothing	18	hours and resources of the mental health team, rather
19	to prevent deterioration.	19	than symptomatic of a seriously unwell man. Neither
20	In fact, in D801's case he tried to kill himself	20	contemplated that he could lack mental capacity to make
21	using a shoelace as a ligature, and razors, whilst on	21	decisions about accessing medical treatment or speak up
22	ACDT, but even that didn't trigger any statutory	22	for himself about his detention or conditions of
23	reporting mechanisms under rule 35. There were a total	23	detention. There was no practice to do so. They didn't
24	of four part Cs sent to the Home Office, each uploaded	24	know how to do so. Ms Calver accepted, and rightly so,
25	onto the system, each ignored.	25	that this was a serious failure in knowledge and care.
23	onto the system, each ignored.	23	that this was a scrious failure in knowledge and care.
	Page 97		Page 99
1	The only treatment following his suicide attempt was	1	D1275 was just left to languish. But for the
2	advice to him on how to snap an elastic band around his	2	tenacity of Naomi Blackwell, a caseworker at GDWG, he
3	wrist to help him cope with stress. It is not hard to	3	could have remained in detention indeterminately in
4	begin to understand that this cannot be treatment of the	4	an environment that discriminated against him because
5	kind necessary for him.	5	the Home Office has refused to make provision for
6	You will recall Dr Bingham's evidence that detention	6	independent advocacy for people who lack mental
7	has the effect of forcing victims of torture to relive	7	capacity. By the time GDWG found him, he had been in
8	their past torture as if it was happening to them again.	8	detention for nearly 400 days, even though the
9	There is no doubt, from D801's narrative to	9	Home Office knew long before that he could not be
10	an independent expert, Dr Sen, that he suffered	10	removed. He would remain in detention for 616 days, 442
11	article 3 inhumane and degrading treatment at	11	at Brook House, before he was able to access lawyers and
12	Brook House, and Dr Sen summarises:	12	secure release. Dr Hard said in oral evidence that it
13	"He could not eat and was throwing up all time. He	13	was inevitable that a vulnerable detainee, subjected to
14	just stayed inside his room and didn't want to socialise	14	this kind of length, would suffer harm and, in fact,
15	with anyone. The food tasted to him as if he was eating	15	even someone who didn't have these issues would find it
16	a pair of glasses, like it was burning. He didn't wish	16	difficult and would deteriorate in an environment like
17	to explain anything to the authorities, just stayed away	17	this.
18	from the food, and the whole experience felt to him like	18	Sandra Calver accepted serious omissions in this
19	walking on fire. Every single day felt as if there was	19	case, causing him significant ill-treatment.
20	biting on his skin and he physically felt the pain."	20	His immediate hospitalisation on release under the
21	D1275. But for this inquiry, the true nature of the	21	Mental Health Act for nearly half a year clearly
22	ill-treatment suffered by D1275 at Brook House would	22	demonstrates the extent of his mental deterioration and
23	never have come to light. He was so severely unwell	23	how unsuited he was for immigration detention. We all
24	during the time he was there that he couldn't even	24	now know too familiarly the footage from 14 June 2017
25	describe his experiences to anyone in a coherent way and	25	where he was cruelly and casually mocked by
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-5	It was startly and subdury moved by
	Page 98		Page 100

		1	
1	DCM Nathan Ring and DCO Derek Murphy with derogatory	1	nothing to prevent him from re-experiencing, over and
2	remarks, including "div", "scrotum" and the more	2	over again, his torture in the form of intrusive
3	chilling and recurring phrase that has been used at	3	flashbacks.
4	Brook House, "If he dies, he dies". All this while he	4	Not one nurse carrying out ACDT reviews thought to
5	was suffering the acute effects of a spice attack.	5	refer him for rule 35 assessment, despite repeated
6	A nurse present for the mockery didn't challenge it, in	6	disclosure of torture, flashbacks and self-harm. Whilst
7	fact, joined in with, "Homey is after your coke". The	7	detained, he was the target for derogatory and demeaning
8	evidence before the inquiry shows that it was widely	8	comments. One DCO compared him to locking up a dog. He
9	known that he was vulnerable and being exploited as	9	felt humiliated, scared, "Like I was not being seen or
10	a guinea pig for spice. No one did anything to stop it.	10	treated as a human being". He was powerless to do
11	No one reported it. They just watched it happen and	11	anything because, "We were all scared of the
12	some joined in to mock him. It was callous, but allowed	12	consequences of speaking out, we were living in fear.
13	to be repeated because of a culture of impunity and	13	Brook House was like hell". He is now scared to go to
14	dehumanisation that pervaded Brook House, which	14	sleep at night, scared to close his eyes, fearing that
15	normalised this kind of behaviour and suppressed	15	the experiences that he had at Brook House would flash
16	dissent.	16	through his mind. Detention at Brook House spawned
17	He still is not able to speak about his experience	17	a severe episode of depression and has had a lasting
18	at Brook House. When his solicitor Hamish Arnott tried,	18	effect which an independent expert, Dr Galappathie, has
19	he became distressed. This fragility of his mental	19	said has a poor prognosis for recovery.
20	state, still, is a product of the intense mental	20	D2158's experience is very similar. He was not
21	suffering he experienced in prolonged immigration	21	pre-screened before detention, despite being of a victim
22	detention and an article 3 breach is inescapable in his	22	of torture or sexual abuse. He was detained unlawfully
23	case.	23	for the whole time he was at Brook House because there
24	D1713 is a victim of torture, sexual and physical	24	was no power to detain someone like him. Although he
25	abuse with pre-existing PTSD before entering Brook House	25	was liable to be returned to Germany under the
	1 8		,
	Page 101		Page 103
1	in March 2017. He is a classic illustration of the	1	Dublin Pagulations, the tension could only be applied to
			Dublin Regulations, the tension could only be applied to
2 3	lasting mental harm caused by a complete deprivation of	2 3	someone like him if he was at significant risk of absconding, and he was not.
4	safeguards. No questions were asked at health screening to identify any past history of trauma or torture.	4	Once detained, again, there were no rule 34
5	Within hours of being at Brook House, he was asking to	5	appointments, there were no rule 35 appointments. In
6	see a GP because he was experiencing flashbacks from	6	the meantime, he suffered worsening heart palpitations
	being detained. Although he disclosed self-harm	7	
7 8		8	and nightmares and often felt like someone was putting
9	ideation and torture to Dr Chaudhary, no rule 35(3) report was raised and no rule 35(1) was raised.	9	their hands around his throat and he struggled to breathe. The sounds of doors opening, banging and the
10	Dr Chaudhary could not give a coherent answer for why	10	
		11	sounds of keys would make his whole body shake and he would feel an electric shock in his body. He couldn't
11	this was the case. He said he thought he needed to wait	12	•
12	and see if D1713 actually deteriorated, which plainly is not what the rules say.	13	convey the intensity of his mental anguish and physical
13	•		suffering because, each time he went to healthcare, he
14	We now know, of course, that Dr Chaudhary didn't	14	was not given an interpreter. So the rule 35 assessment
15	understand what the rule 35 safeguard required of him as	15	he finally got from Dr Oozeerally was cursory and
16	a doctor or why, which, as Dr Hard said, put detainees	16	careless and didn't address the impact of detention on
17	like D1713 directly in harm's way.	17	him as a victim of torture, who was suffering recurring
18 19	The Home Office treated his self-harm, trauma and past torture as self-declared, of no value as far as the	18 19	trauma symptoms and heart palpitations. His report was
	-		one of three quarters of the rule 35 reports at
20	Adults at Risk policy was concerned. This reflected, of	20	Brook House at the time which failed to address the
21	course, the culture of disbelief built into the evidence	21	impact of detention. The Home Office relied on that to
22	levels of the risk, but in circumstances, also, where	22	keep him in detention, so that he could suffer even
23	the Home Office failed to ensure the safeguards linked	23	more.
24	to it actually functioned.	24	When he commenced a period of food refusal because
25	Again, the only treatment was ACDT, which did	25	he felt he had no alternative, this was dismissed as
	Page 102		Page 104
		1	

1	a dietary issue with no investigation into his	1	normalisation of the use of force in the centre. It was
2	escalating trauma symptoms and deteriorating mental	2	reckless, inhumane and degrading, especially when
3	health. Whilst detained, he was kicked by different	3	deployed for prolonged periods of time. The entrenched
4	custody officers on two occasions and also bullied and	4	failure of the Home Office and its contractors to even
5	demeaned. The violence was unprovoked, doled out	5	appreciate and recognise this is illustrated by the
6	casually with the intent of intimidating, demeaning and	6	PSU's response to the complaint made by D1473 concerning
7	humiliating.	7	his restraint, categorising it as a "minor misconduct".
8	He couldn't complain, he didn't know how, and he was	8	On behalf of all of these individuals, I endorse
9	afraid to because, at night, he often heard other	9	Ms Harrison's submissions on the need for urgent interim
10	detainees screaming in pain after lock-in. He thought	10	recommendations so as to bring to an end, finally, the
11	they were being physically assaulted by officers. He	11	deprivation of safeguards which continue to this day to
12	didn't want it to happen to him. Such was the culture	12	currently affect detainees in Brook House. This has to
13	of fear detainees were subjected to at Brook House.	13	stop and it has to stop now.
14	Finally, D1473, his mistreatment at Brook House is	14	Thank you very much.
15	graphically illustrated by the prolonged and excessive	15	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ms Luh.
16	restraint he suffered for some five and a half hours	16	Thank you.
17	during an attempted unlawful removal whilst at	17	I appreciate you keeping to that time. Much
18	Brook House. Whilst the force used the waist	18	appreciated. We are going to break for lunch now and
19	restraint belt was applied by Tascor officers, it was	19	I am still going to keep us to 2.00 to make sure we
20	initiated on Brook House premises with the knowledge and	20	don't slip from the timetable. Thank you, see you at
21	apparent supervision of G4S and Home Office staff.	21	2.00.
22	There was simply no justification for this	22	(1.05 pm)
23	restraint, it was unplanned, because there was no risk	23	(The short adjournment)
24	assessment to suggest he should be restrained for	24	, ,
25	removal. He was compliant throughout the removal	25	(2.00 pm)
	D 40-		D 40-
	Page 105		Page 107
1	process from start to finish and presented no actual	1	THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Armstrong, thank you.
2	risk to anyone. And more importantly, it is another	2	MR ARMSTRONG: Now I am going to work out which of these
3	case where it should never have happened, because D1473	3	microphones work. It sounds like that one is.
4	was not removable at the time. He had outstanding	4	Thank you, chair. I hope does that sound like
5	representations on article 8 grounds and he was	5	it's working to you?
6	recognised as an Adult at Risk, level 3, and manifestly	6	THE CHAIR: It does to me.
7	unsuitable for detention and on ACDT.	7	Closing statement by MR ARMSTRONG
8	Mr Shaw, in 2014, in a report prepared by the	8	MR ARMSTRONG: Chair, my purpose this afternoon is to try to
9	Advisory Panel on Non-compliance Management, identified	9	persuade you to be clear and definitive in your findings
10	the use of a waist restraint belt in these circumstances	10	and to be bold in your recommendations. I do that
11	as inimical to the person's dignity. The duration and	11	because this inquiry is unique, it has not been done in
12	effects of this use of force against D1473 actually	12	this area before, the Home Office didn't want it, and
13	caused mental and physical suffering. In his own words:	13	they probably won't do it again.
14	"It was terrifying and humiliating from start to	14	There have, of course, been investigations, there
15	finish. I was treated like an animal you were	15	have been years of them Yarl's Wood, Oakington,
16	transporting. The terror was indescribable."	16	Shaw I know that you know about all of those.
17	His is but one of many cases concerning routine	17	There has also been years of litigation, there have
18	misuse of a waist restraint belt to facilitate the	18	been inquests, we have heard about Jimmy Mubenga and
19	discharge of vulnerable detainees to Tascor officers.	19	Prince Fosu, but there has been nothing like this.
20	Other examples include the removals of 1234 and D2054,	20	There has certainly not been the volume and range and
21	both forcibly restrained whilst naked and subsequently	21	intensity of the oral evidence you have had. Litigation
22	placed in waist restraint belts on handover to Tascor.	22	in this area is almost always judicial review or
23	The routine use of passive restraints in these	23	tribunal and it almost never has much in the way of oral
24	circumstances, with no prior consideration of the risk	24	evidence.
25	of vulnerabilities of the person, reflected the general	25	Inquests have a bit more, but they are necessarily
	Page 106		Page 108
	0		

1	limited in their scope and they certainly don't have the	1	PTSD, and you may remember how he was on the stand,
2	assistance that you have had from the solicitor and	2	struggling to give his evidence.
3	counsel to the inquiry teams, who have worked as hard as	3	The parade of unreconstructed men, the DCOs, unled
4	they have worked for as long as they have worked.	4	and unguided in their attitudes.
5	So you are in this unique position.	5	One or two people tried to stand up to it, but they
6	It is also, of course, the fact that none of that	6	got nowhere. So you heard from Owen Syred, you heard
7	previous work prevented what we have seen in 2017 in	7	of, and we have seen evidence from, David Waldock, and
8	Brook House. And it also appears that, even when	8	of course there is also, in all of this, the women, the
9	Panorama came out in September 2017, as happened	9	senior women, in fact, Stacie Dean, Michelle Brown,
10	previously with Yarl's Wood and Oakington, the secret	10	I think, in my submission, broken, too, in their way,
11	recording itself was not enough to stop things. Serious	11	not here, including for reasons that Michelle Brown,
12	problems continued. And you have heard evidence post	12	you understand the reasons for that, and we have seen
13	the relevant period about what has happened when	13	their histories of being stressed, having periods of
14	pressures have been put back on the system, including	14	time off work, and telling you how and when they raised
15	things like Dublin removals and small boats and you have	15	matters and you can see how far those got.
16	heard evidence, even from Mr Hewer last week, about	16	You have seen their emails, you have seen the
17	constant watches, there were two constant watches in the	17	response or the lack of it, including when raised
18	centre and still it appears in 35(2) reports. So those	18	directly by senior people, directly with
19	problems remain. All of that is, of course, with the	19	Jerry Petherick, in January 2018, in the Stacie Dean
20	spotlight of this inquiry on it.	20	example, and one has to remember, if it is like that for
21	A key question of concern, certainly for those	21	them, if those people, at their level, cannot get change
22	I represent, is what happens when that spotlight is	22	or movement, what must it be like being or if they
23	taken away again, and how much and to what extent do	23	are reacting or experiencing that from Brook House, what
24	things slide because, certainly in this area, things	24	on earth must it be like for the detained people
25		25	themselves?
23	always slide.	23	uicinscives:
	Page 109		Page 111
1	Mr Riley gave evidence yesterday, he spoke of	1	You have heard a lot about their unique and
2	change. But he, too, has been forced to speak of	2	vulnerable characteristics and it is, again, we say,
3	change. He was abandoning statements yesterday under	3	only you who can do something about it. Because, if not
4	questioning from Mr Altman that he made as recently as	4	you, then who? And if not now, then when?
5	the beginning of this inquiry in his witness statement	5	I do just want to note the chronology because it is
6	when more was being put to him.	6	not just now nearly 20 years since Yarl's Wood and 17
7	So we have, certainly from this side of the room,	7	since Oakington, it is six years since Callum Tulley was
8	a degree of skepticism, because we have been here so	8	concerned about what he was seeing to contact the BBC in
9	much more so many times before. As that when that	9	the wake of Medway. It is four and a half years since
10	inertia stays, when that inertia entrenches, what	10	Panorama came out.
11	happens is the number of victims mount because they	11	It cannot be said that the Home Office has not had
12	remain in detention and the victims that we already have wait for change or wait for a solution. So I am afraid	12	the time to do something about this. We have to ask,
13	_	13	why haven't they acted? And we'll see some answers to
14	I am here to say only you can do something about it.	14	that in a moment.
15	Only you can try to achieve sustained and reliable	15	We say there is just one shot at this, and we
16	change, so that this does not happen again.	16	certainly have to assume there is only really going to
17	I also say that, related to that, only you have the	17	be one shot at this, and I am afraid it is you.
18	material, because you have had the breadth and the depth	18	The not fiddling with it; we say, fundamentally
19	of the evidence and that starts with Callum Tulley's	19	altering it.
20	footage and then it moves into the sheer grinding	20	Now, what do we say that you have seen and you
21	awfulness of the granular detail that you have heard and	21	have sat through all of this, and I am not going to go
22	have sat through, so the inadequate systems, the	22	through all of the evidence, I don't have the time to do
23	inadequate management, the inadequate staff, the parade	23	the evidence, you have sat through every witness
24	of broken men, remember you Mr Lee talked about his	24	I think it may be just you and Zaynab, in fact, and,
25	client D643, the former army officer struggling with	25	I think, one other, who has seen every single witness in
	Page 110		Page 112

1 1 the room, so you know what they have said and you have importance of language, but where you have language that 2 2 robs people of their fundamental humanity, and that 3 From our point of view, the key point that I would 3 that -- and the "dehumanising" is the word that they are 4 emphasise, and we presage this in our opening, is the 4 all using, then that does take us a long way, we say, to 5 toxicity, the unique toxicity, of immigration detention. 5 establishing that the treatment was inhumane. And 6 Now, "toxicity" is a word that has been used a lot, I make another point here, which is a point that 6 7 counsel to the inquiry has referred to the contagion of 7 Ms Harrison has already made this morning, that both in 8 toxicity, and I do want to say something about the 8 phase 1, when we heard from detained people directly, 9 9 but also in phase 2, when we had the read-in evidence language that we have heard. 10 10 I am not going to go back through it, I am not going from detained people, men spoke of their experience of 11 being -- "I felt like an animal", "I was being treated 11 to repeat it, but I am just going to say keep in mind, 12 of course, its extent and its intensity, and it has been 12 like I was an animal" and it may very well be that those 13 shocking even for those who look at these things. 13 men spoke in those terms without realising the legal 14 Professor Bosworth told you last week, on 29 March, she 14 significance of the language that they were using, but 15 said it is obviously completely corrosive, and it was, 15 it does have a legal significance because it is 16 dehumanising. That is what they are describing, being you know, the widespread nature of those sorts of 16 17 comments that are picked up on the undercover footage 17 treated like an animal. So that is also very highly 18 that is genuinely shocking, and it clearly was not being 18 relevant in article 3 terms. 19 addressed by management, it was widespread and, you 19 The second point I want to emphasise, moving on from 20 know, I think played quite a large part in the physical 20 language, is the extent to which we say this obviously 21 manifestation. 2.1 goes -- and we just want to knock this on the head --22 Remember when you are looking at the language, none 22 much wider than that which -- than Panorama showed. 23 of that would be acceptable, even in the high-security 23 There has been this discussion, and it is perhaps not 24 prison estate where you are dealing with extremely 24 a very helpful discussion, about whether it is bad 25 25 apples or a bad barrel, and there was that exchange dangerous men, and this is not the high-security prison Page 113 Page 115 between Mr Altman and Professor Bosworth last week about 1 estate, this is not even a prison. There are people 1 2 it, and we could debate about how many apples it takes that we have been looking at in this inquiry who have 2 3 never been anywhere like this before, gentle men, 3 to make a barrel. It isn't everyone in Brook House, but 4 guileless men, but even those who have been in a prison 4 it is wider than Panorama, and it is certainly wider 5 5 environment before, a wide variety of people, they, too, than those people who were dismissed as a result of 6 often scared, often mentally unwell. They may have 6 Panorama, and you can see that because we have to add in 7 7 committed offences, but those offences may just be a number of other groups, and that includes the people 8 documents offences, and they may also well be people 8 that you see on the unbroadcast footage, the people that 9 who -- and I will come back to this -- will, in fact, 9 you see on the body-worn camera footage. All of that is 10 end up staying in the UK. All of them are experiencing 10 the footage, incidentally, that Mr Brockington didn't 11 all of this pretty much all of the time with nothing 11 bother to watch before he gave his evidence about it 12 being done about it, the use of the language not being 12 being a supposed minority, despite his organisation 13 reported, not being corrected and not being stopped. 13 being responsible for producing much of that footage and 14 14 That is corrosive, as Professor Bosworth says and it producing it late. 15 15 You have to add in all of that. You have to add in is dehumanising. "Dehumanising" is another word that all of the people who didn't report the ill-treatment 16 has been used a lot in this inquiry. It has been the 16 17 17 premise for much of the questions from your counsel. and who were complicit, in that sense. And then you 18 18 have to add in the growing list of others who also seem No one seriously disagrees about the characterisation of 19 19 that. But it is worth emphasising the use of the word on the evidence, and we say, to be guilty of very 20 "dehumanising", because we are fundamentally in 20 serious behaviour. You have within that list -- and 2.1 an inquiry about article 3 ill-treatment, and article 3 2.1 just to name a few of them, Luke Instone-Brewer must be 22 ill-treatment is about treatment that is inhumane and, 22 pretty close to the top of that list, in my submission. 23 if you have language that is dehumanising, you will get 23 You have seen an enormous quantity of evidence that he 24 to a position where it renders something inhumane and we 24 was supplying spice to detained people and that he was 25 can look at authorities in due course about the 25 making a lot of money supplying spice to detained people

Page 114

		1	
1	and you have seen that evidence be multi-sourced. You	1	David Waldock complaint at the same time she is turning
2	have seen the intelligence that staff had and that	2	up in the GDWG materials, where people are talking about
3	Stacie Dean and Michelle Brown were talking about, you	3	how she was trying to stamp on things she thought were
4	have seen all of that material, Mr Livingston took him	4	second visits. There is no possibility of collusion
5	through it, but you have also seen that chime with	5	between GDWG and David Waldock. You see similar things
6	a completely different source of evidence, which is my	6	with Mr Purnell Mr Lee has talked about that again
7	client, D687. He has talked about the detail of that	7	this morning and the extreme racism that he
8	and how he was supplying it and the way that it was done	8	exhibited, and you see that that is being produced by
9	and the mechanics of how it was done and how it was	9	D643 but it was also in Callum Tulley's materials.
10	£50.02 in order to identify that level of detail.	10	Again, multi-source material that all knits together
11	And when that kind of evidence knits together, it shows	11	to show powerfully, we say that the allegations
12	you, in my submission, that it is true. What that tells	12	are true. Mr Tomsett, top of the leader board, as the
13	you is that Mr Instone-Brewer was doing this or behaving	13	most complained-about officer at Brook House, which is
14	in these ways in 2014/2015 and raising concerns with	14	something, given how many others were competing for that
15	staff then.	15	and how reluctant people were to complain in the first
16	It was raised again specifically with Mr Petherick	16	place. Promoted to DCM by Steve Skitt. All of that
17	in January 2017, but he was left in place at Brook House	17	material pointing in the same direction, all of them
18	until he left himself in July 2017.	18	taking part all of the time with this casual language.
19	You will you may remember, chair, when he was	19	And I'll just talk about that again. Where do you go
20	being challenged about this, the slightly cocky way, we	20	when you have used the F word, then they go to the
21	say, in which he gave his evidence, laughing as he	21	C word, then they go to the N word and you think, where
22	started his evidence. My submission is we can see very	22	else can they go after this? And then you get
23	clearly who he was and what he was and draw the	23	Sean Sayers comes out with a new phrase that seems to
24	conclusions accordingly.	24	have taken hold in this inquiry, and you see, again,
25	We also have on this list his friend, Mr Fagbo, he	25	just how toxic and degrading it has become.
	, 3		
	Page 117		Page 119
1	was also friends who were also friends. Both he and	1	But, now, what you do have, we say, is a significant
2	Mr Fagbo were friends with Jules Williams, and I am	2	percentage of the staff list. And you have,
3	emphasising these people because both of those two came	3	a significant percentage of that list, some of the
4	into contact we see it in his early witness	4	behaviour that is described here, some of them are still
5	statements. Again, my client, D687, these were the	5	working at Brook House. So a number of staff implicated
6	people he was bumping into. Jules Williams was also	6	in serious wrongdoing it has already been said this
7	friends with him and you have these insights as the	7	morning Chris Donnelly, Steve Loughton, Steve Dix,
8	evidence emerges, you have these insights which come out	8	Steve Skitt, all implicated to greater or lesser
9	of the detail, like Jules Williams and the complaint	9	degrees, still working, and that is a real concern about
10	that was made about him, and he was asked about it in	10	achieving proper change here.
11	his evidence, mucking about with a banana, apparently	11	The point about how wide this is and how culturally
12	aimed at a gay female member of staff.	12	broad or otherwise it is, you can also take from Callum
13	When you look at people who are behaving like that,	13	himself. He saw all of this in 2015 and 2016, which is
14	and he is a member of the SMT and you look at what that	14	why he approached the BBC in January 2016. He then
15	is showing the people below him, and then you just	15	waited for more than a year, he took notes, and they
16	imagine for a moment the dexterity which you think he	16	checked whether it was still all happening, they went
17	brings, or might bring, to the pain and suffering or	17	through the editorial process and realised it was still
18	concerns of detained persons, you get a real insight	18	happening and so started filming.
19	into how dehumanising and difficult this environment	19	
20	was. It is awful stuff. And on it goes. We see	20	He told you on 30 November, he said:
20	_	20 21	"Answer: [I know] why the inquiry are interested in the relevant period is because of my filming"
22	Gayatri Mehraa, Graham Purnell, Darren Tomsett, all of	21 22	Then he said this:
23	these names coming up in lots of different aspects of the evidence, all names with extensive poor behaviour	23	
23	and inadequacies recorded against them and, again,	23	"Answer: but to me it's the years and months before that were just as relevant, if not more relevant,
25	multi-sourced. We see Gayatri Mehraa turning up in the	25	because at least I was able to capture some of the abuse
23	mani-sourced. We see Gayant Mentaa turning up in the	23	occause at reast 1 was able to capture some of the abuse
	Page 118		Page 120

1	during between March and between April and August.	1	and not to acknowledge and not to reflect.
2	You know, to be honest, it's not the things I saw whilst	2	But we have still had people we still had the
3	secretly filming undercover which trouble me most,	3	senior people, we still had people like Mr Neden
4	because at least I filmed it so the world can see it.	4	persisting in claiming that Callum should have reported,
5	But it's the stuff that I witnessed before I started	5	that he could have relied on the systems, and then
6	wearing secret cameras. I know you're going to ask me	6	saying that people were harmed because Mr Tulley did not
7	about one incident in particular. You know, that's the	7	do that.
8	hardest stuff, because those officers have gotten away	8	Chair, I just want to note that. Others represent
9	with it and it seems G4S are only being held accountable	9	Callum, but I do want to note that on behalf of those
10	for the months of April to August, and I hope that's not	10	I represent. All of that is obvious nonsense. Those
11	going to be the case"	11	kinds of statements are entirely reprehensible, and we
12	The point this comes down to, he didn't just get	12	say two things should flow from it.
13	lucky with what he filmed between April and August.	13	First, we say you should reject it expressly. We
14	That was representative of the period he had seen for at	14	say Mr Tulley's actions in bringing all of this to light
15	least the preceding year. I said this in my opening and	15	have been entirely exemplary and we should all be
16	I will say it again: this is not just a snapshot; it is	16	grateful for them. It cannot sensibly be suggested that
17	indeed a panorama.	17	he did anything other than the right thing. 20 years
18	Mary Bosworth also told you on 29 March we can	18	old, 20 years old, and he managed to stand up in the
19	argue about the numbers, but there are clearly systemic	19	face of all of this when other people, who were much7
20	issues here. We say they are deep ones and they are	20	older, much more experienced and whose job it was to do
21	long-standing ones.	21	this stuff, stayed silent. We say the inquiry should
22	Now, just while I talk about Callum Tulley's	22	record that and record its gratitude. He stood up when
23	evidence, I want to make one other point. The inquiry	23	the system which he had happened to join crushed so many
24	has heard a lot from him. He has given evidence over	24	others.
25	four days, so, in fact, he has been pressed harder and	25	But secondly, we should just reflect for a moment in
	Page 121		Page 123
	1 age 121		1 age 123
1	for longer than any other witness. You have also had	1	relation to those who persist in these baseless
2	the benefit of his notes, his full footage, including	2	allegations and nonsensical allegations against him,
3	during unguarded moments, we all remember the time in	3	record that, too, and bear in mind what that means for
4	the toilet, and my submission is that he has answered	4	the chances of sustained or reliable change. And this
5	the questions that were asked of him clearly, openly and	5	is just propping up the submission I make to you about
6	precisely. I imagine that, like the BBC, we will and	6	being bold, because that is what we are facing down,
7	I imagine the BBC will also do the same invite you to	7	this persistence of holding the line, because that
8	accept him as being a witness of truth, unlike a number	8	doesn't look like people who are seriously interested in
9	of other people who gave evidence to you.	9	changing, people who are seriously interested in
10	But, the inquiry has also seen this ongoing number	10	examining their own actions or inactions or taking
11	of allegations still mounted, sometimes even here in	11	responsibility for them. Instead, they are determined
12	oral evidence by the DCOs and the DCMs he filmed, who	12	to minimise, and we say the people who maintain those
13	have persisted in this range of allegations that he	13	fictions as an attempt to cover their own responsibility
14	doctored or dubbed footage. You may remember the	14	should be called out on it.
15			
	exchange between Mr Altman and Mr Connolly about this,	15	Also, chair, the longer that goes on, the longer
16	exchange between Mr Altman and Mr Connolly about this, where he was asking, whether Mr Connolly was saying:	15 16	Also, chair, the longer that goes on, the longer they hold that position, all they are doing is holding
16	where he was asking, whether Mr Connolly was saying:	16	they hold that position, all they are doing is holding
16 17	where he was asking, whether Mr Connolly was saying: "Question: Is that a serious proposition,	16 17	they hold that position, all they are doing is holding up the real change that the system requires and, as they
16 17 18	where he was asking, whether Mr Connolly was saying: "Question: Is that a serious proposition, Mr Connolly? When we are all done here and we have all	16 17 18	they hold that position, all they are doing is holding up the real change that the system requires and, as they do that, the victims mount and the victims wait.
16 17 18 19	where he was asking, whether Mr Connolly was saying: "Question: Is that a serious proposition, Mr Connolly? When we are all done here and we have all moved on and the chair retires to write her report, is	16 17 18 19 20 21	they hold that position, all they are doing is holding up the real change that the system requires and, as they do that, the victims mount and the victims wait.  But returning to what we saw with the DCOs, can
16 17 18 19 20	where he was asking, whether Mr Connolly was saying: "Question: Is that a serious proposition, Mr Connolly? When we are all done here and we have all moved on and the chair retires to write her report, is this how you want to be remembered?"	16 17 18 19 20	they hold that position, all they are doing is holding up the real change that the system requires and, as they do that, the victims mount and the victims wait.  But returning to what we saw with the DCOs, can I also just make this point very clear. It is entirely
16 17 18 19 20 21	where he was asking, whether Mr Connolly was saying:  "Question: Is that a serious proposition,  Mr Connolly? When we are all done here and we have all moved on and the chair retires to write her report, is this how you want to be remembered?"  And it was only after that, that Mr Connolly finally	16 17 18 19 20 21	they hold that position, all they are doing is holding up the real change that the system requires and, as they do that, the victims mount and the victims wait.  But returning to what we saw with the DCOs, can I also just make this point very clear. It is entirely hopeless to suggest that it stops with them, or even
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	where he was asking, whether Mr Connolly was saying:  "Question: Is that a serious proposition,  Mr Connolly? When we are all done here and we have all moved on and the chair retires to write her report, is this how you want to be remembered?"  And it was only after that, that Mr Connolly finally abandoned this implausible point and went, "No,	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they hold that position, all they are doing is holding up the real change that the system requires and, as they do that, the victims mount and the victims wait.  But returning to what we saw with the DCOs, can I also just make this point very clear. It is entirely hopeless to suggest that it stops with them, or even with G4S more generally. That is, of course, who Verita were looking at; they were looking at G4S primarily. But it obviously goes up to the Home Office, too,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	where he was asking, whether Mr Connolly was saying:  "Question: Is that a serious proposition,  Mr Connolly? When we are all done here and we have all moved on and the chair retires to write her report, is this how you want to be remembered?"  And it was only after that, that Mr Connolly finally abandoned this implausible point and went, "No, actually, no, I don't". That is what it takes, that is	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they hold that position, all they are doing is holding up the real change that the system requires and, as they do that, the victims mount and the victims wait.  But returning to what we saw with the DCOs, can I also just make this point very clear. It is entirely hopeless to suggest that it stops with them, or even with G4S more generally. That is, of course, who Verita were looking at; they were looking at G4S primarily.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	where he was asking, whether Mr Connolly was saying:  "Question: Is that a serious proposition, Mr Connolly? When we are all done here and we have all moved on and the chair retires to write her report, is this how you want to be remembered?"  And it was only after that, that Mr Connolly finally abandoned this implausible point and went, "No, actually, no, I don't". That is what it takes, that is the inertia we are seeing, in order to get them to move	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they hold that position, all they are doing is holding up the real change that the system requires and, as they do that, the victims mount and the victims wait.  But returning to what we saw with the DCOs, can I also just make this point very clear. It is entirely hopeless to suggest that it stops with them, or even with G4S more generally. That is, of course, who Verita were looking at; they were looking at G4S primarily. But it obviously goes up to the Home Office, too,

1	contracting department with the enforcement powers and	1	see a number of things. Nathan Ward talked of his cold
2	we have to look at where all of this comes from. If we	2	functionality and you may think a matter for you, of
3	are looking at leadership and void of leadership and so	3	course, but you may think that you saw some of that in
4	on, what leadership or tone are they showing and	4	the way he gave evidence.
5	setting? We say that is very obvious. You see it	5	You have more direct evidence of that in the
6	everywhere you look. Start at the bottom end and look	6	evidence of James Wilson and GDWG. You remember the
7	at the likes of Vanessa Smith in that February 2018	7	meeting in August 2017. Now, I want to just touch on
8	Hibiscus training session, laughing along, using some of	8	that briefly. What on earth was the problem with GDWG,
9	the same language, certainly not reporting the language	9	you may think? Gentle people trying, politely and
10	as Hibiscus did, and you will remember, chair, that was	10	appropriately, to help people who we can see obviously
11	13 separate upheld allegations of misbehaviour in	11	needed that help. They were filling in the gaps in
12	relation to that incident and the language was serious.	12	a system that obviously had many, many gaps. Yes, they
13	Hibiscus report it. Nobody else does. That was	13	are a campaigning organisation, for many years, for the
14	five months after Panorama where they were supposedly	14	end of immigration detention, but they do have force in
15	looking at this stuff seriously because Panorama had	15	that point. There are absolutely grounds for that
16	just come out and it was two years after Medway when	16	campaign.
17	they were supposed to be looking at these things very	17	What was the response what was the response of
18	seriously.	18	the Home Office to them? And you have Mr Wilson's oral
19	When she gave evidence to you, Vanessa Smith	19	evidence where he said this:
20	couldn't say why she didn't report it, but that, as	20	"That was a dynamic that I felt was increasingly
21	I think he accepted yesterday, did undermine what	21	there. I was particularly I was vividly aware of
22	Mr Riley told us in his witness statement about having	22	that in that meeting, the dynamic. I remember the
23	the confidence that, had they seen it, officers would	23	meeting very vividly. I remember it was Steve Skitt and
24	have reported it. And they didn't. Because they did	24	Paul Gasson who were in the meeting. They were nearest
25	see it, five months after Panorama, and still didn't	25	the door. I was on my own. They were very, very
23	see it, five months after I anorania, and still didn't	23	the door. I was on my own. They were very, very
	Page 125		Page 127
		1	
1	report it And that was put to him Mr Riley got	1	agitated Very As I put it I felt that they were
1	report it. And that was put to him. Mr Riley got	1 2	agitated. Very. As I put it, I felt that they were
2	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry,	2	toying with me, they were threatening me with something,
2 3	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about	2 3	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access.
2 3 4	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material,	2 3 4	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access.  I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark
2 3 4 5	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said	2 3 4 5	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access.  I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre
2 3 4 5 6	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:	2 3 4 5 6	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access.  I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings
2 3 4 5 6 7	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is	2 3 4 5 6 7	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access.  I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer? "Answer: No, it isn't.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and it means this: when Mr Riley thought about what needed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for the judicial review which produced this inquiry, but the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?"  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and it means this: when Mr Riley thought about what needed to be done, and what needed to change, he did it not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for the judicial review which produced this inquiry, but the reason why he was saying less at that stage is also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and it means this: when Mr Riley thought about what needed to be done, and what needed to change, he did it not knowing that Vanessa Smith or immigration officers were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for the judicial review which produced this inquiry, but the reason why he was saying less at that stage is also something that he explained in that witness statement,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and it means this: when Mr Riley thought about what needed to be done, and what needed to change, he did it not knowing that Vanessa Smith or immigration officers were behaving in this way, and that can't be a promising	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for the judicial review which produced this inquiry, but the reason why he was saying less at that stage is also something that he explained in that witness statement, which he was scared of losing drop-ins at that stage,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and it means this: when Mr Riley thought about what needed to be done, and what needed to change, he did it not knowing that Vanessa Smith or immigration officers were behaving in this way, and that can't be a promising basis for sustained or meaningful change or reform.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for the judicial review which produced this inquiry, but the reason why he was saying less at that stage is also something that he explained in that witness statement, which he was scared of losing drop-ins at that stage, back in 2018, when those proceedings began. He was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and it means this: when Mr Riley thought about what needed to be done, and what needed to change, he did it not knowing that Vanessa Smith or immigration officers were behaving in this way, and that can't be a promising basis for sustained or meaningful change or reform.  Moving on from her, you can also look at Mr Gasson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for the judicial review which produced this inquiry, but the reason why he was saying less at that stage is also something that he explained in that witness statement, which he was scared of losing drop-ins at that stage, back in 2018, when those proceedings began. He was still very worried about what might happen if he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and it means this: when Mr Riley thought about what needed to be done, and what needed to change, he did it not knowing that Vanessa Smith or immigration officers were behaving in this way, and that can't be a promising basis for sustained or meaningful change or reform.  Moving on from her, you can also look at Mr Gasson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for the judicial review which produced this inquiry, but the reason why he was saying less at that stage is also something that he explained in that witness statement, which he was scared of losing drop-ins at that stage, back in 2018, when those proceedings began. He was still very worried about what might happen if he challenged G4S or the Home Office.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and it means this: when Mr Riley thought about what needed to be done, and what needed to change, he did it not knowing that Vanessa Smith or immigration officers were behaving in this way, and that can't be a promising basis for sustained or meaningful change or reform.  Moving on from her, you can also look at Mr Gasson. We start moving up the scale and look at Mr Gasson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for the judicial review which produced this inquiry, but the reason why he was saying less at that stage is also something that he explained in that witness statement, which he was scared of losing drop-ins at that stage, back in 2018, when those proceedings began. He was still very worried about what might happen if he challenged G4S or the Home Office.  Both Mr Gasson and Mr Skitt were challenged about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and it means this: when Mr Riley thought about what needed to be done, and what needed to change, he did it not knowing that Vanessa Smith or immigration officers were behaving in this way, and that can't be a promising basis for sustained or meaningful change or reform.  Moving on from her, you can also look at Mr Gasson. We start moving up the scale and look at Mr Gasson.  Mr Gasson, it is said we are told, doesn't often come out of his room, doesn't like to mix with detained	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for the judicial review which produced this inquiry, but the reason why he was saying less at that stage is also something that he explained in that witness statement, which he was scared of losing drop-ins at that stage, back in 2018, when those proceedings began. He was still very worried about what might happen if he challenged G4S or the Home Office.  Both Mr Gasson and Mr Skitt were challenged about this and were asked about what they did, and both of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and it means this: when Mr Riley thought about what needed to be done, and what needed to change, he did it not knowing that Vanessa Smith or immigration officers were behaving in this way, and that can't be a promising basis for sustained or meaningful change or reform.  Moving on from her, you can also look at Mr Gasson. We start moving up the scale and look at Mr Gasson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for the judicial review which produced this inquiry, but the reason why he was saying less at that stage is also something that he explained in that witness statement, which he was scared of losing drop-ins at that stage, back in 2018, when those proceedings began. He was still very worried about what might happen if he challenged G4S or the Home Office.  Both Mr Gasson and Mr Skitt were challenged about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	told you that he got a daily update from the inquiry, but didn't appear to get an update on that issue, about one of his own officers. He hadn't read the material, he hadn't read the investigation report, and he said this Mr Altman put to him:  "Question: Presumably, Mr Riley, none of that is anything you would expect of a Home Office officer?  "Answer: No, it isn't.  "Question: Do you think that undermines your confidence in Home Office attitudes or a willingness to report things or do you think this is just a one-off?  "Answer: I would hope that that is a one-off."  Then, "Well, on what basis do you think it is a one-off?", is what follows from that, because and it means this: when Mr Riley thought about what needed to be done, and what needed to change, he did it not knowing that Vanessa Smith or immigration officers were behaving in this way, and that can't be a promising basis for sustained or meaningful change or reform.  Moving on from her, you can also look at Mr Gasson. We start moving up the scale and look at Mr Gasson.  Mr Gasson, it is said we are told, doesn't often come out of his room, doesn't like to mix with detained	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	toying with me, they were threatening me with something, with something a very immediate threat to our access. I remember it being in my recollection, it was a dark and rainy day. I remember walking out of the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I had had meetings before when they had been difficult, but I was really shaken by that meeting."  That evidence is supported by the contemporaneous email that he wrote, and that you have seen, where he talks about, "I've just had a gruelling meeting, drop-ins are on a knife edge, it sounds draconian, but this is serious", and you may have picked up that he didn't give as much detail the first time he gave evidence on this, which was in his witness statement for the judicial review which produced this inquiry, but the reason why he was saying less at that stage is also something that he explained in that witness statement, which he was scared of losing drop-ins at that stage, back in 2018, when those proceedings began. He was still very worried about what might happen if he challenged G4S or the Home Office.  Both Mr Gasson and Mr Skitt were challenged about this and were asked about what they did, and both of

1	just slightly been caught out and were now sullenly	1	It also chimes with other material, it chimes with
2	staring at their feet in the head's office, giving	2	Lee Hanford in his Verita interviews, and in his oral
3	grudging apologies, saying, "Well, if we were hostile,	3	evidence, talking about G4S having been criticised for
4	we didn't mean to be".	4	being too empathetic. Ben Saunders was asked about that
5	By way of, also, further emphasis on this, remember	5	evidence and he agreed that he also had that take.
6	it has been referred to a couple of times already but	6	Ben Saunders was, of course, trying to please the
7	that Naomi Blackwell statement. She gave evidence and	7	Home Office and he was said to be good at it, but he did
8	you have got the witness statement in the materials,	8	that by showing little or no empathy.
9	about, in a very sober, very restricted way, talking	9	He told us we heard that he stayed in his room as
10	about an incapacitated detained person who was obviously	10	well as Mr Gasson staying in his room, not being
11	very vulnerable and who, it turned out, was not only	11	visible, and that is important because it is, of course,
12	unlawfully detained, but was being detained in breach of	12	much easier to mistrust and it is much easier to
13	article 3.	13	mistreat and much easier to dehumanise if you do it from
14	Now, the knowledge of that witness statement, the	14	a distance. If you separate yourself out, you will find
15	way G4S and others came to know of that witness	15	it much easier to mistreat.
16	statement, must have come from the Home Office because	16	So that is where we saw when you look at all of
17	it was the Home Office that was the party to the	17	that evidence, that is what you see about the approach
18	litigation.	18	of the Home Office. But is that really very surprising,
19	When that comes to light, what do they do? They	19	that you are finding those sorts of uncompassionate
20	don't respond saying "Oh, this is very serious, we have	20	attitudes from the Home Office? When you look at things
21	a vulnerable individual in detention who maybe shouldn't	21	like the overall political rhetoric in this area, the
22	be in detention. How have we missed this?", they attack	22	overall agenda of the Home Office and you see that in
23	GDWG, was their response. "How dare they write the	23	all sorts of places too. So you look at the contract,
24	statement". Remember, then, how GDWG come to be	24	and you see the absence of relevant provisions, so there
25	examined and described in all of those meetings, and you	25	is nothing in there on welfare, nothing specific on
	Page 129		Page 131
	1 age 129		1 age 131
1	will remember the phrase "The problem is one of trust".	1	welfare, there is nothing on checking use of force in
2	The problem is one of trust. Immediately characterising	2	schedule G, you look at the way schedule G works or
3	this as an "us and them" situation, GDWG are a "them"	3	doesn't work, you look at the focus that everybody
4	not an "us", they are on the wrong side of that line,	4	describes on immigration throughput. We have looked
5	and all of that is, of course, stifling the production	5	a lot at things like the KPIs and the complete absence
6	of evidence that, in seeking to stifle the production of	6	of any KPI, and suicide and self-harm, despite 60
7	evidence that was very desperately needed, but in	7	incidents in the relevant period.
8	an article 3 context, because if you are stifling the	8	We cannot see how that system could sensibly have
9	production of an evidence in an article 3 context, you	9	work because, in order to have a KPI, it requires all
10	are breaching article 3.	10	these steps in the chain for Barry Timms to find out, in
11	Now, as well as, it may be noted, in August 2017,	11	order to report it, and then to get sufficient
12	driving or helping drive the IMB to a degree of	12	information to characterise it as a procedural breach,
13	hostility and distrust towards GDWG. That is pretty	13	and then somebody to check whether that judgment is
14	serious and pretty telling stuff. And it was the	14	correct. Mr Gasson is asked about that. He cannot
15	Home Office at least as much as it was G4S. And you	15	remember doing it, doesn't know how it worked.
16	will remember the evidence of Mr Haughton who thought	16	Mr Castle didn't know how it worked and couldn't
17	the steer he even told you that the steer he had had	17	remember the system either. And the reason they can't
18	with regard to GDWG was unfortunate and was a shame, but	18	is because there wasn't one because it wasn't happening.
19	it came from the Home Office and from Ben Saunders.	19	The only inference you can draw from that is because
20	All of that material, chair, points in the same	20	nobody really cared about whether G4S was failing in its
21	direction. It certainly doesn't point to	21	monitoring of suicide and self-harm arrangements.
22	a compassionate approach. In fact, I don't think we can	22	I would just ask briefly about that. How is that
23	see, in the relevant period, any evidence of any	23	happening now? Because the KPIs and the contract now,
24	Home Office official behaving in a compassionate way	24	how does that now work? How have they improved those or
25	towards a detained person.	25	filled in those gaps in the system?
	Page 130		Page 132
	1 age 150		1 age 132

Again, we have had two people on constant obs. Have they self-harmed? Has that become a KPI? Has it become a rule 35(2) report? Dr Oozeerally tells us he has never done one, et cetera.  You have also got, in all of this, the use of force. Obviously a critical issue for this inquiry. You know that the use of force reports were done much later, sometimes by the same person who was involved in the use of force. Steve Webb did that.  Just dealing with D687 himself, the use of force review form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later. Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC box was ticked for it. You will remember how important it box was ticked for it. You will remember how important it was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people up on it, then they won't write their reports accurately, they won't learn, and nothing will change.  This case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Page 133  Inhumane and that is what it flows from.  It is also, of course, the Home Office that built a category B prison on the fiction of a 72-hour detention period, and so they didn't bother buildin and category B prison on the fiction of a 72-hour detention period, and so they didn't bother buildin and category B prison on the fiction of a 72-hour detention period, and so they didn't bother buildin and category B prison on the fiction of a 72-hour detention period, and so they didn't bother buildin and category B prison on the fiction of a 72-hour detention period, and so they didn't bother buildin much in the way of outside space, very little in the of outside activities. Everything in that, too, says "We don't care". Mr Riley yesterday was asked a culture of the Home Office.  Who dreare". Mr Riley yesterday was asked a culture of the Home Office.  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where the det on migration and enforcement is polarised and en and that doesn't help either. And it is a diff	
a rule 35(2) report? Dr Oozeerally tells us he has never done one, et cetera.  4 detention period, and so they didn't bother buildin 5 You have also got, in all of this, the use of force. 6 Obviously a critical issue for this inquiry. You know 7 that the use of force reports were done much later, 8 sometimes by the same person who was involved in the use 9 of force. Steve Webb did that. 10 Just dealing with D687 himself, the use of force on 11 him, or the key one, is 13 May. The use of force review 12 form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later. 13 Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC 14 body-worn camera footage wasn't used, even though the 15 box was ticked for it. You will remember how important 16 that is because Mr Collier told you how important it 17 was. If you don't review it, if you don't write their reports correctly, 18 up on it, then they won't write their reports accurately, they won't 19 they won't write their reports accurately, they won't 20 Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this 21 case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, 22 Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the 23 Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the 24 Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the 25 fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  3 a category B prison on the fiction of a 72-hour 4 detention period, and so they didn't bother buildin the the way of outside space, very little in the 4 detention period, and so they didn't bother buildin that too, says  6 of outside activities. Everything in that, too, says  7 "We don't care". Mr Riley yesterday was asked al culture of the Home Office and he told you.  9 a culture of the Home Office and he told you.  9 "Answer: We live in a society where the det on migration and enforcement is polarised and en and that doesn't help either. And it is a difficult operating environment."  13 Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where think that came from? Who do we think is polarised and en and that d	
a rule 35(2) report? Dr Oozeerally tells us he has never done one, et cetera.  4 never done one, et cetera.  5 You have also got, in all of this, the use of force. 6 Obviously a critical issue for this inquiry. You know 7 that the use of force reports were done much later, 8 sometimes by the same person who was involved in the use 9 of force. Steve Webb did that. 10 Just dealing with D687 himself, the use of force on 11 him, or the key one, is 13 May. The use of force review 12 form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later. 13 Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC 14 body-worn camera footage wasn't used, even though the 15 box was ticked for it. You will remember how important 16 that is because Mr Collier told you how important it 17 was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people 18 up on it, then they won't write their reports accurately, they won't 19 they won't write their reports accurately, they won't 10 learn, and nothing will change. 21 Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this 22 case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, 23 but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No 24 Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the 25 fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  3 a category B prison on the fiction of a 72-hour 4 detention period, and so they didn't bothey didn't bothey didn't bothey didn't bothey detention for they determined in the way of outside space, very little in the of outside activities. Everything in that, too, says  6 of outside activities. Everything in that, too, says  7 "We don't care". Mr Riley yesterday was asked al culture of the Home Office and he told you:  9 "Answer: We live in a society where the det on migration and enforcement is polarised and en and that doesn't help either. And it is a difficult operating environment."  13 Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where think that came from? Who do we think is polarised and en and that doesn't help either. And it is a difficult operating environment."  15 So that	
4 never done one, et cetera.  5 You have also got, in all of this, the use of force.  6 Obviously a critical issue for this inquiry. You know  7 that the use of force reports were done much later,  8 sometimes by the same person who was involved in the use  9 of force. Steve Webb did that.  10 Just dealing with D687 himself, the use of force on  11 him, or the key one, is 13 May. The use of force review  12 form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later.  13 Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC —  14 body-worn camera — footage wasn't used, even though the  15 box was ticked for it. You will remember how important that is because Mr Collier told you how important that is because Mr Collier told you how important they won't write their reports accurately, they won't they won't won't write their reports accurately, they won't they won't won't write their reports correctly, they won't w	
You have also got, in all of this, the use of force.  Obviously a critical issue for this inquiry. You know that the use of force reports were done much later, sometimes by the same person who was involved in the use of force. Steve Webb did that.  Just dealing with D687 himself, the use of force on him, or the key one, is 13 May. The use of force review form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later. Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC— body-worn camera — footage wasn't used, even though the box was ticked for it. You will remember how important that is because Mr Collier told you how important that is because Mr Collier told you how in mortant they won't write their reports accurately, they won't they won't write their reports accurately, they won't case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  You have don't care". Mr Riley yesterday was asked a culture of the Home Office and he told you: "Answer: We live in a society where the det on migration and enforcement is polarised and en and that doesn't help either. And it is a difficult operating environment."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where the detained environment."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where the detained environment."  So that is what I say about the Home Office.  On the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental ill-health, English not as first language — I know have all of those points. Much harder to build relationships. It is much harder to build relationships. It is much harder to build relationships. When you have those characteristics.  Page 133	g
Obviously a critical issue for this inquiry. You know that the use of force reports were done much later, sometimes by the same person who was involved in the use of force. Steve Webb did that.  Just dealing with D687 himself, the use of force on him, or the key one, is 13 May. The use of force review form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later.  Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC body-worn camera footage wasn't used, even though the box was ticked for it. You will remember how important that is because Mr Collier told you how important it was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people up on it, then they won't write their reports accurately, they won't hey won't write their reports accurately, they won't learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No  Page 133  Obviously a critical issue for this hint, that use of force on the don't care". Mr Riley yesterday was asked al culture of the Home Office and he told you:  "We don't care". Mr Riley yesterday was asked al culture of the Home Office and he told you:  "Answer: We live in a society where the det on migration and enforcement is polarised and en and that doesn't help either. And it is a difficult operating environment."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where think that came from? Who do we think is polarised debate on migration and enforcement?  So that is what I say about the Home Office.  On the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental ill-health, English not as first language I knowy have all of those points. Much harder to build relationships which is the normal way in which run establishments of this kind, is by building relationships. It is much harder to build relationships when you have those characteristics.	_
that the use of force reports were done much later, sometimes by the same person who was involved in the use of force. Steve Webb did that.  Just dealing with D687 himself, the use of force on him, or the key one, is 13 May. The use of force review form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later. Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC body-worn camera footage wasn't used, even though the box was ticked for it. You will remember how important that is because Mr Collier told you how important it was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people up on it, then they won't write their reports accurately, they won't learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No  Page 133  "We don't care". Mr Riley yesterday was asked al culture of the Home Office and he told you: "Answer: We live in a society where the det on migration and enforcement is polarised and en and that doesn't help either. And it is a difficult operating environment."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where the det operating environment."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where the det on migration and enforcement is polarised and en and that doesn't help either. And it is a difficult operating environment."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where the det on migration and enforcement is polarised and environment."  So that is what I say about the Home Office.  On the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental ill-health, English not as first language I know you have all of those points. Much harder to build relationships which is the normal way in which relationships. It is much harder to build relationships when you have those characteristics.  Page 133	,
sometimes by the same person who was involved in the use of force. Steve Webb did that.  Just dealing with D687 himself, the use of force on him, or the key one, is 13 May. The use of force review form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later.  Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC that is because Mr Collier told you how important that is because Mr Collier told you how important that is because Mr Collier told you how important they won't write their reports accurately, they won't they won't write their reports accurately, they won't learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No  Page 133  Culture of the Home Office and he told you:  "Answer: We live in a society where the det on migration and enforcement is polarised and en and that doesn't help either. And it is a difficult operating environment."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where the det on migration and enforcement."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where the det on migration and enforcement."  So that is what I say about the Home Office.  On the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental ill-health, English not as first language I know in the properties of the properties accurately in the properties of the Home Office and he told on migration and enforcement is polarised and en on migration and enforcement."  So that is what I say about the Home Office.  On the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental ill-health, English not as first language I know in the properties of the Home Office.  The Home Office and he told you have the detained people themselves and I say about the Home Office.  On the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave	out the
9 of force. Steve Webb did that. 10 Just dealing with D687 himself, the use of force on 11 him, or the key one, is 13 May. The use of force review 12 form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later. 13 Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC 14 body-worn camera footage wasn't used, even though the 15 box was ticked for it. You will remember how important 16 that is because Mr Collier told you how important it 17 was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people 18 up on it, then they won't write their reports accurately, they won't 19 they won't write their reports accurately, they won't 20 learn, and nothing will change. 21 Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this 22 case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, 23 but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No 24 Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the 25 fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Page 133  Page 135  "Answer: We live in a society where the det on migration and enforcement is polarised and en and that doesn't help either. And it is a difficult on migration and enforcement."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where the det on migration and enforcement."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where the det on migration and enforcement."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where the det on migration and enforcement."  So that is what I say about the Home Office.  On the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental ill-health, English not as first language I know in the properties of the properties and vulnerabilities, mental ill-health, English not as first language I know in the properties of the properties of this kind, is by building relationships. It is much harder to build relationships when you have those characteristics.	
Just dealing with D687 himself, the use of force on him, or the key one, is 13 May. The use of force review form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later.  Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC body-worn camera footage wasn't used, even though the box was ticked for it. You will remember how important that is because Mr Collier told you how important it was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people up on it, then they won't write their reports accurately, they won't learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No  Page 133  On migration and enforcement is polarised and en and that doesn't help either. And it is a difficult operating environment."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where think that came from? Who do we think is polarised and enforcement."  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where think that came from? Who do we think is polarised and enforcement."  So that is what I say about the Home Office.  On the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental ill-health, English not as first language I know you have all of those points. Much harder to build relationships. It is much harder to build relationships fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Page 133	ate
him, or the key one, is 13 May. The use of force review form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later. Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC body-worn camera footage wasn't used, even though the box was ticked for it. You will remember how important that is because Mr Collier told you how important it was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people up on it, then they won't write their reports accurately, they won't learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  him, or the key one, is 13 May. The use of force review they won't write their months later.  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where think that came from? Who do we think is polarise debate on migration and enforcement?  So that is what I say about the Home Office.  On the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental ill-health, English not as first language I know you have all of those points. Much harder to build relationsly but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No  Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the  Page 133  Page 135	
form is done on 31 July, two and a half months later.  Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC  body-worn camera footage wasn't used, even though the  box was ticked for it. You will remember how important  that is because Mr Collier told you how important it  was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people  up on it, then they won't write their reports correctly,  they won't write their reports accurately, they won't  learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this  case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done,  but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No  Chair that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Page 133  Page 135  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where think that came from? Who do we think is polarise.  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where think that came from? Who do we think is polarise think that came from? Who do we think is polarise.  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where think that came from? Who do we think is polarise.  Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where think that came from? Who do we think is polarise.  Who do we think that came from? Who do we think is polarise.  It whink that came from? Who do we think is polarise.  By debate on migration and enforcement?  So that is what I say about the Home Office.  On the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental is a list of characteristics and vulnerab	
Tick box, not even picking up the fact that BWC  14 body-worn camera footage wasn't used, even though the 15 box was ticked for it. You will remember how important 16 that is because Mr Collier told you how important it 17 was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people 18 up on it, then they won't write their reports correctly, 19 they won't write their reports accurately, they won't 10 learn, and nothing will change. 11 Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this 12 case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, 13 Who do we think drove that, Mr Riley? Where 14 think that came from? Who do we think is polaris 15 debate on migration and enforcement? 16 So that is what I say about the Home Office. 17 On the other side of this, of course, we have the 18 detained people themselves and I gave you in our 19 a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental 20 learn, and nothing will change. 20 ill-health, English not as first language I know you 21 Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this 22 case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, 23 but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No 24 Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the 25 fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing 26 Page 133  Page 135	
body-worn camera footage wasn't used, even though the box was ticked for it. You will remember how important that is because Mr Collier told you how important it was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people up on it, then they won't write their reports correctly, they won't write their reports accurately, they won't learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No  Crun establishments of this kind, is by building relationships. It is much harder to build relationsl when you have those characteristics.  Page 133  Page 135	do we
box was ticked for it. You will remember how important that is because Mr Collier told you how important it that is because Mr Collier told you how important it was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people up on it, then they won't write their reports correctly, learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No  Crutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Do the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental 20 ill-health, English not as first language I know you have those points. Much harder to build relationsly relationships which is the normal way in which run establishments of this kind, is by building relationships. It is much harder to build relationsly when you have those characteristics.  Page 133  Page 135	
that is because Mr Collier told you how important it  was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people  up on it, then they won't write their reports correctly,  they won't write their reports accurately, they won't  learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this  case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done,  but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No  Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the  fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Page 133  So that is what I say about the Home Office.  On the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental  20 ill-health, English not as first language I know you have all of those points. Much harder to build relationships which is the normal way in which 23 run establishments of this kind, is by building relationships. It is much harder to build relationships when you have those characteristics.  Page 133  Page 135	ing the
was. If you don't review it, if you don't pull people up on it, then they won't write their reports correctly, they won't write their reports accurately, they won't learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Don the other side of this, of course, we have the detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental 20 ill-health, English not as first language I know you have all of those points. Much harder to build 21 relationships which is the normal way in which 23 run establishments of this kind, is by building 24 relationships. It is much harder to build relationships when you have those characteristics.  Page 133  Page 135	
up on it, then they won't write their reports correctly, they won't write their reports accurately, they won't learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  up on it, then they won't write their reports correctly, a detained people themselves and I gave you in our a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental 20 ill-health, English not as first language I know you have all of those points. Much harder to build 22 relationships which is the normal way in which 23 run establishments of this kind, is by building 24 relationships. It is much harder to build relationsh 25 fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Page 133  Page 135	
they won't write their reports accurately, they won't learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  They won't write their reports accurately, they won't a list of characteristics and vulnerabilities, mental a list of characteristics and	
learn, and nothing will change.  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this  case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No  Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Page 133  Learn, and nothing will change.  20 ill-health, English not as first language I know the lattern of those points. Much harder to build relationships which is the normal way in which run establishments of this kind, is by building relationships. It is much harder to build relationships when you have those characteristics.  Page 133  Page 135	opening
Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Page 133  Chair, in my submission, the use of force in this have all of those points. Much harder to build relationships which is the normal way in which run establishments of this kind, is by building relationships. It is much harder to build relationsh when you have those characteristics.  Page 135	/OII
case was a car crash. So much of it was badly done, but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Page 133  relationships which is the normal way in which run establishments of this kind, is by building relationships. It is much harder to build relationship when you have those characteristics.  Page 135	rou
but, again, nobody seemed to pick it up. No  Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Page 133  Page 135  run establishments of this kind, is by building relationships. It is much harder to build relationships when you have those characteristics.	vou
24 Scrutiny Committee meetings, nobody is picking up the 25 fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing  Page 133  Page 135  Page 135	you
25 fact that Steve Webb is both being involved and doing 25 when you have those characteristics.  Page 133 Page 135	.i.a.
Page 133 Page 135	ups
1 the review and doing them two months later 1 I do want to just briefly summarise some of the	
2 Then tie in, all of that shows no real interest in 2 characteristics for D687 himself. You have seen a	bit
welfare, but of course you see it in all of these other  3 of him around, he was at the early stages of the	
4 places, like no 35(2) reports, for years. That is 4 inquiry, a cheeky, likeable man I hope he will	
5 astonishing and nobody picks up it. Article 3 findings 5 forgive me for saying so. He finds it quite hard to	
6 in respect of this detention centre, article 3 findings 6 watch. Turns up in court and finds himself on the	
7 more generally not being handed back, nobody can tell 7 video, which is part of the reason why he has not b	een
8 the system for feeding that back to the people involved. 8 here as much, because and he had recurrent depr	
9 What on earth is going on? But, moreover, what kind 9 disorder, PTSD, he is suspected of undiagnosed lea	
of message is that sending? What is that saying to the low difficulties and bipolar disorder. Been in the UK	8
DCO on the wing who has never done anything like this 11 nearly all of his life. He might well have had Britis	sh
before, who is paid £25,000 flat rate a year with no 12 citizenship, but for the fact that he was in care and	
13 chance of an increase, understaffed, in the noise,  13 social services didn't apply for him so the rest of	
firefighting, and is unguided and unled? Is that saying  14 his family got citizenship and he didn't and he w	
to that DCO, spend more time, engage more, try to  15 in care because he had suffered childhood abuse. I	
16 understand what is happening with this vulnerable 16 not he's not had an easy time, hasn't D687. Scho	
individual? Of course it is not. And where will he 17 here, family here, being told regularly, "Fuck off	
look, then, for help and support? He will look at 18 home", but feels that he is home. His suicide and	
people above him and look at how they are behaving or 19 self-harm, clearly there for years, clearly serious,	
20 expressing themselves.  20 well recorded. Remember the scarring, which only	came
20 cxpressing themserves.  21 Chair, the Home Office I have talked about  21 out in this inquiry, because, when his solicitors saw	
The consequence of that is it is degrading and it is 25 is how the scarring came out for the first time.	
Page 134 Page 136	

1	So he has always found it difficult to express	1	two DCMs who are wearing BWC but don't turn it on. They
2	himself about those things and, by May 2017, two years	2	are both individuals who abuse D687 in the course of the
3	and three months in immigration detention, in that	3	use of force. One of them is responsible for the "We'll
4	patch, and a year and a half of which had been at	4	just wait for it. If you do put it on, we will wait for
5	Brook House, and that is, of course, very significant	5	a minute until you pass out and then we will cut you
6	because he has had all of the stuff we are looking at	6	down", said by a DCM. Humanity, chair, at that point,
7	for that period of time.	7	has left the building.
8	He was significantly suffering as a result of that,	8	Then it Mr Collier says they should have engaged
9	which is not very surprising, because all of the medical	9	more. Force may not have been required if they had.
10	evidence you have had, all of the independent doctors in	10	Then they used the trick with the cigarette lighter,
11	particular, have told you how detention impacts.	11	they take him to the ground, he's got four or five men
12	They have told you about the indeterminate nature of	12	on top of him whilst he's still got a ligature around
13	detention in particular and how that impacts, and D687	13	his neck. They cuff him. He's subdued and in cuffs, so
14	had done a lot of that and, throughout that time, he has	14	he doesn't appear to be a threat to anybody, but at that
15	been bumping into the likes of Luke Instone-Brewer, who	15	point he has a pain-inducing inverted wrist hold
16	he has described in his early witness statements, and we	16	applied, and he cries out in pain. We also know that he
17	can imagine how that was and we can imagine how those	17	turns up when he gets to hospital later in Dorset
18	interactions were, and Vanessa Smith, who he tells he is	18	that night, when he has got to the Verne, he has got
19	writing a suicide note, but doesn't open an ACDT, or	19	bruising to his ribs which has not been explained.
20	Dr Oozeerally, who doesn't open an ACDT either and	20	So, chair, in relation to him, we say in relation to
21	doesn't do a 35(2) report. And he had just, at that	21	D687, he was degraded in breach of article 3 before he
22	point, told this individual for the first time, he	22	entered that toilet, but when you that is he's
23	had opened up about his childhood abuse and the story of	23	a very good example of what Brook House can do to you,
24	his life there. Where does it get him? What does that	24	particularly over a sustained period of time, but if you
25	tell him? He opens up and nothing happens, so it tells	25	add in a domestically unlawful use of force,
23	ten min. The opens up and nothing nappens, so it tens	23	add in a domestically dinawful use of force,
	Page 137		Page 139
1	him the system really doesn't care. And remember	1	an unjustifiable use of force into that mix on top of
1 2	him the system really doesn't care. And remember	1 2	an unjustifiable use of force into that mix on top of
2	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you,	2	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all
2 3	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative	2 3	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly
2 3 4	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is	2 3 4	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by
2 3 4 5	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's	2 3 4 5	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.
2 3 4 5 6	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.	2 3 4 5 6	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said
2 3 4 5 6 7	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years	2 3 4 5 6 7	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had enough, bruv, I want to go, bruv", that is what he tells	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking things unless "No, we don't check things. Unless you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had enough, bruv, I want to go, bruv", that is what he tells you. That is what we hear on the video. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking things unless "No, we don't check things. Unless you can tell us what date it was, and which individual it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had enough, bruv, I want to go, bruv", that is what he tells you. That is what we hear on the video. And Brook House has reduced him to that. That has degraded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking things unless "No, we don't check things. Unless you can tell us what date it was, and which individual it was, we won't do it". We will not weigh in I will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had enough, bruv, I want to go, bruv", that is what he tells you. That is what we hear on the video. And Brook House has reduced him to that. That has degraded him, that has dehumanised him, that has broken him. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking things unless "No, we don't check things. Unless you can tell us what date it was, and which individual it was, we won't do it". We will not weigh in I will dismiss the allegations of racial abuse, because I will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had enough, bruv, I want to go, bruv", that is what he tells you. That is what we hear on the video. And Brook House has reduced him to that. That has degraded him, that has dehumanised him, that has broken him. And where does it end up? It ends up with a use of force	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking things unless "No, we don't check things. Unless you can tell us what date it was, and which individual it was, we won't do it". We will not weigh in I will dismiss the allegations of racial abuse, because I will not weigh, because it is not in front of me, what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had enough, bruv, I want to go, bruv", that is what he tells you. That is what we hear on the video. And Brook House has reduced him to that. That has degraded him, that has dehumanised him, that has broken him. And where does it end up? It ends up with a use of force which, in domestic legal terms, Mr Collier cannot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking things unless "No, we don't check things. Unless you can tell us what date it was, and which individual it was, we won't do it". We will not weigh in I will dismiss the allegations of racial abuse, because I will not weigh, because it is not in front of me, what Panorama is showing about racist abuse, but he is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had enough, bruv, I want to go, bruv", that is what he tells you. That is what we hear on the video. And Brook House has reduced him to that. That has degraded him, that has dehumanised him, that has broken him. And where does it end up? It ends up with a use of force which, in domestic legal terms, Mr Collier cannot justify, and because it is not planned. There is no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking things unless "No, we don't check things. Unless you can tell us what date it was, and which individual it was, we won't do it". We will not weigh in I will dismiss the allegations of racial abuse, because I will not weigh, because it is not in front of me, what Panorama is showing about racist abuse, but he is clearly right D687 is clearly right about that and we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had enough, bruv, I want to go, bruv", that is what he tells you. That is what we hear on the video. And Brook House has reduced him to that. That has degraded him, that has dehumanised him, that has broken him. And where does it end up? It ends up with a use of force which, in domestic legal terms, Mr Collier cannot justify, and because it is not planned. There is no healthcare present, despite the ACDT, despite the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking things unless "No, we don't check things. Unless you can tell us what date it was, and which individual it was, we won't do it". We will not weigh in I will dismiss the allegations of racial abuse, because I will not weigh, because it is not in front of me, what Panorama is showing about racist abuse, but he is clearly right D687 is clearly right about that and we say the PSU was wrong because of the narrowness of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had enough, bruv, I want to go, bruv", that is what he tells you. That is what we hear on the video. And Brook House has reduced him to that. That has degraded him, that has dehumanised him, that has broken him. And where does it end up? It ends up with a use of force which, in domestic legal terms, Mr Collier cannot justify, and because it is not planned. There is no healthcare present, despite the ACDT, despite it being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking things unless "No, we don't check things. Unless you can tell us what date it was, and which individual it was, we won't do it". We will not weigh in I will dismiss the allegations of racial abuse, because I will not weigh, because it is not in front of me, what Panorama is showing about racist abuse, but he is clearly right D687 is clearly right about that and we say the PSU was wrong because of the narrowness of the approach that they took, but that PSU dismissal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had enough, bruv, I want to go, bruv", that is what he tells you. That is what we hear on the video. And Brook House has reduced him to that. That has degraded him, that has dehumanised him, that has broken him. And where does it end up? It ends up with a use of force which, in domestic legal terms, Mr Collier cannot justify, and because it is not planned. There is no healthcare present, despite the ACDT, despite the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking things unless "No, we don't check things. Unless you can tell us what date it was, and which individual it was, we won't do it". We will not weigh in I will dismiss the allegations of racial abuse, because I will not weigh, because it is not in front of me, what Panorama is showing about racist abuse, but he is clearly right D687 is clearly right about that and we say the PSU was wrong because of the narrowness of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Dr Hard here, because these interactions he told you, these actions being regularly dismissed has a negative impact on mental health, and D687, we say, is the paradigm of that. You may not need Dr Hard's evidence to understand that.  Just put it all together and imagine what two years and three months of that must be like. Being denied the identity that you feel and believe to be yours, not being taken to the funeral of his brother and his grandmother. Remember here the contemporaneous notes, Callum's video diary, and he's deteriorating, and where does it end up? In a disabled toilet with a ligature around his neck. He goes into the disabled toilet, too broken even to lock the door properly, "I have had enough, bruv, I want to go, bruv", that is what he tells you. That is what we hear on the video. And Brook House has reduced him to that. That has degraded him, that has dehumanised him, that has broken him. And where does it end up? It ends up with a use of force which, in domestic legal terms, Mr Collier cannot justify, and because it is not planned. There is no healthcare present, despite the ACDT, despite it being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that, then that is the breach and that is where it all absolutely goes over threshold with that final, slightly chaotic, thoughtless act, unplanned, as it were, by Duty Director Haughton.  Can I also just bear in mind what D687 has said about all of that, and the number of times he has told the story about what happened then before the footage came out? And when the footage does come out and we have been able to examine it with the detail that you have been able to examine it with, it does show that he was right, in terms of what he was describing, and it shows also that the PSU was wrong about that. We haven't got time to go through the difficulties of what the PSU does and the way that it does it, not checking things unless "No, we don't check things. Unless you can tell us what date it was, and which individual it was, we won't do it". We will not weigh in I will dismiss the allegations of racial abuse, because I will not weigh, because it is not in front of me, what Panorama is showing about racist abuse, but he is clearly right D687 is clearly right about that and we say the PSU was wrong because of the narrowness of the approach that they took, but that PSU dismissal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

So those are the findings that we invite you to
reach, chair. There is some law to deal with here about
the correct approach. I am not going to go through that
in any detail, we have CTI's note on it. We may have
some points of difference, but I think they will be
minor difference. What I say about that is essentially
this.
You will need to reach findings about what happened
111 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

g

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you will need to reach findings that inform an article 3 assessment. That will mean looking at what happened, but also why it happened, and when you come to look at why it happened, you will need to look at things like the motivation of the abuser, any justification for it, the language which surrounds it, whether that is intended to degrade, whether it is racist because that sounds particularly heavily in an article 3 assessment, and D687 had all of that, but then you will need to look at things like, even from an individual breach point of view, even the individual treatment point of view, things like official indifference or the failure to operate safeguards is also relevant to whether or not you get to an article 3 threshold, so that will require you to examine the systems, the training and the resources. Even on that individual assessment, one will have look at both what happened and why it happened and

So whether it is five-minute rule 34 assessments or whether it is rule 35(1) and 35(2) reports or the reliance on part Cs or the absence of use of force scrutiny or the absence of staff or staff culture making systems ineffective because they don't believe what is being said about suicide and self-harm ideation, all of those are capable of being article 3 systems breaches and all of those are impacting, we say, on the people you are hearing from, including, to a large extent, D687. So we say there will need to be findings and we invite you to do that in relation to all of those matters.

Now, where, then, does that take you? I started this by saying I was going to invite you to be bold in your recommendations. What does that entail? Now, back to this point: we say that the problems here are too legion and they are too manifest and they are too long-standing and too entrenched to call for anything short of fundamental change. Otherwise, you are facing too much inertia. Look at how long these go back, 20 years to Yarl's Wood, look at how the Home Office had to be dragged kicking and screaming to do it; it required an order. They said in the judicial review, "There is nothing here to be found, we don't need to do this". We don't, in particular, need to have witness

## Page 141

that will take you into systems issues.

When you then come to look at whether there are systems breaches. Again, I am going to leave this to written submissions, but you are concerned here with whether there were inadequacies in the system which materially increased the risk of an article 3 breach or, to put it another way, would a system without these inadequacies have had a real prospect of producing a different outcome? Now, I am slightly borrowing that phrase from the operational side of article 3, but it must be the same.

Now, what counsel to the inquiry is saying, that there will need to be something that ties a system breach to an individual breach, so there will need to be a system that produces a consequence, there will need to be an impact. We say you won't need that because you can be future looking and say, "Is there an inadequate system that might produce an outcome of that kind?", and that would be an article 3 breach and, therefore, you should look at it, but it is very difficult. I am not sure I need to get that far, because it is very difficult to look at all of the systems that you have been examining through the course of this inquiry, without finding somebody who that will have had an impact on it -- that will have had an impact on.

Page 142

Page 143

compellability in order to get Yan Paschali -- we don't need the powers to hear from Yan Paschali, or to hear from the others, or from Connolly, or from Nathan Ring, or any of those individuals. You did need to hear from all of those individuals to understand how bad it was, you did need to hear from all of those individuals, and the -- and you needed to have that enforcement power available to you. So the Home Office was wrong about that. And, as it has continued to be wrong about many things -- and I have already said Phil Riley was still revising his remarks yesterday on rules 35(1) and (2) and on part C. He was also, yesterday, when he sought to reassure you that it was now a changed Home Office under him, he told you that "We have done "-- he said: "Answer: ... [chair], we have done an awful lot of work over the last four years -- three years, four years -- in learning from the Wendy Williams report ..."

Which was a slightly astonishing piece of timing, given that Wendy Williams had issued her Windrush progress report five days earlier, when she said that -which contains 13 expressions of disappointment in the progress that has been made in relation to Windrush. Only eight of her 30 recommendations have been acted on. Much more progress was required and there was limited evidence that a compassionate approach had been embedded

1	consistently.	1	put prompts on ACDT forms that then link it into the
2	So none of that is giving a great deal of	2	35(2) report, we can do all of those things, energise
3	reassurance, you may feel.	3	the IMB or the other monitors, but we submit that none
4	Mr Brockington also sought to reassure you change is	4	of that is likely to be enough. All of those things
5	being made, "It is only a minority", et cetera,	5	have been done or said before and all of them are
6	et cetera. It's not immediately clear to me how he was	6	capable of sliding when the spotlight moves away, and
7	seeking to persuade you or be persuasive in	7	they will fade as the energy fades, or when you get the
8	circumstances where he had not read the Mary Bosworth	8	pressure small boats, Dublin remember the 2020 IMB
9	report, he had not read the transcripts, he hadn't	9	report and the Observer and Liberty materials telling
10	listened to the key bits of evidence and he sought to	10	you what it is like yet what it is like certainly in
11	come along and tell you what he knew when you have heard	11	2020, and what Mary Molyneux told you. They were
12	all of that material at great length. Again, not	12	clearly not coping in 2020 with suicide and self-harm,
13	a terribly promising start, but what those attitudes	13	is what she told you.
14	tell you is that these are not organisations that	14	Ian Castle was asked about that IMB report. We said
15	welcome change. These are organisations that tell you	15	that treating the whole of the detention estate
16	what they think you want to hear in order to make the	16	inhumanely and he said he couldn't disagree.
17	issue go away. And they will need again I have said	17	The numbers are down at the moment, but Mr Hewer
18	this already to be dragged, kicking and screaming,	18	told us, unsurprisingly, in his oral evidence, that he
19	into any serious alteration.	19	expected an increase. What will happen when that
20	They have also told you, a number of them have told	20	increase comes? Mary Molyneux, again, she told you
21	you, Mr Riley in particular has told you, and told you	21	that, "The Home Office kept" this is at the time of
22	in some detail, that further change is waiting for the	22	the Dublin Convention situation:
23	Nationality and Borders Bill, and you can be reassured	23	"The Home Office kept bringing these men in. The
24	that because big changes coming in relation to that	24	Home Office were aware of the problem. The Home Office
25	and they will do something after that, but you don't	25	knew this was happening the numbers, and the numbers
	Page 145		Page 147
	1 450 110		1 450 117
1	have to look at that very closely to be pretty concerned	1	of self-harm."
2	too. Do we think that a Home Office that is currently	2	And then she said the reply that she got was all
3	proposing offshore processing of asylum seekers is	3	about process. "We have the right, we have the
4	seriously committed to migrant welfare? Do we think	4	process", and then she said, "There was just a total
5	an Ascension Island Brook House is going to be better	5	disconnect and not, in my view, acknowledgement of the
6	than this one? What do we think the scrutiny is likely	6	problem". That is what they do, that is what the
7	to be there like there? What do we think	7	Home Office seems to do, on that evidence, they plough
8	an Ascension Island IMB is likely to be like? What do	8	on.
9	we think that that degree of removal from the world will	9	Now, the other thing I just mention, that I would
10	do for the situational psychology of that potential	10	single out for special mention, is that, yes, you could
11	environment?	11	look at what you can do to change the culture. But in
12	So we say one has to be one has to be fundamental	12	order to change the culture of the number of witnesses
13	in what one does.	13	told you, you would need clarity of purpose and
14	We can work down the list of the other things. And	14	a recalibration of the purpose in favour of detained
15	I will just do mine, briefly. One can adjust the	15	person welfare.
16	contract, as it is said it has been done, but, as I have	16	Professor Bosworth talked about that, she talked
17	already said, things like KPI problems appear to remain.	17	about how hard it was for DCOs in circumstances when the
18	We can increase the staffing. I remember your question,	18	purpose of the detention was not clear to them. The
19	chair, about moving the ratios around because, in the	19	Jill Dando Institute said the same thing. You have more
20	same way as you move the ratios around in open prison	20	clarity of purpose in a prison because it is about
21	and closed prison, think about the fact that immigration	21	punishment and rehabilitation and release, so you know
22	detention has a different purpose and has different	22	what that is for, but immigration detention is much more
23	needs and has a different cohort. We can do that. And	23	difficult, and it is difficult for this reason, because
24	we can introduce better work or better activities, we	24	it does need openness and honesty about what it is
	can train staff in mental health and capacity, we can	25	really about. The problem with immigration detention is
25			
23	Page 146		Page 148

1	there is just no point in pretending it is about a short	1	the community.
2	period of detention just in order to affect removal	2	But what you are also being told is, "Why not do
3	because we know that is not, in fact, what is happening,	3	time limits?". Now, I understand that it would be said
4	as soon as you look at the release statistics you see	4	this is outside of the terms of reference, but is it?
5	the numbers are very low. The only reason the release	5	Because the terms of reference say, "examine the reasons
6	numbers are anywhere is because, essentially, when you	6	for the mistreatment and the experience", and the
7	look at the numbers, you have places like Poland and	7	reasons for the experience, at least in part, is a lot
8	Romania, where there is a probability of removal, but in	8	of people are telling you, the detained people are
9	relation to all the tricky countries, if I can put it	9	telling you, that indeterminate detention is making the
10	informally, when you look at places like Sudan, Syria,	10	experience worse for them, at the same time as
11	Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran also, coincidentally, the	11	Mary Bosworth tells you it is making it harder to
12	countries where the people coming from there are most	12	respond to them because it is undermining the clarity
13	likely to be most damaged the removals in relation to	13	and the purpose of immigration detention. So one does
14	those countries are very low. The latest statistic,	14	have to reflect what the evidence is telling us, and
15	below 5 per cent for all of those. So this isn't really	15	that is what it is telling us.
16	about removal, and all that is happening is the	16	Even Jerry Petherick said in his oral evidence:
17	Home Office is pretending it is and, once it does that,	17	"I think the real issue and you are right, I am
18	as it ploughs on, believing, or wanting to believe, that	18	not a clinician at all, but my experience would say that
19	it is, in fact, about removal and that all of these	19	the real issue that impacted on detainees' wellbeing and
20	people are off and all these people are charlatans and	20	mental health was their sense of not knowing the
21	they are maintaining claims to remain that are not real,	21	uncertainty of the situation."
22	then that fosters the abuse, because as long as you	22	When you have that consistency of evidence all
23	maintain that, that you are on the way out, it informs	23	saying the same thing across these different kinds of
24	the language of, "Why don't you fuck off home?".	24	witnesses, then we need to do something about that, we
25	The so, yes, look at that. Yes, see if we can do	25	need to take it seriously and we certainly need to
	Page 149		D 151
	1 age 149		Page 151
1	that. Yes, see if we can bring some honesty and	1	record it.
1 2	that. Yes, see if we can bring some honesty and transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the	1 2	record it.  Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method
2	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the	2	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method
2 3	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are	2 3	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes
2 3 4	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with	2 3 4	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is
2 3 4 5	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given	2 3 4 5	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within
2 3 4 5 6	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have	2 3 4 5 6	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is
2 3 4 5 6 7	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the	2 3 4 5 6 7	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at all. Professor Bosworth has told you, and it is very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That is where we say the evidence has taken you. Too many
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at all. Professor Bosworth has told you, and it is very interesting the timing of all this, that the pandemic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That is where we say the evidence has taken you. Too many people from too many different stripes are saying the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at all. Professor Bosworth has told you, and it is very interesting the timing of all this, that the pandemic has shown that much larger numbers can be managed in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That is where we say the evidence has taken you. Too many people from too many different stripes are saying the same thing. You are unconstrained, we say. Again, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at all. Professor Bosworth has told you, and it is very interesting the timing of all this, that the pandemic has shown that much larger numbers can be managed in the community. We have not there is no evidence that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That is where we say the evidence has taken you. Too many people from too many different stripes are saying the same thing. You are unconstrained, we say. Again, we say look at the scale of what we've seen. You should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at all. Professor Bosworth has told you, and it is very interesting the timing of all this, that the pandemic has shown that much larger numbers can be managed in the community. We have not there is no evidence that we have seen that suggests that the pandemic and large	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That is where we say the evidence has taken you. Too many people from too many different stripes are saying the same thing. You are unconstrained, we say. Again, we say look at the scale of what we've seen. You should respectfully do all you can about it. If not you, then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at all. Professor Bosworth has told you, and it is very interesting the timing of all this, that the pandemic has shown that much larger numbers can be managed in the community. We have not there is no evidence that we have seen that suggests that the pandemic and large numbers of people being managed in the community has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That is where we say the evidence has taken you. Too many people from too many different stripes are saying the same thing. You are unconstrained, we say. Again, we say look at the scale of what we've seen. You should respectfully do all you can about it. If not you, then who, and if not now, then when? And don't succumb to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at all. Professor Bosworth has told you, and it is very interesting the timing of all this, that the pandemic has shown that much larger numbers can be managed in the community. We have not there is no evidence that we have seen that suggests that the pandemic and large numbers of people being managed in the community has produced an escalation in absconding or offending.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That is where we say the evidence has taken you. Too many people from too many different stripes are saying the same thing. You are unconstrained, we say. Again, we say look at the scale of what we've seen. You should respectfully do all you can about it. If not you, then who, and if not now, then when? And don't succumb to the siren song of Mr Blake, who told you who's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at all. Professor Bosworth has told you, and it is very interesting the timing of all this, that the pandemic has shown that much larger numbers can be managed in the community. We have not there is no evidence that we have seen that suggests that the pandemic and large numbers of people being managed in the community has produced an escalation in absconding or offending.  There is no evidence of that and, if there was, we would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That is where we say the evidence has taken you. Too many people from too many different stripes are saying the same thing. You are unconstrained, we say. Again, we say look at the scale of what we've seen. You should respectfully do all you can about it. If not you, then who, and if not now, then when? And don't succumb to the siren song of Mr Blake, who told you who's not now in the room to hear me say this, but Mr Blake said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at all. Professor Bosworth has told you, and it is very interesting the timing of all this, that the pandemic has shown that much larger numbers can be managed in the community. We have not there is no evidence that we have seen that suggests that the pandemic and large numbers of people being managed in the community has produced an escalation in absconding or offending.  There is no evidence of that and, if there was, we would expect the Home Office to produce it because the burden	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That is where we say the evidence has taken you. Too many people from too many different stripes are saying the same thing. You are unconstrained, we say. Again, we say look at the scale of what we've seen. You should respectfully do all you can about it. If not you, then who, and if not now, then when? And don't succumb to the siren song of Mr Blake, who told you who's not now in the room to hear me say this, but Mr Blake said in opening, "Don't go into the politics. The things
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at all. Professor Bosworth has told you, and it is very interesting the timing of all this, that the pandemic has shown that much larger numbers can be managed in the community. We have not there is no evidence that we have seen that suggests that the pandemic and large numbers of people being managed in the community has produced an escalation in absconding or offending. There is no evidence of that and, if there was, we would expect the Home Office to produce it because the burden of proof in detention is on them.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That is where we say the evidence has taken you. Too many people from too many different stripes are saying the same thing. You are unconstrained, we say. Again, we say look at the scale of what we've seen. You should respectfully do all you can about it. If not you, then who, and if not now, then when? And don't succumb to the siren song of Mr Blake, who told you who's not now in the room to hear me say this, but Mr Blake said in opening, "Don't go into the politics. The things that Brook House require is mundane. Don't do that".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	transparency to bear about what the real purpose of the function of immigration detention actually is, but are we going to achieve that, are we going to get there with that, is that a realistic thing that we can alter, given the political rhetoric and everything else that we have around this area? And the problem that we have and the people I represent have, is that, absent something really hard and robust and fundamental, we can do all of the work around those softer issues, but it won't actually produce the outcome that we need.  What you need to do is just get much shorter periods of immigration detention or no immigration detention at all. Professor Bosworth has told you, and it is very interesting the timing of all this, that the pandemic has shown that much larger numbers can be managed in the community. We have not there is no evidence that we have seen that suggests that the pandemic and large numbers of people being managed in the community has produced an escalation in absconding or offending.  There is no evidence of that and, if there was, we would expect the Home Office to produce it because the burden of proof in detention is on them.  Absent that, we are entitled to infer that very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Equally, why isn't indeterminate detention a method policy practice or management arrangement, that causes or contributes to any identified mistreatment? That is something that you are tasked with looking at within your terms of reference. It seems to us that it is amply wide enough for indeterminate detention to be a contributing practice and, therefore, within the terms of reference.  Equally, your scope determination, 6 January, confirms you can make any recommendation you like, and you were clear in the scope determination that you would be flexible and go where the evidence takes you. That is where we say the evidence has taken you. Too many people from too many different stripes are saying the same thing. You are unconstrained, we say. Again, we say look at the scale of what we've seen. You should respectfully do all you can about it. If not you, then who, and if not now, then when? And don't succumb to the siren song of Mr Blake, who told you who's not now in the room to hear me say this, but Mr Blake said in opening, "Don't go into the politics. The things that Brook House require is mundane. Don't do that". It is impossible to avoid politics. We are talking

1	certainly let's go beyond mundane.	1	people in their care. He regrets not having done more
2	So a couple of other things very briefly. If	2	to counteract these behaviours at the time. He would
3	Brook Houses are to continue, the mentally ill need to	3	like to commend the bravery and resilience of those
4	be out. They just need to not be in Brook House, they	4	formerly detained persons who have provided evidence to
5	need to be not in detention. Not just those who can	5	the inquiry.
6	produce a certain calibre of medical report that just	6	As Mr Syred said in his opening statement to the
7	results in the Home Office then complaining about there	7	inquiry, he welcomes the inquiry's scrutiny, and
8	being too many medical reports, "We don't like the	8	continues to be hopeful that the inquiry's findings and
9	medical reports because they all say these people are	9	recommendations will lead to significant improvement for
10	ill". Well, there may be a reason why they say that.	10	those who are detained within immigration detention
11	We know that you can't do therapeutic work in the	11	centres like Brook House, but also for the people who
12	centre. All of the doctors say that. And not just the	12	work in these centres. This closing statement is
13	mentally ill, all of the vulnerable need to come out	13	focused on issues that concern staff and management at
14	the trafficking victims, torture victims, all of them.	14	the centre, which is where Mr Syred feels that he can
15	Bring into the systems those who understand the	15	add the most value.
16	experience of detention, and that may be GDWG, but it	16	It will address six areas as follows: first,
17	also means the former detained people themselves because	17	dysfunctional leadership; second, recruitment; third,
18	that will bring them closer, that will foster	18	training; fourth, career progression and professional
19	understanding, it will foster empathy and care, and it	19	standards; fifth, the impact of staff sorry, the
20	will do more to understand the detained person	20	impact on staff of working at Brook House; and sixth,
21	experience that has not, so far, been well understood.	21	balance.
22	And stop, absolutely stop, using this building to detain	22	First, dysfunctional leadership. Part of the reason
23	people for any length of time beyond the 72 hours for	23	for addressing this area first is because the leadership
24	which it has been designed.	24	is responsible and accountable for the behaviours within
25	Chair, there are other longer lists of	25	the centre. But also to highlight at the outset
	Page 153		Page 155
1	recommendations and they are contained in the fourth	1	an issue that Mr Syred believes runs throughout the
2	witness statement of Anna Pincus, who I represent in the	2	whole of Brook House, including the senior leadership,
3	GDWG, but there is also more from BID, from	3	namely, the lack of clarity and awareness about the fact
4	Detention Action, from Medical Justice. You have long	4	that immigration detention is not a punitive measure but
5	lists of recommendations, and I can't improve on all of	5	a means of facilitating immigration controls.
6	those. You have all of those and I will put them in our	6	There are some features of immigration detention at
7	written submissions, but there is a reason why all of	7	Brook House which are clearly punitive without any
8	those people agree. They all know their own bits of	8	obvious justification, such as being locked in a room
9	a system and they all agree, and there is a reason why	9	with strangers for 11 hours a day.
10	they agree. And I conclude simply by saying, again, go	10	There is also a very obvious tension between the
11	where the evidence takes you. Now is the time. Be	11	caring element of ensuring the welfare of detained
12	bold.	12	persons and the reality of immigration detention,
13	Thank you very much.	13	including the need, on occasion, to use force. It was
14	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Armstrong. Thank you.	14	striking the number of occasions that staff spoke when
15	Mr Stanton, do you require a lectern or anything?	15	giving oral evidence about their empathy with detained
16	MR STANTON: No, I'm fine, thank you.	16	persons, which Mr Syred believes is, on the whole,
17	THE CHAIR: Okay, thank you.	17	genuine, only to be confronted with recordings of their
18	Closing statement by MR STANTON	18	actions and statements which evidenced authoritarian,
19	MR STANTON: Chair, I will be giving the closing statement	19	aggressive, abusive or uncaring behaviour.
20	on behalf of Owen Syred, who is in attendance today and	20	Some staff appeared visibly shocked while giving
21	is sat beside me.	21	evidence and being confronted by their own behaviour.
22	At the outset, Mr Syred would like to say that he	22	Mr Syred believes the lack of clear direction from
23	has followed the evidence of the inquiry closely, and	23	senior leaders as to the purpose of an immigration
24	has been disgusted at the actions and attitudes of some	24	detention centre, most particularly, that it is not to
25	staff which demonstrated a lack of humanity towards	25	operate as a punitive measure, is at the heart of the
	Page 154		Page 156
			20 (D 152 + 154)

		1	
1	problem, coupled with the fact that the majority of	1	An example of the ineffectiveness of the senior
2	staff were inexperienced and without adequate training.	2	leadership team is the failure to support Mr Syred when
3	Mr Syred has always been aware that there were two	3	he reported the fact that he was being bullied,
4	camps within the DCO and DCM staff, those like Mr Syred,	4	following his report of a racist incident. You will
5	who believed that their role and priority was to ensure	5	recall, chair, that a poster which contained photographs
6	the welfare of detained persons, and those who believed	6	of staff so that they could be identified within the
7	that Brook House should be run more like a prison.	7	centre had been defaced next to Mr Syred's image with
8	However, having engaged with the inquiry proceedings,	8	the words "Grass" and Post-It notes were also placed
9	Mr Syred now realises that this fault line also ran	9	over his locker stating "[N-word] lover" and "Grass".
10	through the senior leadership team.	10	Such an appalling example of bullying in support of
11	The inquiry has heard how there was a lack of	11	a member of staff who had engaged in racist behaviour
12	cohesion among the senior leadership team. Lee Hanford	12	ought to have resulted in an immediate, visible and
13	referred to the "toxic" relationship between senior	13	unequivocal response from senior leadership, including
14	management, to an element of chaoticness, to the fact	14	clear communication to the workforce that this type of
15	that the relationship between the centre director,	15	behaviour is unacceptable, an investigation to identify
16	Ben Saunders, and his deputy, up to 2015,	16	those responsible and a review of processes, procedures
17	Duncan Partridge, had broken down and that other staff	17	and training so that the staff were in no doubt of their
18	knew there were two camps on site.	18	responsibility to call out inappropriate behaviour, and
19	The statement of Michelle Brown refers to a clear	19	that the more senior the member of staff, the greater
20	lack of trust within the senior management team.	20	their responsibility to call it out.
21	Mr Syred believes that Ben Saunders was out of his	21	Instead, nothing was done, other than the provision
22	depth and did not command the respect of his senior	22	of hollow expressions of support. The fact that
23	leadership team, which was in part due to his social	23	inappropriate behaviour was not routinely challenged by
24	care background. There were many within the senior	24	the senior leadership team and managers led to staff
25	leadership team who saw Mr Saunders as too soft and	25	feeling empowered to behaviour inappropriately because
	D 157		D 150
	Page 157		Page 159
1	wanted to see the centre run more like a prison, such as	1	they knew there would be no consequences.
2	Duncan Partridge, Steve Skitt, Jules Williams and	2	The lack of proper recruitment, training and
3	Ian Danskin(?). The prison approach was too ingrained	3	induction processes, which will be mentioned in more
4	within many of the senior leadership team and this	4	detail later in this statement, was also a significant
5	filleted down through the whole organisation and	5	failure of the senior leadership team, as was the lack
6	resulted in the promotion of individuals who shared	6	of presence and visibility and any real insight and
7	these values and contributed to the "us and them"	7	awareness of what was happening on the shop floor.
8	culture. Attempts to lighten the prison-style	8	There were no proper mechanisms for feeding the views
9	environment were opposed and the less austere atmosphere	9	and experiences of DCOs and DCMs into the senior
10	at Tinsley House was referred to by some senior	10	leadership team and, worse, suggestions for improvement
11	managers, DCMs and DCOs as "Disney House".	11	and expressions of concern were actively suppressed.
12	Mr Syred believes that Brook House suffers from	12	An example of this within Mr Syred's first statement
13	an identity crisis for which the senior leadership team	13	that ironically occurred at a staff forum concerns
14	bear a significant responsibility. In addition to this	14	Mr Syred's attempt to discuss what he considered had
15	specific and profoundly damaging failure, the staff at	15	been an unnecessary use of force to facilitate
16	Brook House were generally not well led. Brook House is	16	a transfer which had caused injury to a detained person
17	not a particularly large work force, and almost all	17	and to suggest that, in future, officers who may have
18	staff are required to be physically present to carry out	18	a positive relationship with a detained person be
19	their work. It should not have been difficult to	19	afforded an opportunity to explain and persuade the
20	instill a positive supportive team ethos and to	20	detained person to transfer without the need for use of
21	communicate important messages such as the importance of	21	force. This is the same type of engagement that the
22	freedom to speak out and to create and reinforce	22	inquiry's expert witness Jon Collier indicated when
23	positive shared values.	23	giving evidence was not happening enough at Brook House.
24		24	However, Mr Syred was told by Ian Danskin, who was
25		25	chairing the staff forum, that it wasn't for discussion.
	Page 158		Page 160
	1 age 130	I	Page 160

2.1

The inquiry has heard a lot from staff witnesses about the fact that bad language was rife within the centre. Some staff continued to seek to justify its use, whereas others had come to realise that, whatever poor language and abuse they faced while working at Brook House, it was not acceptable to respond in kind. Given the relative inexperience and lack of training of many of the staff, it is understandable that they responded in this way. However, it was the job of the senior leadership team to ensure that staff behaved professionally through training, messaging, monitoring and role modelling and, again, in this regard they failed.

Second, recruitment. If staff are not interested and concerned at the conditions and circumstances in which people are detained, and do not have an interest and concern for the individuals that they are caring for, then they will not be motived to do a good job. Motivational fit needs to become a central plank of the recruitment process and more emphasis should be placed on identifying people who will take pride in their roles.

Mr Syred experienced verbal abuse and was sworn at and assaulted on a number of occasions for relatively modest pay but he stayed because he enjoyed the work,

## Page 161

particularly the interaction with detained persons, and he felt that he was making a difference. He is not alone in this view and, with more effort, a higher number of candidates with these values could be identified.

Assessment days for recruitment were often staffed by people such as Graham Purnell and Derek Murphy, both of whom face allegations of violent behaviour against detained persons. This is yet another example of the inappropriate emphasis and value placed on control and restraint and the macho culture at Brook House.

Mr Syred applied to run an assessment day and was turned down, which illustrates that the values he promoted and his caring approach to detained persons were not regarded by the senior leadership team as attributes to look for in new recruits.

There is a need to identify and attract staff who will treat the role as a career and not as a stopgap for something else, as was too often the case and which resulted in staff who were content to do the bare minimum. Some suggestions of how this can be achieved are made in a later section in this statement.

The inquiry has heard from a number of staff

witnesses that the reality of the role was nothing like advertised and that many staff left soon after they

Page 162

started, once reality had dawned. This is a huge waste of recruitment and training resource and another aspect of a flawed recruitment strategy.

Mr Syred believes that there is a need for a much more robust assessment process to identify and attract people with the right skills who are interested in undertaking the role for the right reasons. The assessment process should continue both through the initial training course and a properly assessed, not just time-served, probationary period.

Third, training. The inquiry has been repeatedly told that the initial training course did not prepare staff for the realities of the job, which, similar to the failure to accurately advertise the role to identify the right candidates, makes no sense because time and money is wasted on training staff, who often leave shortly after starting once they become aware of the reality of Brook House. On any level the role of a wing DCO as someone who is required to safeguard the welfare of approximately 100 detained persons, together with only one or two colleagues, taking account of physical and mental health issues, the ACDT process, drugs issues and incidents of violence and bullying, as well as contending with verbal abuse and threats of violence, is an extremely challenging position and to perform the

## Page 163

role properly there needs to be significantly more and
 better training.
 Given the high levels of incidents of self-harm and

mental illness, it is a particularly shocking failure that more training and insight into mental health was not provided to the staff. Some staff have told the inquiry that they received no mental health training. Mr Syred believes that they are mistaken in this regard; however, the fact that many staff do not recognise that they received mental training at all speaks volumes.

Mr Syred has been a little puzzled at some criticisms of staff during inquiry proceedings for comments made while engaging in role play scenarios, because the whole point of role play training is for it to be as realistic as possible. The language used by detained persons could sometimes be threatening and abusive and there is a need for this to be reflected in the training.

Mr Syred suggests that there should be more scenario based training and that staff should be confronted in group learning sessions with how and how not to behave in the difficult and challenging circumstances that they will inevitably encounter.

Mr Syred will also recommend there should be an opportunity during the initial training course for

1	engagement between trainees and detained persons,	1	provided is the fact that Mr Syred was never trained in
2	perhaps former detained persons if they would be willing	2	the operation of rule 35, which represents a significant
3	to take part in such a programme, to better help	3	failure given the importance of this provision, as has
4	trainees to see detained persons as individuals, to gain	4	been emphasised in the inquiry proceedings. It was only
5	a better insight into the impact of detention and to	5	when he started working in welfare several years after
6	establish and build empathy.	6	he had started at Brook House that he learned about the
7	Staff must be better equipped to meet the complex	7	requirements and the significance of the rule.
8	needs of detained persons. The range of needs is huge,	8	Fourth, career progression and professional
9	from short term stays by people who have overstayed	9	standards. There needs to be an opportunity to progress
10	their visa and wish or do not object to a return, to	10	within the DCO grade, so that the centre can build
11	people who suffer from serious mental health issues and	11	a reservoir of experienced and committed practitioners
12	may have suffered torture and persecution. There are	12	as well as managers. Mr Syred had no ambition to become
13	also significant numbers of detained persons who are	13	a DCM; however, it was the only way to achieve career
14	liable to behave aggressively or violently or to	14	progression. He wanted to carry on and develop his role
15	self-harm.	15	as a welfare officer, which allowed him to assist people
16	Mr Syred felt it necessary to undertake additional	16	on a daily basis. Mr Syred believes that the
17	training at a two-day course on immigration law	17	introduction of a senior DCO role to allow for career
18	delivered by Amnesty International to gain a better	18	progression, development and job satisfaction would
19	understanding of the legal issues involved in	19	improve standards within immigration detention centres
20	immigration and so that, as a DCO, he was better able to	20	and also greatly improve staff retention.
21	engage with detainees who were subject to the legal	21	The lack of financial remuneration for experience
22	process of removal or deportation. As a result of this	22	and commitment to the role also needs to be addressed.
23	interest and commitment, Mr Syred was able to assist	23	As a 10-year served DCO, Mr Syred was earning the same
24	a detained person who had been described by officials	24	salary as a new recruit with no experience, which was
25	from his home country as an a abomination because of his	25	a source of frustration and needs to be addressed in
	Page 165		Page 167
	-		Ü
1	sexuality; and Mr Syred spoke about this in his evidence	1	order to retain people with the right skills and
2	before the inquiry.	2	experience.
3	It is accepted that it is not the role of staff at	3	As an example of the benefits of experience,
4	immigration detention centres to advise detained persons	4	Mr Syred's reaction when he first started working at
5	about their claims. However, given the context of	5	Brook House was to become offended by abusive comments
6	immigration detention, and the length of time that some	6	or aggressive behaviour by detained persons. However,
7	detained persons spent at Brook House, there is a need	7	he came to recognise that it was the detained persons
8	for better training on the basic principles of	8	who were locked up while he was not, and to see past
9	immigration law in order to effectively carry out the	9	such behaviours as isolated incidents, realising that
10	role of DCO and DCM.	10	the detained person was in a stressful situation or
11	Training is also largely based on the National	11	perhaps having a bad day. The inquiry's counsel team
12	Offender Management Service training, which is designed	12	have highlighted this imbalance of power and the duty on
13	for prisons and not immigration detention centres. The	13	staff to behaviour professionally at all times, even in
14	rules governing the running of a prison and	14	the face of abusive or aggressive behaviour. However,
15	an immigration detention centre are different and there	15	it can be particularly difficult for inexperienced or
16	are a number of other factors that make the role of	16	immature staff to do so, particularly without effective
17	a prison officer and that of a DCO and DCM very	17	and reinforced training and the availability of
18	different, including the uncertainty around the length	18	experienced role models, such as Mr Syred.
19		1	
	of detention, the mixed population of detained persons	19	DCOs and DCMs should be recognised as a specialist
20	of detention, the mixed population of detained persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences	20	profession, not the cheap cousin of prison officers.
21	of detention, the mixed population of detained persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences with overstayers with no previous experience of	20 21	profession, not the cheap cousin of prison officers.  A recognised qualification tailored to immigration
21 22	of detention, the mixed population of detained persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences with overstayers with no previous experience of detention, and freedom of association and movements, at	20 21 22	profession, not the cheap cousin of prison officers.  A recognised qualification tailored to immigration detention centres should be developed and become
21 22 23	of detention, the mixed population of detained persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences with overstayers with no previous experience of detention, and freedom of association and movements, at least during the day, which requires a different set of	20 21 22 23	profession, not the cheap cousin of prison officers.  A recognised qualification tailored to immigration detention centres should be developed and become mandatory for those seeking to work in the centres.
21 22 23 24	of detention, the mixed population of detained persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences with overstayers with no previous experience of detention, and freedom of association and movements, at least during the day, which requires a different set of skills to manage.	20 21 22 23 24	profession, not the cheap cousin of prison officers.  A recognised qualification tailored to immigration detention centres should be developed and become mandatory for those seeking to work in the centres.  This would provide staff with a sense of pride and
21 22 23	of detention, the mixed population of detained persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences with overstayers with no previous experience of detention, and freedom of association and movements, at least during the day, which requires a different set of	20 21 22 23	profession, not the cheap cousin of prison officers.  A recognised qualification tailored to immigration detention centres should be developed and become mandatory for those seeking to work in the centres.
21 22 23 24	of detention, the mixed population of detained persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences with overstayers with no previous experience of detention, and freedom of association and movements, at least during the day, which requires a different set of skills to manage.	20 21 22 23 24	profession, not the cheap cousin of prison officers.  A recognised qualification tailored to immigration detention centres should be developed and become mandatory for those seeking to work in the centres.  This would provide staff with a sense of pride and

		1	_
1	Fifth, the impact of working at Brook House on	1	Lee Hanford told the inquiry that the behaviours you
2	staff. Professor Bosworth spoke about the secondary	2	see from the majority of staff, their relationships with
3	trauma experienced by DCOs and DCMs when confronted by	3	detainees were excellent. A number of officers and
4	the trauma suffered by detained persons, and many	4	managers have told the inquiry about the efforts they
5	officers and managers have been adversely affected by	5	made to build relationships with detained persons and to
6	their experiences at Brook House. The evidence of	6	look after their needs. The inquiry has already heard
7	Professor Katona has prompted Mr Syred to reflect about	7	evidence of officers seeking to support detained persons
8	the challenges of seeking to support people in dire need	8	by helping them with forms and documents needed for
9	without the appropriate knowledge, training and support,	9	immigration cases and assisting with access to legal
10	and the detrimental impact on how staff cope and work	10	representatives and charities.
11	with people with mental illness.	11	Mr Syred can recall numerous examples of caring and
12	Working at Brook House, you are exposed to	12	supportive behaviour by staff, such as a welfare officer
13	high-levels of aggression, abuse and violence, and	13	colleague, Nikki Madgwick, who arranged for a detained
14	Mr Syred has been assaulted on a number of occasions.	14	person's dog to be cared for by a canine charity;
15	There is a need to be hyper vigilant to respond to drug	15	James Begg, safer custody manager, who provided detained
16	misuse, violence and threatening behaviour, and this can	16	persons with his contact number so that they could
17	cause mental health problems for staff, particularly	17	contact him 24/7 if they had thoughts of self-harm;
18	when the training and support is inadequate. Mr Syred	18	Ramon Giraldo, a highly respected and well liked
19	has been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder	19	colleague who worked tirelessly to provide activities
20	and when he tried to raise his own mental health issues,	20	for detained persons with the limited resources
21	the management of Brook House wouldn't listen.	21	available to him; Michelle Brown, who attended Surrey
22	The strain of working at Brook House led some	22	Accident and Emergency with an Egyptian national who
23	officers to hide their lack of confidence with bravado	23	required specialist treatment for mental health issues
24	or to act out of character in order to fit in. The	24	and stayed at hospital all night to support him; and
25	inquiry heard a particularly distressing example of this	25	Mr Syred's colleagues in welfare, who all went the extra
	D 170		D 474
	Page 169		Page 171
1	when Mr Sanders gave his evidence. Staff were also	1	mile on a daily basis.
2	frustrated by staff shortages, the lack of support from	2	There are also many officers who Mr Syred believes
3	senior management and by colleagues who were not pulling	3	were caring individuals who were shown in the BBC
4	their weight, leaving staff who took the role seriously	4	recordings behaving inappropriately, for example
5	to become overwhelmed and dispirited by not having	5	Charlie Francis, Steve Webb, Kalvin Sanders and
6	sufficient time to do their jobs properly.	6	Clayton Fraser. Mr Syred has known some of them for
7	Sixth, balance. Mr Syred's main aim as a core	7	years and witnessed them trying to do their best. In
8	participant is to tell the inquiry what it was really	8	his evidence to the inquiry, Mr Syred described
9	like at Brook House. The inquiry has seen and heard	9	Clayton Fraser as someone who he had "always witnessed
10	about the worst of Brook House but there is also another	10	being quite caring, considerate; to me that was quite
11	side which was not shown in Panorama or drawn out in the	11	really out of character but I do believe that was
12	inquiry hearings. It was a small minority of staff who	12	probably more just to fit in, just to be accepted and
13	conducted themselves as Yan Paschali and Derek Murphy	13	it's a very common thing".
14	did. By and large, staff at Brook House behaved well	14	The inquiry has understandably focused on a small
15	and treated residents with care, dignity and compassion.	15	selection of the recordings made by Callum Tulley.
16	There are no recordings of officers and detainees	16	However, they do not present a balanced picture of life
17	chatting, having a coffee, sharing a joke or playing	17	within Brook House, which is a point recognised by
18	pool. However, these were everyday occurrences at	18	Professor Bosworth in her expert evidence to the
19	Brook House.	19	inquiry. It is important to Mr Syred that the inquiry
20	In his evidence in December of last year, Mr Syred	20	has a balanced view of what Brook House was like and
21	told the inquiry:	21	that it should find some way of recognising the many
22	"When you worked on a wing with guys, you got to	22	positive interactions that took place between staff and
23	know them, they got to know you. It felt like you were	23	detained persons. Mr Syred is conscious of the
24	almost a community. Believe it or not, I had some very	24	distressing experiences that many detained persons
25	funny times joking and laughing together."	25	experienced. However, not all allegations made by
	D 470		D 470
	Page 170	1	Page 172

1	detained persons are accurate; for example, the witness	1	do if they feel they are able to have a positive impact
2	statement of D390 submitted to the High Court that	2	on the circumstances of detained persons and their
3	referred to the use of batons by staff in circumstances	3	families, and they are able to positively influence
4	where video evidence demonstrated that this was not the	4	management of the centre.
5	case. There were other examples, and a careful	5	Second, the act of locking someone up for 11 hours
6	examination of the availability facts is needed when	6	each day, either alone or with one or more other
7	assessing the merits.	7	detained persons, is stressful and damaging to mental
8	Mr Syred would also ask the inquiry to take account	8	health and wellbeing. It is also punitive nature and
9	of the fact that there have been significant	9	cannot be said to be in any way necessary to ensure
10	improvements in the conditions at Brook House between	10	lawful immigration controls. There is no reason that
11	2009, when Mr Syred first joined, and the relevant	11	detained persons could not be provided with their own
12	period in 2017, so that recommendations can be made for	12	key, with wing officers being able to access rooms which
13	the future, having regard to relevant past developments.	13	are locked from within where necessary. This is
14	In his first witness statement, Mr Syred states:	14	a practice adopted in other countries, notably Norway,
15	"When Brook House first opened in 2009, it was	15	and the current low numbers of people in immigration
16	a dreadful place. 90 per cent of the detainees were	16	detention would be an ideal time to trial it in the UK.
17	foreign national criminals and it was infested with	17	One has only to imagine how it would feel to be
18	drugs. There were also problems with prostitution,	18	locked in a room for such a long period of time each day
19	bullying and gambling. It was a very menacing	19	to begin to appreciate the levels of anxiety the
20	atmosphere which you could cut with a knife."	20	practice causes. The fears of detained persons about
21	Some of the factors that Mr Syred believes	21	being locked up at night were very obvious to Mr Syred.
22	contributed to the problems in the first few years were	22	Staff would spend considerable time persuading people to
23	the fact that the overwhelming majority of residents	23	be locked up together with a stranger and when detained
24	were time-served prisoners; the failure to allow the	24	persons refused they would be taken to the Care and
25	centre time to bed in almost immediately it was	25	Separation Unit.
	Page 173		Page 175
1	opened, it was filled with residents and an even less		For people who have difficulty sleeping, which is
2	experienced workforce than in 2017; less recreational	2	very common in those who are experiencing stress or
3	activities were available and the fact that all wings	3	anxiety, it would be far better for them to have access
4	were open to each other, which caused considerable	4	to communal areas and to be able to undertake
5	disruption and violence.	5	an activity, rather than lying in bed with negative
6	The atmosphere changed completely from 2009 to 2017,	6	thought patterns. Staffing levels would need to
7	and you could not compare the two periods. The main	7	increase, but not significantly, and the additional cost
8	reason that conditions and behaviour improved was	8	would be a small price to pay for the potentially
9	because staff were able to build positive relationships	9	significant improvements to the wellbeing of those in
10	with detained persons, and Mr Syred suggests a continued	10	immigration detention.
11	focus in this area will lead to further improvements.	11	A final final point, picking up on what Mr Armstrong
12	Finally, Mr Syred would like to suggest two other	12	said about a hostile environment. Mr Syred can confirm
13	broad areas for improvement. First, an independent	13	that he was encouraged to make known the hostile
14	state-run service to better ensure the welfare of people	14	environment to detained persons.
15	in immigration detention. In Mr Syred's view, the role	15	Thank you, chair.
16	of a DCO and DCM is far too important for it to be left	16	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Stanton.
17	to a private company whose priorities are to profit and	17	Mr Kelly, we are going to be hearing from you next
18	shareholders. Mr Syred also has concerns about the need	18	but I am going to suggest that we take our 15-minute
19	of any private company to protect their corporate image	19	break and we will hear from you when we return at 3.45.
20	and the disincentive this brings, conscious or not, to	20	MR KELLY: That is fine.
21	seek to identify poor practices and areas of concern by	21	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 3.45.
22	thorough investigation and external reporting, so that	22	(3.30 pm)
23	issues can be addressed and improved. In Mr Syred's	23	(A short break)
24	experience, staff rarely have loyalty to profit	24	(3.46 pm)
25	companies. However, they will take pride in what they	25	THE CHAIR: Mr Kelly, thank you.
	D 474		D 457
	Page 174	1	Page 176

and indexed created an atmosphore leadings to restratation proposes to just deal effectively in a thambnail sketch with the submissions that we are making, because we will meading full within submissions that dealing with all of the points. The very first point I would like to make is that, in section 2 of the Inquiries Act 2005, it provides at asbacetion (1) that an inquiry must not reliate in has no power to determine, may person's civil or the has no power to determine, may person's civil or criminal likebility. It is an inquiry is "not to law, yoo one is not rial.  I law. No one is not rial.  I law, No one is not rial.  I law, I woo one is not rial.  I law in the discharge of its functions by any likebilitod of litability being inferred from facts that if determines or recommendations that in makes." The use of the word "inferred" ether facts that the is indicated created an atmosphore leading to form that both the literation.  I mespect of article of, and of the allegations against them is the use of food language on limited occasions.  I mespect of article 3, in of course prohabits or tortue, inhumance treatment and pomishiment. We say, in short, that there is no credible evidence that effort of the minimum tervaturation and pomishiment. We say, in short, that there is no credible evidence that effort of the allegations against them is the use of food language on limited occasions.  I mespect of article 3, in of course prohabits  THE CHAIR: Sorry, Mr Kelly, I think we have lost your microphone. Could you just give us a moment and we will get that faced.  I have no everyweding and a place which was under-sourced and understanded.  I mespect of article 3, in of course prohabits  THE CHAIR: Sorry, Mr Kelly, I think we have lost you microphone. Could you just give us a moment and we will get that faced.  I have no virtually all accounts a building with physical irnadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with physical irnadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with physical irnadequacies, with poor f				
detection with the submissions that we are making, becomes we will be making full written submissions have emaking, becomes with all of the points.  The very first point 'law sould like to make is that, in section 2 of the Inquiries Act 2005, it provides at subsection (1) that an inquiry must not "relat on, and has no power to determine, any person's evil or criminal liability." It is an inquiry, not a court of law, to one is no trial.  Subsection (2) provides that mi inquiry is 'not to be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any like it determines or recommendations that it makes." The trace of the own of "informed 'calry ferfor to subsequent it determines or recommendations that it makes." The trace of word "informed 'calry ferfor to subsequent liftigation, thereby reinforcing the point.  In respect of article 3, in of course prohibits In respect of article 3, in of course prohibits contact. The flurus of the allegations against them is the use of food language on limited occasions.  Page 177  difficult environment for everyone involved— dehainess, employed caised by offices and other employees a like. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequencies, with poor facilities, a building with a physical inadequencies, with poor facilities, a building with the physical inadequencies, with poor facilities, a building with the physical inadequencies, with poor facilities, a building with the physical inadequencies, with poor facilities, a building with the physical inadequencies, with poor facilities, a building with the physical inadequencies, with poor facilities, a building with the physical inadequencies with poor facilities, a building with the physical inadequencies with poor facilities, a building with the physical inadequencies with poor facilities, a building with the physical inadequencies with poor facilities, a building with the physical inadequencies with poor facilities of the physical inadequencies with poor facilities of the physical inadequencies with poor facilities	1	Closing statement by MR KELLY	1	and indeed created an atmosphere leading to frustration
sketch with the submissions that we are making, because we will be making full written submissions later dealing with all of the points.  The very first point I would like to make is that, in section 2 of the Inquiries Act 2005, it provides at subsection (1) that an inquiry must not "rule on, and lib has no power to determine, any person's civil or criminal liability." It is an inquiry, not a court of lie with No one is on trial.  Subsection (2) provides that an inquiry is "not to lib has no power to determine, any person's civil or lie with blind in the discharge of its functions by any likelihood of liability being inferred from faces that it determines or recommendations that irmake." The use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent likelihood of liability being inferred from faces that litigation, thereby reinforcing the point.  In respect of article 3, 1 of course prohibits be in the treatment and punishment. We say, in torture, inhumane treatment and punishment. We say, in such conduct. The throst of the allegations against them is the use of fool language on limited ceasesons.  Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally  Page 177  difficult environment for everyone involved— deliances, employed custody officers and other employees a dike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor flecitities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and undestaffed.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be aid to be a poor environment and there was everified in extress were and the except sequences, with poor flecitities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and undestaffed.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be aid to be a poor environment and there was everified to extreme spone. Could you just give us a moment and we will say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were leadi	2	MR KELLY: Thank you very much, chair.	2	and aggression, all of which contributed to the problems
swith lib emaking full written submissions later dealing with all of the points. The very first point I would like to make is that, subsection 2 of the Inquiries. Act 2005, it provides at subsection () that an inquiry must not "rule on, and las no power to determine, any person's civil or laws no power to determine, any person's civil or laws one is on trait. Subsection (2) provides that an inquiry is "not to lab in so one is on trait. Subsection (2) provides that an inquiry is "not to lab entitle in the dischained provided in the dischained providence that Brook House was overcrowded and that was certainly not helped by putting in a indirect was it determines or recommendations that it makes". The use of the word "inferred clearly refers to subsequent litigation, thereby reinforcing the point. In respect of article 3, it of course prohibits torture, inhumane treatment and punishment. We say, in such conduct. The thrast of the allegations against them is the use of foul language on limited occasions. Drook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally  Page 177  difficult environment for everyone involved— detuinese, employed custody officers and other employees alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacles, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed. Looking it just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detained, language in surface of the course of the course prohibits to be physical inadequacles, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed. Looking it just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detained would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributel, ve say, to is problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, so	3	I propose to just deal effectively in a thumbnail	3	this inquiry is examining.
a problem, which, among other things, contributed to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to the delainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to a region of the people are subject to a people delainee, poor mental health. If people are subject to a page and frist station. If people are subject to a people peo	4	sketch with the submissions that we are making, because	4	Professor Mary Bosworth also identified the length
The very first point I would like to make is that, so in section 2 of the Inquiries Act 2005, it provides at subsection (1) that an inquiry must not "rule on, and has no power to determine, any person's civil or criminal liability". It is an inquiry, not a court of law. No one is on trial.  Subsection (2) provides that an inquiry is "not to be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any likelihood of liability being inferred from facts that if determines or ecommendations that it makes". The use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent litigation, thereby reinforcing the point.  In respect of article 3, it of course prohibits torrure, inhuman retarnet and punishment. We say, in short, that there is no credible evidence that either 22 Nathan Ring nor Stephen beed, an individuals, engaged in such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against them is the use of foul language on limited occasions.  Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally  Page 177  The difficult environment for everyone involved— definition, and the independent investigation into concerns about RELLY: Thanks.  Do you want me to repeat the last bit or have you got that?  Page 179  The CHAIR: If you could start again — you were going to start talking about the independent investigation into start talking about the independent investigation into concerns about MR KELLY: Thanks.  Do you want me to repeat the last bit or have you got that?  Page 179  The CHAIR: If you could start again — you were going to start talking about the independent investigation in you and the independent investigation in you and the independent investigation into concerns about MR KELLY: The	5	we will be making full written submissions later dealing	5	of time detainees were held in centres such as this as
a regime where they don't know how long they will be detained, it is hardly surprising that there will be detained, it is hardly surprising that there will be adetained, it is hardly surprising that there will be adetained, it is hardly surprising that there will be appeared to be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any likelihood of liability. It is an inquiry, not a court of a surprising that there will be appeared to be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any likelihood of liability being inferred from face that it determines or recommendations that it makes. The use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent likigation, thereby reinforcing the point.  In respect of article 3, it of course prohibits to torture, inhuruna treatment and punishment. We say, in such conduct. The threat of the allegations against the time of food language on limited occasions.  Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally  Page 177  I difficult environment for everyone involved—detuinees, employed custedly officers and other employees alake. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequaces, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overtrowding, and a place which was an under-resourced and understaffed.  Looking al just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was every continuity uncertainty as too how hong the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, the response of the word with the service of the contributed, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Myou know, this is in elation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  20 A we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  21 As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  22 Bentry the problems. The cells were not kept clean, the particular,	6	with all of the points.	6	a problem, which, among other things, contributed to the
9 subsection (1) that an inquiry must not "rule on, and 10 has no power to determine, any person's civil or 11 criminal liability". It is an inquiry, not a court of 12 law. No one is on trial. 13 Subsection (2) provides that an inquiry is "not to 14 be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any 15 likelihood of liability being inferred from facts that 16 it determines or recommendations that it maken." The 17 use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent 18 litigation, thereby reinforcing the point. 18 litigation, thereby reinforcing the point. 19 In respect of article 3, if of course prolibibs 10 torture, inhuman treatment and punishment. We say, in 18 short, that there is no credible evidence that either 18 such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against 12 them is the use of foul language on limited occasions. 18 Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally 19 page 177 Page 177  1 difficult environment for everyone involved — 1 detainees, employed custody officers and other employees a like. It was on virtually all accounts a building with 19 physical inadequacies, with poor ficilities building 19 which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was 10 under-resourced and understaffed. 10 be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we 11 say to kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we 12 say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, 14 the say to the pair clean of the major ones is the fact that, 15 the was poor vertiliation, some exercise areas were 16 closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that 17 be defined in a "verer-rowded and unsertial" of described its "verer-rowded and unsertial" of described its "verer-rowded and unsertial" of described its "verer-rowded and unsertial" of the said to be a poor environment and there was 18 colored, the exercise space was far too limited, and that 18 is just according to Jeruny Petherick of G4S. 14 secretal its "verer-rowded and unsertial" of described its "verer-rowded and unsertial" of desc	7	The very first point I would like to make is that,	7	detainees' poor mental health. If people are subject to
has no power to determine, any person's civil or criminal liability.' It is an inquiry, not a court of law. No one is on trial.  Subsection (2) provides that an inquiry is "not to be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any likelihood of liability heing inferred from first that it determines or recommendations that it makes". The use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent likingation, thereby reinforcing the point.  In respect of article 3, it of course prohibits torture, inhumane treatment and punishment. We say, in such conduct. The thruss of the allegations against them is the use of foul language on limited occasions. Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally  Page 177  difficult environment for everyone involved — detainese, employed custody officers and other employees alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was ecratically uncertainty as to low low office defatineses would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor verifilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S. The long of chainese would had that was certainty not helpod by putting in a third bed in many cells in entry 2012 in many exerting that is inappropriate for a detailed, find the was contained that was certainly not helpod by putting in a third bed in many cells in entry 2012 in many set as sealed off extra that was certainly not helpod by putting in a third bed in many cells in entry 2012 in many set as sealed that was accretainly not helpod by putting in a third bed in many cells in entry 2014 in many set as sealed the control of the count of the many and an exert all off exert the	8	in section 2 of the Inquiries Act 2005, it provides at	8	a regime where they don't know how long they will be
criminal liability.* It is an inquiry, not a court of law. No one is on trial.  Subsection (2) provides that an inquiry is "not to be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any likelihood of liability being inferred from facts that it is marked.* The use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent life it determines or recommendations that it makes.* The use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent life it determines or recommendations that it makes.* The use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent life it does not be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any likelihood of liability being inferred from facts that the use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent life it was on the state of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent life in the use of the word inferred "clearly refers to subsequent life in the use of the allegations against them is the use of foul language on limited oceasions.  Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally Page 177  The difficult environment for everyone involved— detainees, employed custody officers and other employees alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with which looks and feely in the physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with which looks and feely in the physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with which looks and feely in the physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with which looks and feely in the physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with leave the physical independent investigation into concerns about brook House by Kate Lampard, and Ed Marsden in 2018 descri	9	subsection (1) that an inquiry must not "rule on, and	9	detained, it is hardly surprising that there will be
law. No one is on trial.   12	10	has no power to determine, any person's civil or	10	anger and frustration.
that was certainly not helped by putting in a third bed be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any likelihood of liability being inferred from facts that if determines or recommendations that it makes". The use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent litigation, thereby reinforcing the point litigation, thereby reinforcing the point particular, it is a centre with a substance of the word inferred clearly refers to subsequent litigation. The thrust of the allegations against totrue, inhuman treatment and punishment. We say, in such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against them is the use of foul language on limited occasions. Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally  Page 177  difficult environment for everyone involved— detainees, employed castody officers and other employees alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with his distribution of those things, briefly, it sould be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be keept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some excresis areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr. Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "Hat DAIAIR: Sorry, Mr Kelly, I think we have lost your microphone. Could you just give us a moment and we will get that fixed. (Pause)  HTHE CHAIR: Bry MELLY: I thanks.  Do you want me to repeat the last bit or have you got that?  THE CHAIR: If you could start again — you were going to start talking about the independent investigation by  RKELLY: The independent investigation by  RKELLY: Intended.  The chair (Pause)  THE CHAIR: If you could start again — you were going to start alking about the independent investigation into concerns about  MR KELLY: The independent investigation into concerns abou	11	criminal liability". It is an inquiry, not a court of	11	Brook House was overcrowded. There is a significant
be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any likelihood of liability being inferred from facts that it idetermines or recommendations that it makes". The use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent litigation, thereby reinforcing the point.  In respect of article 3, it of course prohibits otorture, inhumane treatment and punishment. We say, in short, that there is no credible evidence that cither short, that there is no oredible evidence that cither hem is the use of foul language on limited occasions. Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally Page 177  difficult environment for everyone involved— detainees, employed custody officers and other employees a like. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed. Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be keep prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were close the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  M Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  The Hength of detainees was potitive, particularly in terms of how many hours	12	law. No one is on trial.	12	amount of evidence that Brook House was overcrowded and
beds. The independent investigation into concerns about it determines or recommendations that it makes". The use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent lifigation, thereby reinforcing the point.  In respect of article 3, it of course prohibits torture, inhumane treatment and punishment. We say, in short, that there is no credible evidence that either Nathan Ring nor Stephen Webb, as individuals, engaged in such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against them is the use of fool language on limited occasions.  Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally Page 177  I difficult environment for everyone involved— detainees, employed custody officers and other employees alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be keep prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was fir too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  M Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "Pat I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in the particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison."  Pat I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in the particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison."  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite and other way, detainees were subject to indefinite and that another way, detainees were subject to indefinite and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put	13	Subsection (2) provides that an inquiry is "not to	13	that was certainly not helped by putting in a third bed
16 it determines or recommendations that it makes". The 17 use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent 18 litigation, thereby reinforcing the point. 19 In respect of article 3, it of course prohibits 20 torture, inhumane treatment and punishment. We say, in 21 short, that there is no credible evidence that either 22 Nathan Ring nor Stephen Webb, as individuals, engaged in 23 such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against 24 them is the use of foul language on limited occasions. 25 Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally 26 detainees, employed custody officers and other employees 27 alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with 28 physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building 29 which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was 29 certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would 20 be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we 21 say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, 22 there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were 23 alike never one and the stage of the surface of the surfac	14	be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any	14	in many cells in early 2017 the so-called 60 extra
use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent litigation, thereby reinforcing the point.  In respect of article 3, it of course prohibits to torture, inhumane treatment and punishment. We say, in short, that there is no credible evidence that either Nathan Ring nor Stephen Webb, as individuals, engaged in state them is the use of foul language on limited occasions.  Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally Page 177  1 difficult environment for everyone involved — detainees, employed custody officers and other employees a like. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities was under-resourced and understaffed.  1 Cooking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainly as to how long the detainees would be keep trisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not k	15	likelihood of liability being inferred from facts that	15	beds. The independent investigation into concerns about
Itigation, thereby reinforcing the point.  In respect of article 3, it of course prohibits torture, inhumane treatment and punishment. We say, in short, that there is no credible evidence that etither Nathan Ring nor Stephen Webb, as individuals, engaged in such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against the sin is the use of foul language on limited oceasions. Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally  Page 177  I difficult environment for everyone involved — detaninese, employed custody officers and other employees a flike. It was on virtually all accounts a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed. Locking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S. Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detaninee way, detainees were subject to indefinite activated to the course prohibits.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  The Home Office contract was, is a condition to the detainees.  The Home Office contract was, I believe, very prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours	16	it determines or recommendations that it makes". The	16	Brook House by Kate Lampard and Ed Marsden used three
In respect of article 3, it of course prohibits torture, inhumane treatment and punishment. We say, in short, that there is no credible evidence that either short, that there is no credible evidence that either such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against them is the use of foul language on limited occasions. Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally Page 177  difficult environment for everyone involved — detainces, employed custody officers and other employees alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed. Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we supposed to be. In any event, Brook House didn't there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S. Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detaince population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainces were subject to indefinite detention. That had a serious impact on the detainces  'The Home Office contract was, I believe, very prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours	17	use of the word "inferred" clearly refers to subsequent	17	words about it.
torture, inhumane treatment and punishment. We say, in short, that there is no credible evidence that either Nathan Ring nor Stephen Webb, as individuals, negaged in such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against them is the use of foul language on limited occasions.  Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally Page 177  difficult environment for everyone involved — detainces, employed custody officers and other employees a alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with could be said to be a poor environment and there was under-resourced and understaffed.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was ecretically uncertainty as to how long the detainces would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were last closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mrk KELLY: Is that working?  THE CHAIR: That is bette, thank you.  Mrk KELLY: Is that working?  THE CHAIR: That is bette, thank you.  Mrk KELLY: Thanks.  Do you want me to repeat the last bit or have you got that?  THE CHAIR: If you could start again — you were going to start talking about the independent investigation by Kate Lampard, if you want to start there. I think we lost you then Thank you.  Mrk KELLY: The independent investigation by Kate Lampard, if you want to start there. I think we lost you then Thank you want to start there. I think we lost you then Thank you want to start there. I think we lost you then Thank you want to start there. I think we lost you then Thank you want to repeat the last bit or have you were going to start talking about the independent investigation by Kate Lampard, if you want to start there. I	18	litigation, thereby reinforcing the point.	18	THE CHAIR: Sorry, Mr Kelly, I think we have lost your
short, that there is no credible evidence that either  Nathan Ring nor Stephen Webb, as individuals, engaged in such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against them is the use of foul language on limited occasions.  Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally  Page 177    Mile CHAIR: That is better, thank you. MR KELLY: Thanks.    Do you want me to repeat the last bit or have you got that?    Page 179    THE CHAIR: If you could start again — you were going to start talking about the independent investigation by alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed.   Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainces would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.	19	In respect of article 3, it of course prohibits	19	microphone. Could you just give us a moment and we will
22 Nathan Ring nor Stephen Webb, as individuals, engaged in such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against them is the use of foul language on limited occasions. 24 them is the use of foul language on limited occasions. 25 Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally  Page 177  1 difficult environment for everyone involved	20	torture, inhumane treatment and punishment. We say, in	20	get that fixed. (Pause)
such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against them is the use of foul language on limited occasions.  Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally  Page 177    Doyou want me to repeat the last bit or have you got that?    Page 179    Page 179    THE CHAIR: If you could start again – you were going to start talking about the independent investigation by start talking about the independen	21	short, that there is no credible evidence that either	21	MR KELLY: Is that working?
them is the use of foul language on limited occasions. Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally  Page 177  Page 179  THE CHAIR: If you could start again you were going to detainces, employed custody officers and other employees a like. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainces would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were is used to be a poor eventilation, some exercise areas were is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detaince population.  23 The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainces were subject to indefinite detention. That had a serious impact on the detainces.  24 Do you want me to repeat the last bit or have you got that?  Page 179  THE CHAIR: If you could start again you were going to start talking about the independent investigation by attract least out the independent investigation by attract laking about the independent investigation by a fact Lampard, if you want to start talking about the independent investigation by attract laking about the independent investigation by attract laking about the independent investigation by a fact Lampard, if you want to start talking about the in	22	Nathan Ring nor Stephen Webb, as individuals, engaged in	22	THE CHAIR: That is better, thank you.
Page 177  difficult environment for everyone involved detainces, employed custody officers and other employees alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building with high suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed. Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainces would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S. Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like particular, it is a centre which looks and feels	23	such conduct. The thrust of the allegations against	23	MR KELLY: Thanks.
difficult environment for everyone involved  detainees, employed custody officers and other employees alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were slosed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S. Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  THE CHAIR: If you could start again you were going to start talking about the independent investigation by  Kate Lampard, if you want to start there. I think we lost you then. Thank you.  MR KELLY: The independent investigation into concerns about Brook House by Kate Lampard, and Ed Marsden in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled".  Brook House was under-resourced. Footage of Callum Tulley looking for a evacuation chair but there were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were supposed to be. In any event, Brook House didn't have enough evacuation chairs.  There was a group complaint submitted by detainees regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers unable to provide basics such as toilet roll, not enough showers for the number of detainees, poor internet, poor ph	24	them is the use of foul language on limited occasions.	24	Do you want me to repeat the last bit or have you
detainees, employed custody officers and other employees alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed. Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainces would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S. Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Mr Kell-Y: The independent investigation into concerns about Brook House by Kate Lampard, and Ed Marsden in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled". Brook House was under-resourced. Footage of Callum Tulley looking for a evacuation chair but there were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were supposed to be. In any event, Brook House didn't have enough evacuation chairs. There was a group complaint submitted by detainees regarding the lack of intermet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers unable to provide basics such as toilet roll, not enough sport for a detainee population.  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  Brook House was also understaffed. Brook House was also understaffed in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled". Brook House was also understaffed in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled". Brook House was also understaffed in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled". Brook House was also understaffed in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled". Brook House was also understaffed in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled". Brook House was also understaffed in 2018 described it as "overc	25	Brook House, it has to be said, was an exceptionally	25	got that?
detainees, employed custody officers and other employees alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed. Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S. Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Mr Kell Ly: The independent investigation into concerns about Brook House by Kate Lampard, and Ed Marsden in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled". Brook House was under-resourced. Footage of Callum Tulley looking for a evacuation chair but there were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were supposed to be. In any event, Brook House didn't have enough evacuation chairs. There was a group complaint submitted by detainees regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers unable to provide basics such as tolet roll, not enough showers for the number of detainees, poor intermet, poor phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality food.  Brook House was also understaffed. Brook House was also understaffed. Brook House by Kate Lampard, and Ed Marsden in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled". Brook House was also understaffed in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled". Brook House was also understaffed in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled". Brook House by Kate Lampard, and Ed Marsden in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled". Brook House by Kate Lampard, and Ed Marsden in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsett				75 4-0
detainces, employed custody officers and other employees alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majestry's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  Mr Singh from the Major ones is the fact that, The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detained population.  start talking about the independent investigation into concerns about MR KELLY: The in		Page 1//		Page 1/9
alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed. Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S. Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  Take Lampard, if you want to start there. I think we lost you then. Thank you.  MR KELLY: The independent investigation into concerns about MR	1	difficult environment for everyone involved	1	THE CHAIR: If you could start again you were going to
physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S. Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite described it as 'overcrowded and unsettled''.  MR KELLY: The independent investigation into concerns about Assorted and unsettled''.  Brook House bx kate Lampard, and Ed Marsden in 2018  Callum Tulley looking for a evacuation chair surver not any toer and unsetuled''.  There was poor ventilation. For a evacuation chair survers any event, Brook House day, or there any event, Brook House day, or there are any event described in a	2	detainees, employed custody officers and other employees	2	start talking about the independent investigation by
which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was under-resourced and understaffed.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite and the detainees will an another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detainees which looks and pack which looks and the detainees which looks and the detainees were subject to indefinite detained by the said sunderstaffed. Show many hours  MR KELLY: The independent investigation into concerns about described it as "overcrowded and unsettled".  Brook House ws (accident it as "overcrowded and unsettled".  Brook House ws under-resourced. Footage of Callum Tulley looking for a evacuation chair but there were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were supposed to be. In any event, Brook House didn't have enough evacuation chairs.  There was a group complaint submitted by detainees regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers unable to provide basics such as toilet roll, not enough showers for the number of detainees, poor internet, poor phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality food.  Brook House was also underst	3	alike. It was on virtually all accounts a building with	3	Kate Lampard, if you want to start there. I think we
under-resourced and understaffed.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we liberary there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  Brook House by Kate Lampard, and Ed Marsden in 2018 described it as "overcrowded and unsettled".  Brook House was under-resourced. Footage of Callum Tulley looking for a evacuation chair but there were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they have enough evacuation chairs.  There was a group complaint submitted by detainees regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There	4	physical inadequacies, with poor facilities, a building	4	lost you then. Thank you.
Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it could be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it described it as "overcrowded and unsettled".  Brook House was under-resourced. Footage of Callum Tulley looking for a evacuation chair but there were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were supposed to be. In any event, Brook House didn't have enough evacuation chairs.  There was a group complaint submitted by detainees regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers unable to provide basics such as toilet roll, not enough showers for the number of detainees, poor internet, poor phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality food.  Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring put it:  "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours	5	which suffered from overcrowding, and a place which was	5	MR KELLY: The independent investigation into concerns about
second be said to be a poor environment and there was certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we liberary to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like for a detainee population.  Brook House was under-resourced. Footage of Callum Tulley looking for a evacuation chair but there were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they had a prevent, Brook House didn't have enough evacuation chairs.  There was a group complaint submitted by detainees regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or had this to say:  15 decess to the welfare office. There was no clean had this to say:  16 access to the welfare off	6	under-resourced and understaffed.	6	Brook House by Kate Lampard, and Ed Marsden in 2018
certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite  Callum Tulley looking for a evacuation chair but there were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were not any to be had, nor were there any where they have enough evacuation chairs.  Callum Tulley looking for a evacuation chairs.  12 have enough evacuation chairs.  13 There was a group complaint submitted by detainees regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lock of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or saccess to the	7	Looking at just some of those things, briefly, it	7	described it as "overcrowded and unsettled".
be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we were not any to be had, nor were there any where they were subject to indefinite to any to be had, nor were there any where they were subject to indefinite to any to be had, nor were there any where they were subject to indefinite to any to be had, nor were there any where they were subject to indefinite to any to be had, nor were there any where they were subject to indefinite to any to be had, nor were there any where they were subject to indefinite to any to be had, nor were there any where they were subject to indefinite to any to be had, nor were there any where they were subject to indefinite to any to be had, nor were there any where they were subject to indefinite to any to be had, nor were there any where they were subject to indefinite to any to be had, nor were there any where they the subject to be had, nor were there any where they the subject to be had, nor were there any the subject to be. In nany event, Brook House enough evacuation chairs.  12 have enough evacuation chairs.  13 There was a group complaint submitted by detaines or the welfare enough evacuation chairs.  14 regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean the welfare office. There was no clean to the welfare office. There was no clean to the welfare office.  15 a transl	8	could be said to be a poor environment and there was	8	Brook House was under-resourced. Footage of
say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean, there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S. There was a group complaint submitted by detainees regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean There was no clean that this to say: The bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers wou know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison.  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  areas were the were supposed to be. In any event, Brook House didn't have enough evacuation chairs.  There was a group complaint submitted by detainees regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean that is interpreted access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean that is interpreted access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean that is interpreted access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean that is interpreted access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean that is interpreted access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. The equipment or access to the welfare office. There was a group complaints was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to	9	certainly uncertainty as to how long the detainees would	9	Callum Tulley looking for a evacuation chair but there
there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were  closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that  is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons  had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  There was a group complaint submitted by detainees  12 have enough evacuation chairs.  13 There was a group complaint submitted by detainees  14 regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack  15 of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or  16 access to the welfare office. There was no clean  17 bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers  18 unable to provide basics such as toilet roll, not enough  19 showers for the number of detainees, poor internet, poor  20 phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality  21 food.  22 Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring  23 The length of detention was uncertain or, put  24 another way, detainees were subject to indefinite  24 "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very  25 detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  26 prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours	10	be kept prisoner in Brook House and that contributed, we	10	were not any to be had, nor were there any where they
closed, the exercise space was far too limited, and that is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detainees a group complaint submitted by detainees regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers unable to provide basics such as toilet roll, not enough showers for the number of detainees, poor internet, poor phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality food.  Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring put it:  another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  The Home Office contract was, I believe, very prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours	11	say, to its problems. The cells were not kept clean,	11	were supposed to be. In any event, Brook House didn't
is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite  disjust according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  14 regarding the lack of internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean 17 bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers 18 unable to provide basics such as toilet roll, not enough 19 showers for the number of detainees, poor internet, poor 20 phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality 21 food. 22 Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring 23 put it: 24 another way, detainees were subject to indefinite 25 detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees 26 prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours	12	there was poor ventilation, some exercise areas were	12	have enough evacuation chairs.
is just according to Jeremy Petherick of G4S.  Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite  detailed by internet access. There was a lack of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or access to the welfare office. There was no clean bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers unable to provide basics such as toilet roll, not enough showers for the number of detainees, poor internet, poor phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality food.  Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring put it:  "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours	13	•	13	There was a group complaint submitted by detainees
15 Mr Singh from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons 16 had this to say: 17 "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, 18 you know, this is in relation to Brook House in 19 particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like 20 a prison and is designed like a prison." 21 As we have said many times, that is inappropriate 22 for a detainee population. 23 The length of detention was uncertain or, put 24 another way, detainees were subject to indefinite 25 detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees 26 for a detainee population in the detainees 27 of translators, long queues to use IT equipment or 28 access to the welfare office. There was no clean 29 leading often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers 20 unable to provide basics such as toilet roll, not enough 21 showers for the number of detainees, poor internet, poor 22 phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality 23 food. 24 Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring 25 put it: 26 "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very 26 prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours		•	14	
had this to say:  "But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  16 access to the welfare office. There was no clean bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers unable to provide basics such as toilet roll, not enough showers for the number of detainees, poor internet, poor phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality food.  22 Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring put it:  "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours	15		15	
"But I think one of the major ones is the fact that, you know, this is in relation to Brook House in particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality food.  Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring put it:  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours	16	5 7 1	16	
you know, this is in relation to Brook House in  particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like  a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate  for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put  another way, detainees were subject to indefinite  detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  18 unable to provide basics such as toilet roll, not enough  19 showers for the number of detainees, poor internet, poor  20 phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality  21 food.  22 Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring  23 put it:  24 "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very  25 detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  26 prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours		•		bedding often, no cleaning equipment provided, officers
particular, it is a centre which looks and feels like  a prison and is designed like a prison."  As we have said many times, that is inappropriate  for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put  another way, detainees were subject to indefinite  detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality  food.  Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring  put it:  "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very  prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours	18	•	18	
20 phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality 21 As we have said many times, that is inappropriate 22 food. 23 The length of detention was uncertain or, put 24 another way, detainees were subject to indefinite 25 detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees 26 phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality 27 food. 28 Prook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring 29 put it: 20 phone signal, malfunctioning phones and poor quality 21 food. 22 Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring 23 put it: 24 "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very 25 prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours		•	19	
As we have said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee population.  The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  21 food. 22 Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring put it: 24 "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very 25 detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees 26 prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours	20	•	20	
for a detainee population.  22 Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring 23 The length of detention was uncertain or, put 24 another way, detainees were subject to indefinite 25 detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees 26 Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring 27 put it: 28 "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very 29 prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours			21	
The length of detention was uncertain or, put another way, detainees were subject to indefinite another way, detainees were subject to indefinite detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees  23 put it: 24 "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very 25 prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours		•	22	Brook House was also understaffed. As Nathan Ring
24 another way, detainees were subject to indefinite 24 "The Home Office contract was, I believe, very 25 detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees 25 prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours		* *		-
detention. That had a serious impact on the detainees 25 prescriptive, particularly in terms of how many hours			24	
		•		
		D 450		P 400
Page 1/8 Page 180		Page 178		Page 180

1	G4S were prepared for. Staff on the ground, however,	1	lay in the indefinite nature of the detention. That was
2	generally felt that Brook House was understaffed. On	2	the root of all the problems the fact that it was
3	a good day, we were lucky to have 50 officers in the	3	designed and supposedly intended to house people for
4	whole centre. On evenings, you might be lucky to have	4	short term, pending their removal from the
5	six DCOs and two DCMs. It left staff on the ground of	5	United Kingdom and I personally, and I think many
6	the centre often feeling vulnerable, overworked and	6	others in this room are still in the same position,
7	uneasy."	7	whether it was 28 days, 72 days or 72 hours and, if so,
8	However, there was a high turnover of staff and,	8	when that changed, are none the wiser after the evidence
9	because a lot of the candidates were inexperienced, some	9	heard but, whatever it was, through Home Office failings
10	candidates never came back following the training course	10	and inefficiency the detention of its residents
11	or decided that, after a month of working in the role,	11	stretched to many months in some cases.
12	it was not what they expected. It was the residential	12	The Home Office in the form of Mr Phil Riley
13	side which suffered the most with retaining staff.	13	characterised the notion of detention for no more than
14	The counsel to the inquiry, Mr Altman, on the first	14	72 hours in Brook House as an "urban myth". That
15	day seemed to recognise this when, in opening, he said:	15	uncertainty as to how long an individual might be
16	"You may want to consider whether the range of	16	deprived of his liberty led inevitably to frustration on
17	staffing problems described contributed to	17	the part of those detained. This was recognised by
18	dissatisfaction amongst detained persons and a growing	18	Jeremy Petherick on Day 34, when he said:
19	feeling of hopelessness and frustration among them,	19	"The real issue that impacted on detainees'
20	which, in turn, had an impact on the levels of	20	wellbeing and mental health was their sense of not
21	self-harm, substance misuse and violence at	21	knowing what was happening with them and the
22	Brook House."	22	frustrations of their progress towards their release
23	The more challenging or non-compliant detained	23	either into the United Kingdom or their repatriation,
24	persons became in consequence of their environment, the	24	and so the major impact on their wellbeing was the
25	more some staff resented them for the additional work	25	uncertainty of the situation they found themselves in."
	D 101		D102
	Page 181		Page 183
1	and stress this added to their lives. Understaff and	1	The problem, in our submission, is the system. It
2	overwork were also reported to affect staff morale in	2	would be an error to scapegoat the former employees and
3	a direct sense.	3	put events down to a few bad apples. Such an approach
4	Much has been said about the use of foul language.	4	would do nothing to address the issues which have given
5	However, we cannot treat Brook House as a normal	5	rise to the need for this inquiry, and would not address
6	workplace like an office. Swearing was, on the	6	what has been dealt with by a variety of different
7	evidence, a common method of communication and was not	7	witnesses. In short, such an approach would be no more
8	intended to be offensive. In many cases it appears that	8	than a cop out with little credibility.
9	such swearing was speaking to detainees in the common	9	The two men we represent, Nathan Ring and
10	language in use by staff, including in fact	10	Stephen Webb, if guilty of anything, are guilty of
11	Callum Tulley and detainees on occasions. As Mr Ring in	11	little more than a few facetious comments, silly
12	his evidence said, such language often was a coping	12	comments, which were made in what they thought were
13	mechanism for many in Brook House.	13	private conversations. In short, the staff must not be
14	Now, when it comes to the inquiry considering the	14	portrayed trade as the scapegoats; nor are they
15	role of Callum Tulley, you should bear in mind the	15	self-evidently responsible for immigration or
16	evidence of officers such as Yan Paschali, who described	16	deportation policy. They merely worked in
17	Callum Tulley as always fishing for stories. He told	17	a dysfunctional system.
18	you how he, Mr Paschali, responded by making up stories	18	It is, we submit, on the evidence clear that many of
19	and how he embellished the stories. You should also	19	the problems with Brook House were and are due to
20	bear in mind Callum Tulley's own evidence that he only	20	indefinite detention as a policy, combined with housing
21	turned his camera on when he thought he would capture	21	detainees in what in effect was a prison, with extremely
22	interesting material. That footage should not be	22	limited facilities, understaffed, under-resourced, badly
23	treated as intrinsically representative of everyone at	23	managed, and the responsibility for that should be laid
24	Brook House.	24	where it belongs: at the door of the Home Office and its
25	The true ill-treatment and cruelty at Brook House	25	contractors, here G4S.
	Page 182		Page 184

1	Thank you, chair. I am glad to say that I have	1	now?" He said that, at the time, he used those words
2	finished well within time.	2	believing he was bringing D1527 out of a state of
3	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Kelly.	3	anxiety, "to bring him back to reality", in his words.
4	Mr Jacobs.	4	He confirmed in his evidence, when asked by
5	Closing statement by MR JACOBS	5	Mr Altman, that he now understands that he was unable
6	MR JACOBS: Chair, I represent Charlie Francis and I am	6	then to distinguish between a detainee who was capable
7	instructed by Howe & Co. Charlie Francis was a DCO at	7	of rational actions and a suicidal man who was suffering
8	Brook House from 2012 and during the relevant period,	8	from mental illness. Mr Francis received no training in
9	and he appears in the Panorama programme. I don't	9	mental health or PTSD awareness. In the absence of such
10	propose to deal with the evidence at length today, and	10	training, he believed at the time that he was able to
11	will do that in more detail in the written submissions.	11	distinguish between those who he believed were genuine
12	Mr Francis gave evidence on Day 23, 3 March 2022.	12	people who wished to harm themselves and those who he
13	He became a core participant on the previous day, so you	13	thought at the time were attention seeking. Mr Francis'
14	don't have opening submissions in respect of him.	14	position, looking back and reflecting, is that, had he
15	Mr Francis would like the inquiry to know that he is	15	been appropriately trained by G4S, he would have acted
16	watching today on the live link he cannot be here	16	entirely differently towards D1527.
17	this afternoon.	17	The same lack of awareness in relation to mental
18	It is important that I say from the outset that	18	health issues apply to my clients exchanges with D728 on
19	Mr Francis does not seek to excuse his behaviour towards	19	6 July 2017. The video footage shows my client arguing
20	D1527 and D728, as shown on the Panorama programme. He	20	with this detainee who had been trying to frustrate
21	accepted in his evidence that he was shocked when he saw	21	officers by covering the observation hatch with tissue
22	that programme and couldn't believe, he said, that he	22	paper and had been complaining about lack of access to
23	was seeing himself.	23	medication. Mr Francis was heard to say to the
24	Generally speaking, my client was a capable and	24	detainee, "If I have to come back again, you won't be
25	competent DCO. He had no antipathy towards those	25	going anywhere today. You will be staying down here
	D 405		D 407
	Page 185		Page 187
1	detained at Brook House and told the inquiry that he	1	permanently, do you understand?" And after they were
2	treated detainees as human beings. He also told the	2	out of the detainee's earshot, Mr Webb used derogatory
3	inquiry in his evidence that he intervened on two	3	language saying he would like to punch the detainee. He
4	occasions to save detainees who had tried to kill	4	made it clear in his evidence that the detainee couldn't
5	themselves, and the detail of that is detailed in his	5	have heard that, and Mr Francis replied "If you don't,
6	witness statement.	6	I will".
7	DCM Webb referred to Mr Francis when he gave	7	Mr Francis accepts there is no excuse for his
8	evidence on Day 26, and he said:	8	behaviour but, again, he was not able to understand that
9	"Charlie was a good officer, he was a very good	9	D728 was a man who had significant mental health
10	. CC		
	officer who I relied on a lot and I am sorry that he got	10	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he
11	tied up in what I said."	10 11	
11 12			problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he
	tied up in what I said."	11	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with
12	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right,	11 12	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic
12 13	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right,  Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing	11 12 13	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.
12 13 14	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right,  Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing who were macho and cliquey, he said:	11 12 13 14	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.  Neither was my client trained or equipped to deal
12 13 14 15	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right,  Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing who were macho and cliquey, he said:  "Yes, most of the guys apart from one, Charlie,	11 12 13 14 15	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.  Neither was my client trained or equipped to deal with the negative macho-aggressive culture that had been
12 13 14 15 16	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right,  Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing who were macho and cliquey, he said:  "Yes, most of the guys apart from one, Charlie, I knew very well. He was always very good with	11 12 13 14 15 16	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.  Neither was my client trained or equipped to deal with the negative macho-aggressive culture that had been allowed to develop and fester at Brook House.
12 13 14 15 16 17	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right, Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing who were macho and cliquey, he said:  "Yes, most of the guys apart from one, Charlie, I knew very well. He was always very good with detainees."	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.  Neither was my client trained or equipped to deal with the negative macho-aggressive culture that had been allowed to develop and fester at Brook House.  Sarah Newland in her Verita interview referred to a large cadre of DCMs who are testosterone-filled and Mr Francis stated in his evidence that there were two
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right,  Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing who were macho and cliquey, he said:  "Yes, most of the guys apart from one, Charlie, I knew very well. He was always very good with detainees."  Mr Francis is shown on the Panorama programme making	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.  Neither was my client trained or equipped to deal with the negative macho-aggressive culture that had been allowed to develop and fester at Brook House.  Sarah Newland in her Verita interview referred to a large cadre of DCMs who are testosterone-filled and Mr
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right, Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing who were macho and cliquey, he said:  "Yes, most of the guys apart from one, Charlie, I knew very well. He was always very good with detainees."  Mr Francis is shown on the Panorama programme making inappropriate remarks towards D1527 on 25 April 2017 and	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.  Neither was my client trained or equipped to deal with the negative macho-aggressive culture that had been allowed to develop and fester at Brook House.  Sarah Newland in her Verita interview referred to a large cadre of DCMs who are testosterone-filled and Mr Francis stated in his evidence that there were two
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right, Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing who were macho and cliquey, he said:  "Yes, most of the guys apart from one, Charlie, I knew very well. He was always very good with detainees."  Mr Francis is shown on the Panorama programme making inappropriate remarks towards D1527 on 25 April 2017 and using inappropriate language towards that detainee in	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.  Neither was my client trained or equipped to deal with the negative macho-aggressive culture that had been allowed to develop and fester at Brook House.  Sarah Newland in her Verita interview referred to a large cadre of DCMs who are testosterone-filled and Mr Francis stated in his evidence that there were two categories of staff members at Brook House, some in his
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right, Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing who were macho and cliquey, he said:  "Yes, most of the guys apart from one, Charlie, I knew very well. He was always very good with detainees."  Mr Francis is shown on the Panorama programme making inappropriate remarks towards D1527 on 25 April 2017 and using inappropriate language towards that detainee in the aftermath of the Paschali choking incident,	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.  Neither was my client trained or equipped to deal with the negative macho-aggressive culture that had been allowed to develop and fester at Brook House.  Sarah Newland in her Verita interview referred to a large cadre of DCMs who are testosterone-filled and Mr Francis stated in his evidence that there were two categories of staff members at Brook House, some in his words were "very hard-nosed uncaring types without
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right, Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing who were macho and cliquey, he said:  "Yes, most of the guys apart from one, Charlie, I knew very well. He was always very good with detainees."  Mr Francis is shown on the Panorama programme making inappropriate remarks towards D1527 on 25 April 2017 and using inappropriate language towards that detainee in the aftermath of the Paschali choking incident, an incident which my client has described in his	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.  Neither was my client trained or equipped to deal with the negative macho-aggressive culture that had been allowed to develop and fester at Brook House.  Sarah Newland in her Verita interview referred to a large cadre of DCMs who are testosterone-filled and Mr Francis stated in his evidence that there were two categories of staff members at Brook House, some in his words were "very hard-nosed uncaring types without compassion or softness", and he confirmed that that
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right, Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing who were macho and cliquey, he said:  "Yes, most of the guys apart from one, Charlie, I knew very well. He was always very good with detainees."  Mr Francis is shown on the Panorama programme making inappropriate remarks towards D1527 on 25 April 2017 and using inappropriate language towards that detainee in the aftermath of the Paschali choking incident, an incident which my client has described in his evidence as "horrific". My client accepts that he used	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.  Neither was my client trained or equipped to deal with the negative macho-aggressive culture that had been allowed to develop and fester at Brook House.  Sarah Newland in her Verita interview referred to a large cadre of DCMs who are testosterone-filled and Mr Francis stated in his evidence that there were two categories of staff members at Brook House, some in his words were "very hard-nosed uncaring types without compassion or softness", and he confirmed that that certainly included Yan Paschali, who in his view
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	tied up in what I said."  The core participant Syred, who is to my right, Owen Syred said, when asked about the officers on E wing who were macho and cliquey, he said:  "Yes, most of the guys apart from one, Charlie, I knew very well. He was always very good with detainees."  Mr Francis is shown on the Panorama programme making inappropriate remarks towards D1527 on 25 April 2017 and using inappropriate language towards that detainee in the aftermath of the Paschali choking incident, an incident which my client has described in his evidence as "horrific". My client accepts that he used the words, "Are you going to continue being a tool? Are	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	problems. Mr Francis' primary problem here is that he was not properly trained to deal with detainees with mental health and PTSD issues and that is a systemic failing at Brook House.  Neither was my client trained or equipped to deal with the negative macho-aggressive culture that had been allowed to develop and fester at Brook House.  Sarah Newland in her Verita interview referred to a large cadre of DCMs who are testosterone-filled and Mr Francis stated in his evidence that there were two categories of staff members at Brook House, some in his words were "very hard-nosed uncaring types without compassion or softness", and he confirmed that that certainly included Yan Paschali, who in his view shouldn't have been working on E wing. The second

		1	
1	were more human, more sympathetic and more placid men.	1	with G4S, my client received no mental health training.
2	In Mr Francis' case, the former group prevailed over	2	Indeed my client may have believed he was actually doing
3	the latter. Mr Francis agreed in his evidence that he	3	some good by speaking harshly to detainees. He talks in
4	was one of those who was easily led by more dominant	4	his statement about trying to snap someone out of
5	staff members. He was led into behaviour by other	5	an emotional or vulnerable state.
6	officers but did not instigate that behaviour. The	6	Dr Hard told the inquiry on Day 39 that staff didn't
7	Reverend Ward has made the same point in his evidence to	7	understand D1275's mental health problems and he
8	the inquiry. He described my client as someone who did	8	confirmed they were not concerned about his welfare as
9	not have bad intent but an example of someone who was	9	such, rather they were frustrated by the presentation of
10	caught up in the culture of Brook House. He goes on to	10	symptoms. The nurse in the room behaved no differently.
11	say that, in both incidents in which Mr Francis is	11	The inquiry witness Bosworth, Professor Bosworth,
12	featured in the Panorama programme, he took	12	dealt with this issue on Day 40. She said that the
13	inappropriate action and used inappropriate and	13	training given to DCOs was pretty minimal and focused on
14	offensive language when in the company of more dominant	14	security. It did not enable staff to see the residents
15	staff members.	15	as highly vulnerable, but rather dangerous and
16	But, chair, this is as far as it goes. It is	16	difficult. She recommended that mental health training
17	important to note that Mr Francis, when giving evidence,	17	have a focus on secondary trauma training for DCOs, as
18	clearly and categorically rejected any suggestion that	18	that would enable them to conduct their duties with
19	he tried to cover up Paschali's conduct or that his	19	empathy and recognise that the dehumanisation,
20	reluctance to give a police statement over and beyond	20	aggression and losing control of emotions that we have
21	the information that he had given in detail to G4S	21	seen in the evidence can be symptoms of secondary trauma
22	represented any attempt to protect Paschali from	22	in the detention centre staff themselves.
23	prosecution.	23	There appears to have been no mental health element
24	We respectfully say there is no proper basis for the	24	in C&R training. Jon Collier told the inquiry that the
25	inquiry to make any finding along the lines that my	25	test criteria used to medically evaluate the
		-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Page 189		Page 191
1	client was involved in any cover up, aside to what is	1	appropriateness and safety of C&R techniques employed in
2	said about the inquiry not being able to make findings	2	an IRC does not include consideration of mental illness
3	in relation to liability, but that is an important point	3	or vulnerabilities such as history of torture and
4	for my client.	4	trauma.
5	We agree, and we say that there is broad agreement	5	Chair, this is a matter of some concern. Mentally
6	amongst the core participants' representatives, that the	6	ill detainees subjected to these procedures in the
7	evidence has shown that the problem at Brook House was	7	relevant period are likely to have found the experience
8	not one of bad apples or, as Mr Brockington for G4S	8	terrifying and to have been retraumatised by it, but
9	suggested, "isolated incidents". The problems at	9	none of this was in the thinking of G4S or the
10	Brook House in the relevant period arose from systemic	10	Home Office. So we say that the inquiry should
11	failings, as Dr Patterson has said "a corrupted	11	recommend that all IRC staff receive mandatory mental
12	culture", and ultimately it was the responsibility of	12	health awareness training, including PTSD training from
13	G4S and the Home Office to secure the welfare of	13	a recognised and independent source, such as HMIP.
14	detainees at the facility and the systems in place at	14	Chair, the second issue is that Brook House involved
15	Brook House failed to do this.	15	a unique situation for which the training given to DCOs
16	Chair, like Mr Stanton before me, I will address you	16	was inadequate and Mr Francis' evidence highlighted the
17	on six issues, six areas. The first area, which I have	17	fact that it was no ordinary detention facility. He
18	already touched on, is lack of mental health training.	18	stated in his evidence that there were DCOs who left
19	Mr Francis stated in his witness statement that, when he	19	Brook House shortly after completing their training
20	attended DCO refresher courses, he would say that	20	because they realised they had not been properly trained
21	officers needed to receive psychological training to	21	to deal with the condition there and a particular
22	understand and respond to what detainees were	22	problem, as Mr Kelly touched on before I spoke, and as
23	experiencing. He states that he was not alone in	23	Mr Lee submitted in his submissions in relation to D643,
-	1 6	1 23	
24	thinking this and he recalls others on his shift saving	2.4	who was at Brook House for 558 days is that some
24 25	thinking this and he recalls others on his shift saying the same thing but, despite having raised this issue	24 25	who was at Brook House for 558 days, is that some individuals believed they would be staying at
	thinking this and he recalls others on his shift saying the same thing but, despite having raised this issue	24 25	who was at Brook House for 558 days, is that some individuals believed they would be staying at
			-

1	Brook House for two weeks or two months but ended up	1	My client stated in his evidence that the E wing
2	staying there for two years. In reality, Brook House	2	segregation that is the wing on which he worked
3	must have seemed like a place of internment for many who	3	was used to manage distressed behaviour, including
4	were there. Unsurprisingly, this created levels of	4	self-harm and suicidal ideation, certainly not for the
5	exasperation and desperation and many detainees would	5	purpose of providing treatment. Dr Hard stated that
6	eventually lash out and resort to self-harm.	6	E wing detainees were primarily being managed by
7	Professor Bosworth said in her evidence on Day 40	7	detention staff with very little clinical input.
8	that this issue affects staff because it makes their	8	Sandra Calver gave evidence that some people did indeed
9	role unclear. She said:	9	deteriorate as a result of being on that wing.
10	"If you don't know how long someone is there for, it	10	So much of the detention in the relevant period in
11	is hard to motivate yourself to invest in them as	11	2017 was unlawful detention. People were being kept in
12	a person."	12	conditions where they hadn't been properly assessed
13	She said this factor affected staff culture and led	13	when, if they had been assessed, they would have been
14	to desensitisation as a mechanism for dealing with	14	released under the DCO and under the Adults at Risk
15	people who staff members were unable to help.	15	policy.
16	Another problem which Mr Francis highlighted in his	16	I should say a little something about that policy.
17	evidence was the mixing of often dangerous and violent	17	There is a problematic element to it because it involves
18	criminal deportees in cells with vulnerable asylum	18	as balancing exercise between risk factors and so-called
19	seekers or overstayers, and we saw this on the Panorama	19	immigration factors which has been criticised, but there
20	programme. My client said this led to intimidation and	20	is an underlying presumption that detention will not be
21	bullying of the non-criminal detainees. There were also	21	appropriate if a person is considered to be at risk
22	high-levels of the drug spice that came through the	22	through having experienced traumatic events, or where
23	doors largely unchecked, and my client confirmed in his	23	there is a medical or professional or observational core
24	evidence that he received no training on substance abuse	24	of evidence that an individual is suffering in the way
25	and would dread the prospect of violence, which was	25	that they have a condition such as a mental health
	Page 193		Page 195
1	potentially likely when the effects of the drug wore	1	condition that would be likely to render them
2	off.	2	particularly vulnerable to harm if they are placed in
3	It is quite clear, chair, that Mr Francis' evidence	3	detention or remain in detention. Yet that system
4	is that Brook House was dysfunctional with unique	4	didn't work because it was let down by a culture of
5	systemic problems for which no proper training of staff	5	disbelief by healthcare at Brook House.
6	was given to Mr Francis and other DCOs.	6	So Mr Francis' position is not only was he
7	The third issue is that detainees, many of those at	7	inadequately trained to deal with detainees who were
8	Brook House, were simply not suitable to be deputy in	8	lawfully present at Brook House, but he was required
9	detention in the first place. That affected my client's	9	through systemic failures to deal, whilst untrained,
10	working conditions and that is an issue that has been	10	with numerous detainees who suffered from mental health
11	exposed by the Panorama programme. No amount of	11	conditions which, under the Secretary of State's own
12	training could have equipped my client to deal with	12	policies, rendered them unsuitable for administrative
13	those detainees whose experiences of past torture or	13	detention.
14	whose mental health conditions were such that they were	14	Chair, the fourth issue is that Brook House was
15	incapable of being managed in detention.	15	understaffed at the time and run for profit by G4S.
16	Dr Hard said on Day 39 that rules 34 and 35 were not	16	This was a contributing factor to the situation in
17	properly operated in the relevant period. We have heard	17	Brook House which affected my client and which is shown
18	that, in early operating and nursing screening on	18	in the Panorama documentary the financial motivation
19	arrival, healthcare failed to take account of the	19	of the institution that which was charged with running
20	specific needs of the detainees. So DCOs like my client	20	the facility. We saw evidence yesterday that the tender
21	were charged with looking after individuals who had	21	delivered 35 cost savings compared to the original
22	already been failed by healthcare. Dr Hard agreed with	22	budget.
23	the view taken by Medical Justice that the arrangements	23	In my submission, my client was required to work in
24	at Brook House made it impossible to comply with	24	an inhuman environment where removal and security were
25	rules 34 and rule 35.	25	prioritised over health and safety, and nothing
	Tuics 34 and fuic 33.	23	prioritised over health and safety, and houning
23	Page 194	23	Page 196

		1	
1	underscores this is point better, the perversity of the	1	defaced with words such as "Snitch" and "Grass".
2	situation at Brook House, than the penalty points in	2	Effectively my client was powerless to report the
3	schedule G of the G4S-Home Office contract, which fixes	3	abuses that he had seen and experienced and I would draw
4	a fine of £35,000 if a detainee escapes but only £10,000	4	your attention to what Mr Stanton has said about his
5	if a detainee dies. That is the underlying perversity	5	client and the issue in relation to the racist comments
6	of the system as it operated at Brook House.	6	that Mr Syred attempted to report and how he was treated
7	Sarah Newland of G4S gave evidence on Day 34 and	7	in the aftermath of that. Callum Tulley told the
8	said that G4S ran Brook House as understaffed during the	8	inquiry that he had no option other than to go to the
9	relevant period in order to attain profit and that this	9	BBC because officers would have closed ranks and it
10	was evidence of G4S prioritising profit over detainee	10	would have been their word against his.
11	welfare. It is inescapable that my client was required	11	There was also a further systemic problem in
12	to work in difficult conditions due to understaffing.	12	relation to reporting conduct and you have heard the
13	He says in his evidence:	13	evidence of Stacie Dean, who made a complaint in 2015.
14	"Most of the time there were not enough officers.	14	She says that the senior management team at Brook House
15	Usually there would be two officers in the place of my	15	was consistently uninterested and some SMT members found
16	work and one officer would have to go down to conduct	16	the situation amusing. So Mr Francis was dragged into
17	searches or monitor or appear at a case review. Very	17	a culture which had an absence of effective complaint
18	often I was the only officer and that would increase the	18	procedures and DCOs were in effect powerless to change
19	pressure that I was under."	19	the system.
20	Mr Francis has also stated in his statement that the	20	Chair, the sixth point is that the Home Office
21	work was constantly juggling plates, with detained	21	created a hostile environment. The ethos of the
22	people having problems and officers having to respond to	22	Home Office is a significant issue in this inquiry.
23	a crisis with each detained person:	23	Ben Saunders gave evidence on Day 35 and confirmed that
24	"I would go home after a 12-hour shift and we would	24	the Home Office created a hostile environment and that
25	come back later, six hours after that, and do the same	25	was linked to discouraging people from coming to the UK
23	come back fater, six flours after that, and do the same	23	was mixed to discouraging people from coming to the OK
	Page 197		Page 199
1	thing again, which really took it out of all of us.	1	in the first place. He said in his Verita interview
2	I remember a new staff coming on to where I was working	2	that the Home Office line was that detainees at
3	and saying how many can you possibly do this day in, and	3	Brook House had had opportunities to leave the UK and,
4	day out."	4	if they found themselves in an IRC, well they had
5	Mr Francis described his work as mentally draining	5	brought this upon themselves. He went on to confirm
6	and he referred to 12-hour shifts with a one-hour break.	6	that, although some individuals in the Home Office may
7	Officers on the wing where he worked would have to be	7	have cared, as a corporate entity the Home Office was
8	there from 7.45 until after 5.00 in the afternoon,	8	more interested in getting people out of the country.
9	,	9	
	occasionally, without staff cover to enable them to take		It is this approach which has ultimately led to the dehumanisation of the detainees that we have seen on the
10	a break.	10	
11	Chair, in answer to questions from yourself, my	11	Panorama programme.
12	client when he gave evidence said it would have been	12	Dr Patterson has stated that there is a higher risk
13	helpful for him to have had other staff present to have	13	of dehumanisation when the victim is a member of
14	taken him away from a situation where he was feeling	14	a marginal group, which would be foreign nationals
15	frustrated or tired. However, G4S didn't provide that	15	facing removal. Dr Patterson referred to the narrative
16	staff support to assist when officers were struggling to	16	which has gained prominence since 2012 as a result of UK
17	cope. That is because, chair, they had no motivation to	17	government policy, which has sought to create a hostile
18	do so.	18	environment, the aim being to create a life so
19	The fifth issue is whistleblowing. My client told	19	unpleasant for an undocumented migrant that they would
20	the inquiry that he was horrified, shocked and mortified	20	voluntarily choose to leave as their access to public
21	at Yan Paschali's actions on 25 April 2017. However, he	21	services becomes increasingly restricted.
22	told Mr Altman that his life would not have been easy	22	On Day 40, the professor agreed that this
23	had he tried to speak of his concerns. Callum Tulley	23	dehumanisation contributes to the risk of abuse. She
24	told the inquiry that there was a Speak Out poster on	24	said:
25	the wall outside some lavatories; however, it had been	25	"The only moral narrative about IRCs from the
	Page 198		Page 200
	1 456 1 50		

î			
1	Home Office's point of view is either one in relation to	1	recommendations are made: one, that the Home Office
2	security, dangerous criminals or a moral narrative; they	2	exercises a greater degree of oversight of IRCs to
3	don't deserve to be here (interference)."	3	ensure that contractors operate in a transparent fashion
4	This narrative, the Home Office's narrative, led to	4	so that we don't see a repeat of those incidents on the
5	desensitisation or dehumanisation of staff members.	5	Panorama programme; that contracts with IRC operators
6	Karen Churcher said it was the Home Office's view that	6	are varied or drafted to contain provisions requiring
7	detainees with mental health difficulties were better	7	prioritisation of the welfare of detainees; that those
8	off in detention, rather than being released from	8	contracts are varied or drafted to contain provisions
9	detention. Lee Hanford says that the Home Office	9	requiring mandatory staffing levels; that all IRC staff
10	criticised G4S staff for showing too much empathy.	10	receive mandatory mental health awareness and PTSD
11	On Day 40, what Professor Bosworth said is that the	11	training from a recognised and independent source, such
12	Home Office must have known what was going on but her	12	as HMIP; that all IRC staff are provided with
13	understanding is that they did not concern themselves	13	counselling and other facilities to manage secondary
14	with detention. Dr Hard has agreed that people	14	trauma and stress levels; that those who are unsuitable
15	suffering from PTSD may go on to suffer from secondary	15	for detention, as Dr Hard recommends, are screened out
16	psychosis in detention, owing to the stresses of being	16	at an early stage in which the Home Office engages with
17	there and traumatisation.	17	independent medical advisers to assess individuals prior
18	Chair, Mr Francis was required to work within	18	to admission to an IRC; that segregation is no longer
19	a toxic culture at Brook House, but the entire system	19	used as a means of managing those with mental health
20	was dysfunctional. The Home Office were aware of and	20	problems; that effective complaints whistleblowing
21	caused this disfunctionality. Essentially, the	21	procedures are implemented in all IRCs with a specific
22	Home Office's view was that they found Brook House too	22	focus on dealing with the abuse of detainees; that
23	cumbersome to bring about any meaningful change and, as	23	policies are brought into effect to bring about the
24	Mr Altman put to the witness, the corporate witness	24	change to the culture within the Home Office in relation
25	yesterday, they simply sat on the problem; and I endorse	25	to immigration detainees; and, finally, that the
	Page 201		Page 203
1	what Ms Morris said this morning, that at best all the	1	practice of apparently indeterminate detention is
2	Home Office are doing is tweaking around the edges.	2	brought to an end, with detainees being informed of
3	So in relation to the findings that we ask you to	3	a fixed date when their detention will end, in the event
4	make, I endorse what Mr Armstrong has said, that you	4	that they cannot be returned to their countries of
5	must make bold and robust findings, because we don't	5	origin.
6	want another inquiry to sit here in five years' time	6 7	I agree with Mr Armstrong that this does fall within
7	dealing with the same points.	8	the terms of reference of this inquiry.  Chair, I am aware of the time. I think I have ended
8	Ultimately, while my client behaved unacceptably	9	at the right time. Unless I can assist further, those
9	towards detainees, he was at the centre of a perfect	10	are my submissions.
10	storm where DCOs were not trained to deal with mentally	11	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Jacobs.
11	ill detainees at a facility in which men were often	12	I am grateful for all of the submissions I have
12	detained for apparently indefinite periods, in which	13 14	heard today and we will be returning tomorrow at 10.00
13	detention of those with mental health problems was very	15	am for the remaining submissions.  Thank you very much.
14	often unlawful, in which vulnerable asylum seekers and	16	(4.33 pm)
15	visa overstayers were required to share rooms with	17	(The inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am the following day)
16	dangerous criminals, in which there was a drugs and	18	
17	violence problem, and in which segregation was used as	19	INDEX
18	a means of managing vulnerable detainees. Furthermore,	20 21	INDEX
19	the facility was run by an organisation that prioritised	21	Closing statement by MR ALTMAN1
20	profit over safe staffing and the welfare of detainees.	22	g samement of MICLESTINESC MICHIGAN
21	On top of all of this, Brook House was overseen by		Closing statement by MS HARRISON13
22	a government department that had sought to stigmatise	23	
23	and marginalise immigration overstayers, failed asylum	] _,	Closing statement by MS MORRIS49
24	seekers and criminal deportees.	24	Closing statement by MR GOODMAN54
25	So we ask on Mr Francis' behalf that following	25	Closing statement by IVIK GOODIVIAN34
	•	-5	
<u></u>	Page 202		Page 204
_		_	

Closing statement by MS LUH95	
Closing statement by MR ARMSTRONG108	
Closing statement by MR STANTON154	
Closing statement by MR KELLY177	
Closing statement by MR JACOBS185	
Page 205	

			_	1 agc 200
<b>A</b>	149:22 161:5,23	64:13	acts 4:5,16 15:22	76:14
	163:24 169:13	accurate 173:1	55:21 56:23 57:4	admission 60:23
abandoned 122:22	193:24 200:23	accurately 133:19	57:12,20 58:4	203:18
abandoning 110:3	203:22	163:14	59:12,19,21 60:3	admitted 63:11
abandonment	abused 96:9	accusing 19:18	60:4,25 64:4	adopt 4:4,11,20
35:16 <b>able</b> 15:20 17:20	abuser 141:13	ACDT 36:10 38:18	67:9	6:6
	abuses 51:5 199:3	45:24 97:16,22	actual 33:19 37:20	adopted 3:22 5:3
40:19,21 52:17	abusive 23:14	102:25 103:4	45:19 106:1	5:11 7:17 20:1
82:10 85:6 88:11	32:15 41:4 42:13	106:7 137:19,20	acute 40:10 42:2	67:14 175:14
91:19,25 94:22 100:11 101:17	156:19 164:17	138:23 147:1	101:5	adopts 6:13
120:25 140:10,11	168:5,14	163:22	ad 67:20	Adult 72:21 95:25
165:20,23 174:9	accept 20:9,12	achieve 15:14 16:8	adapted 47:7	106:6
175:1,3,12 176:4	21:18 43:6 92:13	76:16 110:15	add 116:6,15,15	<b>Adults</b> 33:13 46:7
187:10 188:8	122:8	150:4 167:13	116:18 139:25	69:12 71:1,8
190:2	acceptable 36:11	achieved 16:11	155:15	72:1 97:9 102:20
abomination	113:23 161:6	34:1 162:21	added 7:5 31:8	195:14
165:25	accepted 55:19	achieving 120:10	182:1	advantages 85:13
absconding 104:3	65:6 88:6 99:24	acknowledge 43:6	adding 6:20 77:12	88:15
150:20	100:18 125:21	70:6 123:1	addition 18:8,10	adverse 21:12
absence 9:6,14	166:3 172:12	acknowledged 5:2	158:14	adversely 169:5
11:6 27:24 40:11	185:21	acknowledgement	additional 45:19	advertise 163:14
50:9 81:4,14	accepts 186:23	148:5	165:16 176:7	advertised 162:25
131:24 132:5	188:7	acknowledgment	181:25	advice 51:9 73:5
143:3,4 187:9	access 34:20 92:19	24:13,24	address 13:17	98:2
199:17	100:11 128:3	act 3:18 5:1 34:14	16:21 25:3 29:4	advise 166:4
absent 15:25 150:8	171:9 175:12	56:8,9 59:21,22	42:19 45:15	advisers 203:17
150:24	176:3 180:14,16	59:24 91:21	46:16 49:4 69:13	Advisory 106:9
absolute 15:1	187:22 200:20	93:12 100:21	82:9 104:16,20	advocacy 34:6
absolutely 127:15	accessing 73:4	140:4 169:24	155:16 184:4,5	100:6
140:3 153:22	99:21	175:5 177:8	190:16	<b>affairs</b> 24:18 33:9
<b>absurd</b> 90:18	Accident 171:22	acted 112:13	addressed 14:9	34:13 44:24
abundantly 54:13	accommodation	144:23 187:15	42:6 47:3 55:10	51:16
abuse 2:23 3:2,7	44:13	acting 10:16	113:19 167:22,25	affect 7:25 107:12
3:12 15:18,22	accompanied 3:1	action 15:10 22:21	174:23	149:2 182:2
16:5,25 17:5,22	60:15 65:3	23:1 25:8 34:1	addressing 14:5	afforded 160:19
18:10 19:5,7	account 7:3,7 8:25	48:2,15 52:23	82:3 155:23	affront 17:3 29:11
20:4,17 21:14	9:1,3,9 11:6	154:4 189:13	adequate 72:17,25	33:22
22:16,20,23 24:1	15:21 48:15 52:6	actions 21:8 34:18	75:9 88:15 90:12	Afghanistan
27:21 32:6 37:14	67:15 70:20 81:5	61:2,14,21	157:2	149:11
41:10 50:3,8	163:21 173:8	123:14 124:10	adjourned 204:17	afraid 30:13 105:9
53:8,14 56:8,10	194:19	138:3 154:24	adjournment	110:13 112:17
59:13 63:22 65:3	accountability	156:18 187:7	107:23	aftermath 186:21
65:17,18 66:1,15	47:1 51:24	198:21	adjust 146:15	199:7
74:22,24 75:8	accountable 121:9	actively 34:23	Admin 55:2,9	<b>afternoon</b> 108:8
79:25 83:19	155:24	160:11	administrative	185:17 198:8
84:18,20 101:25	accounts 19:15	activities 63:14	21:4 26:11 38:2	<b>age</b> 10:12 12:24 64:9
103:22 120:25	26:14 47:16 84:13 178:3	135:6 146:24 171:19 174:3	47:13 82:22 196:12	agenda 131:22
136:15 137:23	accumulation	activity 176:5	administratively	agenda 131:22 aggravate 59:19
139:2 140:19,21	accumulativii	activity 1/0.3	aummish alively	aggravate 33.13
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>

				Page 207
aggression 169:13	104:25	144:15 198:11	162:12	186:19 198:21
179:2 191:20	alternatively 13:7	answered 3:8 57:3	applies 28:12	area 73:17 108:12
aggressive 32:19	13:10 75:21	122:4	apply 7:20 87:12	108:22 109:24
99:4 156:19	alternatives 25:20	answers 99:5	87:15 136:13	131:21 150:7
168:6,14	36:10,11 97:11	112:13	187:18	155:23 174:11
aggressively	Altman 1:3,5,6,7	anticipate 72:7	appointed 21:10	190:17
165:14	13:20 27:16	75:23	appointment	areas 155:16
agitated 128:1	55:16 110:4	antipathy 185:25	80:10	174:13,21 176:4
ago 47:24 83:4	116:1 122:15	anxieties 39:3	appointments	178:12 190:17
agree 92:24 154:8	126:6 181:14	anxiety 11:20	35:11 45:20,22	Arguably 68:21
154:9,10 190:5	187:5 198:22	175:19 176:3	99:13,15 104:5,5	argue 121:19
204:6	201:24 204:21	187:3	appreciate 107:5	arguing 187:19
agreed 37:15	ambit 68:17	anxious 91:19	107:17 175:19	arising 39:4 54:25
70:23 88:9 131:5	ambition 167:12	anybody 139:14	appreciated	81:22
189:3 194:22	Amnesty 165:18	anyoody 139:14 anyone's 87:22	107:18	arms 78:6 87:19
200:22 201:14	amount 3:14 10:21	apart 68:25	apprehension 31:9	Armstrong 108:1
agreement 190:5	13:3 55:23 56:2	186:15	approach 1:8,16	108:2,7,8 154:14
ahead 94:25	59:6,8 64:18,18	apologies 129:3	4:11,13,17,21,22	176:11 202:4
aim 170:7 200:18	65:7 79:21 82:23	apologise 70:4	5:4,5,9,13 6:2,10	204:6 205:2
aimed 32:19 38:24	87:14 179:12	apologised 82:21	7:13,16 20:2	army 83:6,12
118:12	194:11	apology 70:1	25:16 57:7 76:10	85:15,19 86:16
alarm 30:11	amounted 22:24	92:12	130:22 131:17	110:25
alarming 19:7	54:11 55:13 57:3	appalling 159:10	140:24 141:3	Arnott 101:18
albeit 16:20 64:18	58:2,7,16 65:5,11	apparent 63:16	144:25 158:3	arose 28:18 190:10
76:24	66:7 74:9 75:22	97:2 105:21	162:14 184:3,7	arouse 13:11
alike 61:7 178:3	amounting 2:25	apparently 21:13	200:9	arouses 11:1
allegation 7:2 8:19	3:13	22:7 79:5 87:23	approached	arranged 71:7
57:9	amounts 56:9	93:1 118:11	120:14	171:13
allegations 6:24	66:19 88:22	202:12 204:1	approaches 3:22	arrangement
119:11 122:11,13	amply 152:7	appeal 76:2,9	appropriate 2:7	152:3
124:2,2 125:11	amusing 199:16	appear 36:5 126:3	4:7,20 6:3 8:5,8	arrangements
140:19 162:8	analysed 4:24	139:14 146:17	27:22 92:16,19	15:8 26:25 27:5
172:25 177:23	analysis 22:13	197:17	92:20 169:9	132:21 194:23
alleged 7:22 8:4	85:11	appeared 76:7	195:21	arrival 61:17 62:7
allegedly 7:10	<b>Ananyev</b> 6:8 7:2	156:20	appropriately	194:19
allocated 14:17	and/or 56:14	appears 58:21	28:5,7 127:10	arrive 1:22
allow 53:13 71:9	Andrew 83:25	109:8,18 182:8	187:15	article 1:22,25 2:5
167:17 173:24	anger 179:10	185:9 191:23	appropriateness	2:17,21 3:1,5,13
<b>allowed</b> 16:23 20:5	anguish 11:1	<b>apple</b> 43:11	192:1	3:14,18 6:6 8:10
22:16,19 48:19	13:12 19:5 29:17	<b>apples</b> 115:25	approved 73:17	9:16,17 10:1
101:12 167:15	75:10 104:12	116:2 184:3	approving 39:22	11:8,21 12:5
188:16	animal 106:15	190:8	approximately	17:14 26:19,19
allowing 40:1	115:11,12,17	applicant 7:6	163:20	27:8,9,20,24
altar 21:3	animals 41:15	applicant's 57:17	<b>April</b> 1:1 19:8	28:17,24 29:3,10
alter 150:5	Anna 154:2	application 1:18	58:16 60:5,5,7,10	34:21 36:9 37:2
alteration 145:19	anniversary 69:24	4:6 88:5 97:8	64:17,18,20 65:7	54:10,15,25
altercation 73:15	answer 59:25 88:2	applied 3:16,17,21	65:12 71:11,19	57:21 58:6,8
altering 112:19	102:10 120:20,23	5:12 104:1	76:7 77:7 80:7,8	60:13 72:8 74:19
S	10001	40 = 40 4 = - : -		
alternative 44:5	126:9,13 135:9	105:19 139:16	121:1,10,13	75:12 76:3,11
S	126:9,13 135:9	105:19 139:16	121:1,10,13	75:12 76:3,11

				Page 208
81:23 95:13	64:13 71:16	158:8	84:1,15 152:24	banging 104:9
98:11 101:22	72:17,20 103:5	attend 92:1	avoided 69:11	banter 41:5 42:3
106:5 114:21,21	104:14 105:24	attend 92.1 attendance 99:15	avoids 45:14	<b>barbaric</b> 49:14,16
115:18 129:13		154:20		53:18
	141:10,16,24		awaiting 76:23	
130:8,9,10 134:5	162:6,12 163:5,8	attended 171:21	awarded 83:13	bare 162:20
134:6 139:21	assessments 143:1	190:20	aware 20:14 30:12	barely 18:6 87:20
141:9,16,22	assist 3:19 12:3	attention 9:22	127:21 147:24	barrel 115:25
142:6,10,19	85:19 165:23	72:25 187:13	157:3 163:17	116:3
143:7 177:19	167:15 198:16	199:4	201:20 204:8	Barry 132:10
articulate 85:14	204:9	attention-seeking	awareness 156:3	base 69:2
88:10	assistance 27:23	41:17	160:7 187:9,17	based 56:16 67:7
artificially 57:4	109:2	attitude 22:13	192:12 203:10	164:20 166:11
Ascension 146:5,8	assisting 171:9	32:13	awful 118:20	baseless 124:1
ascertain 27:5	associated 76:21	attitudes 22:9	144:15	basic 85:25 99:12
47:22	association 43:19	32:22 41:8 111:4	awfulness 110:21	166:8
Ascertaining 56:3	45:1 61:11 63:15	126:11 131:20	B	basics 180:18
aside 190:1	64:21 67:18	145:13 154:24	<b>B</b> 37:21 94:9 135:3	basis 19:2 58:9
asked 53:2 70:2,6	71:15 77:25	attract 162:17		64:8 76:2 79:11
72:12 75:19	78:21 81:12	163:5	baby 60:19 back 33:20 48:19	86:24 90:2
102:3 118:10	84:24 166:22	attracted 9:21		126:14,20 167:16
122:5 128:24	associations 68:15	attributes 162:15	52:2 63:2 78:6	172:1 189:24
131:4 132:14	assume 14:19	August 80:15	83:3 84:3 109:14	<b>batons</b> 173:3
135:7 147:14	112:16	121:1,10,13	113:10 114:9	<b>BBC</b> 17:16 112:8
186:13 187:4	assumption 33:17	127:7 130:11	128:20 134:7,8	120:14 122:6,7
asking 56:5 72:18	assurance 25:11	austere 158:9	143:15,20 181:10	172:3 199:9
77:3 91:9 102:5	astonishing 134:5	authorisation	187:3,14,24	bear 29:24 124:3
122:16	144:18	39:15 73:20 75:5	197:25	140:6 150:2
asks 63:1 72:6	asylum 32:13 48:6	authorise 68:19	backed 26:13	158:14 182:15,20
aspect 163:2	146:3 193:18	authorised 68:16	background 73:12	bearing 13:1 77:14
aspects 40:6 55:10	202:14,23	74:10 77:25	157:24	becoming 35:12
118:22	atmosphere 31:3	authorising 89:19	bad 43:11 85:4	<b>bed</b> 31:20 173:25
assault 31:18	158:9 173:20	authoritarian	115:24,25 144:5	176:5 179:13
73:13	174:6 179:1	156:18	161:2 168:11	bedding 180:17
assaulted 96:8	attack 67:13 101:5	authorities 11:13	184:3 189:9	beds 179:15
105:11 161:24	129:22	27:15 98:17	190:8	<b>began</b> 71:12 83:7
169:14	attacked 73:23	114:25	badly 82:25	128:20
assaults 49:21	attain 10:9 197:9	authority 18:1	133:22 184:22	Begg 171:15
50:3 57:11 74:24	attempt 74:15	57:8 64:22 68:13	Baha 5:9 7:18,19	beginning 13:17
asserted 77:8	83:10 86:2 92:16	68:25 69:16 77:5	<b>bail</b> 79:16	16:21 85:22
assess 203:17	98:1 124:13	77:24 81:13	baked 21:19	97:17 110:5
assessed 28:3 55:5	160:14 189:22	automatic 45:23	<b>balance</b> 5:19 7:21	<b>begun</b> 43:8
64:8 163:9	attempted 64:20	availability 168:17	8:7 155:21 170:7	behalf 13:15,17
195:12,13	70:24 74:25	173:6	<b>balanced</b> 172:16	14:2,4,10,11 47:8
assessing 3:17	79:19 90:2 95:21	available 18:23	172:20	49:4,18 54:2
56:24 57:1 65:11	105:17 199:6	25:20 45:20	balances 81:15	82:5 95:5,6
66:6,18 173:7	attempting 65:10	55:12 68:12	balancing 195:18	107:8 123:9
assessment 2:17	66:24	90:21 144:8	banal 93:23	154:20 202:25
11:23 28:23	attempts 65:12,14	171:21 174:3	<b>banana</b> 118:11	<b>behave</b> 164:21
35:15 58:12	79:6 122:25	avoid 36:9 41:18	band 98:2	165:14
			<b>banged</b> 60:8 64:23	
	•	•	•	·

				Page 209
		1		l
behaved 161:10	52:16 68:20	45:8 52:8	141:18 142:6,14	Bromley 73:24
170:14 191:10	130:19 131:4,6	body 18:6 21:2	142:14,19	74:5
202:8	157:16,21 199:23	104:10,11	breached 33:8	Brook 2:3 10:4
behaving 117:13	benefit 122:2	body-worn 17:17	60:13 62:9 75:12	15:6 16:15 17:5
118:13 126:19	benefits 168:3	62:11 116:9	75:24	17:7 19:21 20:14
130:24 134:19	best 4:17 15:1	133:14	breaches 27:6 32:3	22:14,23 24:11
172:4	51:17 95:2 172:7	<b>bold</b> 25:17 108:10	54:15,15 142:3	26:8,25 29:22
behaviour 23:14	202:1	124:6 143:14	143:7	30:23 31:15,24
37:6 50:7 60:21	better 66:2 146:5	154:12 202:5	breaching 130:10	32:7,23 35:8,16
61:13,18 62:18	146:24,24 164:2	books 87:10	breadth 110:18	35:22 36:19
63:7,25 65:23	165:3,5,7,18,20	Borders 34:4	break 14:20,24	37:18,20 39:22
66:10 99:4,7,8	166:8 174:14	43:23 48:3	30:15 31:12	40:5,10 41:23
101:15 116:20	176:3 179:22	145:23	48:12,22 49:1	43:4 45:3 47:11
118:23 120:4	197:1 201:7	bored 186:25	107:18 176:19,23	48:19 50:20,24
156:19,21 159:11	better-trained	<b>borne</b> 50:6	198:6,10	51:2,21,21 52:13
159:15,18,23,25	24:4	borrow 6:10	breakdown 80:23	54:5 69:25 71:11
162:8 168:6,13	beyond 6:7 17:15	borrowing 142:9	breaks 31:12	72:14,18,23
168:14 169:16	21:16 153:1,23	<b>Bosnia</b> 83:6	breathe 78:7 104:9	73:10 75:9,18,20
171:12 174:8	189:20	Bosworth 26:12	breeding 24:6	79:3 80:25 82:12
185:19 188:8	Bhatt 14:3,13	33:3 38:20 40:13	32:15 42:13	82:15,20 83:17
189:5,6 195:3	BHM000030	41:12 43:20	brief 77:14	84:13 86:13,19
behaviours 51:8	58:19	47:15 48:10	<b>briefly</b> 93:18 127:8 132:22	87:2,4,12 90:23
155:2,24 168:9 171:1	<b>Bhui</b> 37:24 <b>BID</b> 154:3	113:14 114:14 116:1 121:18	136:1 146:15	91:18,22,25 92:4
beings 26:23 186:2	big 145:24	145:8 148:16	153:2 178:7	92:10 94:7,7 96:5 98:12,22
belatedly 80:9	Bill 48:3,4 145:23	150:14 151:11	bring 15:5 33:12	99:3,10 100:11
<b>Belda</b> 96:25 97:3,6	bind 66:12	169:2 172:18	34:21 107:10	101:4,14,18,25
<b>Belgium</b> 11:3	<b>Bingham</b> 36:17	179:4 191:11,11	118:17 150:1	102:5 103:13,15
27:17	37:14 39:25	193:7 201:11	153:15,18 187:3	102.3 103.13,13
believable 82:23	Bingham's 98:6	Bosworth's 42:9	201:23 203:23	105:13,14,18,20
believe 52:5 138:9	bipolar 136:10	bother 116:11	<b>bringing</b> 38:14	107:12 109:8
143:5 149:18	bit 30:17 108:25	135:4	82:8 123:14	111:23 116:3
170:24 172:11	136:2 179:24	bothered 95:24	147:23 187:2	117:17 119:13
180:24 185:22	biting 98:20	99:12	brings 118:17	120:5 137:5
believed 157:5,6	bits 145:10 154:8	<b>bottom</b> 125:6	174:20	138:18 139:23
187:10,11 191:2	<b>bitter</b> 16:19	box 133:13,15	British 43:18 45:1	146:5 152:23
192:25	bizarre 99:4	<b>bracket</b> 74:16	83:6 85:14,19	153:3,4 155:11
believes 156:1,16	blacks 84:3,4	brags 60:9	136:11	155:20 156:2,7
156:22 157:21	Blackwell 34:12	branch 80:5	broad 120:12	157:7 158:12,16
158:12 163:4	34:19 100:2	bravado 169:23	174:13 190:5	158:16 160:23
164:8 167:16	129:7	bravery 155:3	broadcast 52:11	161:6 162:11
172:2 173:21	Blake 152:20,21	breach 12:5 28:20	Brockington 20:18	163:18 166:7
<b>believing</b> 149:18	blamed 20:3	29:10 34:13,21	116:10 145:4	167:6 168:5
187:2	blatant 77:22	54:24 58:7 72:6	190:8	169:1,6,12,21,22
belongs 184:24	<b>blood</b> 79:21	73:21 74:19	Brodie 33:3	170:9,10,14,19
belt 105:19 106:10	<b>board</b> 51:6 119:12	75:13 77:4 81:22	broke 31:24	172:17,20 173:10
106:18	boasted 80:2	87:7 101:22	broken 110:24	173:15 177:25
belts 106:22	boats 109:15 147:8	129:12 132:12	111:10 138:15,19	178:10,18 179:11
Ben 20:1 51:14	<b>bodies</b> 21:9 33:10	139:21 140:2	157:17	179:12,16 180:6
		· <b>· · -</b>		
	ı	l	ı	I

				Page 210
180:8,11,22	<b>Buss</b> 41:24 60:12	147:6 185:24	97:20 99:12	cellmate 74:15
181:2,22 182:5	BWC 133:13	187:6	100:19 101:23	75:2
182:13,24,25	138:24 139:1	capacity 34:8	100:19 101:23	cells 38:8,10
183:14 184:19	130.27 137.1	99:20 100:7	121:11 133:22	178:11 179:14
185:8 186:1		146:25	162:19 173:5	193:18
188:13,16,20	C 80:5 119:21	capture 120:25	189:2 197:17	cent 39:20 44:3
189:10 190:7,10	144:12	182:21	cases 3:7 6:5 15:13	149:15 173:16
190:15 192:14,19	C&R 191:24 192:1	captures 62:12	18:17 27:4 30:1	central 17:25
190:13 192:14,19	cabinets 74:5	captures 02.12 car 133:22	37:3 62:10 68:23	50:20 161:19
192:24 193:1,2	cadre 188:18	care 10:4 20:23	106:17 171:9	centre 29:15 32:23
194.4,8,24 190.3	calculated 41:18	21:6 27:23 36:6	182:8 183:11	38:12,15 75:18
197:2,6,8 199:14	calibre 153:6	40:3 75:9 82:8	caseworker 100:2	77:2 87:6,9
200:3 201:19,22	call 143:18 159:18	85:22 87:7 90:12	caseworkers 34:20	94:10 107:1
200.3 201.19,22	159:20	90:14 97:15		109:18 128:5
	called 31:7 37:14		Castle 132:16 147:14	
<b>brother</b> 138:10	43:19 48:15	99:25 135:7		134:6 153:12
brought 44:18	124:14	136:12,15 138:1	casual 18:10	155:14,25 156:24
200:5 203:23	callous 19:12 75:1	153:19 155:1	119:18	157:15 158:1
204:2	88:25 89:1	157:24 170:15	casually 100:25	159:7 161:3
Brown 23:10	101:12	175:24	105:6	166:15 167:10
111:9,11 117:3	<b>Callum</b> 19:6,18	cared 54:20	catastrophic 85:21	173:25 175:4
157:19 171:21	20:4 40:19 74:5	132:20 171:14	categorically	178:19 181:4,6
bruised 79:7	93:15 110:19	200:7	189:18	191:22 202:9
<b>bruising</b> 139:19	112:7 119:9	career 155:18	categories 188:20	centrepiece 33:13
<b>brutal</b> 37:24	120:12 121:22	162:18 167:8,13	categorising 107:7	centres 16:1 52:15
brutalised 19:9	120:12 121:22	167:17	category 37:21	92:20 155:11,12
brutalises 93:24	T	careful 173:5	94:9,9 135:3	166:4,13 167:19
bruv 138:16,16	180:9 182:11,15	careless 87:3	188:25	168:22,23 179:5
<b>budget</b> 196:22	182:17,20 198:23	89:17 90:15,24	caught 19:22	certain 11:16
<b>build</b> 135:21,24	199:7	94:1 104:16	129:1 189:10	153:6
165:6 167:10	Callum's 138:12	caring 156:11	causal 51:8	certainly 17:8
171:5 174:9	calm 62:20	161:17 162:14	cause 13:8 29:16	29:12 108:20
<b>building</b> 135:4,23	calmed 61:8	171:11 172:3,10	55:22 66:14 79:6	109:1,21,24
139:7 153:22	Calver 35:6 87:24	carried 20:21	97:6 169:17	110:7 112:16
178:3,4	92:18 99:14,24	carry 158:18	caused 2:15 15:8	116:4 125:9
<b>built</b> 102:21 135:2	100:18 195:8	166:9 167:14	27:6 31:22 50:11	130:21 147:10
bullied 105:4	camera 17:17	carrying 103:4	57:17 62:3 64:7	151:25 152:25
159:3	19:22 62:11	case 6:8,17 7:11	75:10 96:10	153:1 178:9
bullies 128:25	116:9 133:14	8:2 9:19 10:11	102:2 106:13	179:13 188:23
bullish 50:13	182:21	11:3,10 13:2	160:16 174:4	195:4
<b>bullying</b> 23:9,14	cameras 121:6	14:7 17:20 18:5	201:21	cetera 2:15,18
40:21 53:14	campaign 127:16	18:25 28:16 29:4	causes 10:24 16:22	133:4 145:5,6
57:12 84:18	campaigning	34:10 54:6,22	32:5 152:3	<b>chain</b> 132:10
159:10 163:23	127:13	58:14 59:9 60:19	175:20	<b>chair</b> 1:3,5,7,24
173:19 193:21	camps 157:4,18	68:23 70:17 71:5	causing 10:8 13:4	4:9,16 5:11 6:2
bumping 118:6	candidates 162:4	71:13,20 72:3,8	55:18,22 100:19	7:12 8:19 10:2
137:15	163:15 181:9,10	74:19 75:23	cavalier 21:11	12:2 13:14,20,23
<b>burden</b> 3:20 6:23	canine 171:14	76:14 77:1 80:1	<b>CCTV</b> 17:16 78:19	14:15,18 15:2
150:22	capable 3:12 11:2	80:7,16 81:16	cell 79:21 83:21	16:11 30:12,17
burning 98:16	13:13 45:21	82:25 83:16 96:4	85:2	45:17 46:5 48:21
	81:15 143:7			
				•

Page	211	
rage	$\angle 11$	

				Page 211
40 2 4 6 52 2 22	100 10 201 22	140.15	7 20 52 10	100 0 100 1 4
49:3,4,6 53:3,22	199:18 201:23	140:15	7:20 52:19	189:8 190:1,4
54:2,3 56:7,22	203:24	checks 81:15	177:10	191:1,2 193:20
58:14 59:5 64:12	changed 27:7	99:12	civilised 17:3 26:6	193:23 194:12,20
69:6 70:3,12	144:13 174:6	cheeky 136:4	33:22	195:1 196:17,23
75:16 81:25 82:3	183:8	Cheeseman 21:1	CJS001026 61:10	197:11 198:12,19
82:6,24 83:5	changes 21:13	33:23 34:15	CJS001107 54:12	199:2,5 202:8
84:8 85:9 87:9	53:9,12 145:24	chest 76:21 78:8	CJS005530 61:16	client's 194:9
89:1 93:8,18	changing 124:9	chief 34:3 43:23	CJS007239 72:21	clients 14:22
94:13,19,20,25	channels 80:4	69:15	CJS0074121 63:18	187:18
95:3,7 107:15	chaos 19:11 31:17	child 60:18 76:4	claim 3:9,18	climbing 78:5
108:1,4,6,8	chaotic 38:12	<b>childhood</b> 136:15	claimed 19:15	clinical 28:4 35:3
117:19 122:19	140:4	137:23	21:25 74:3	41:22 195:7
123:8 124:15	chaoticness 157:14	children 44:15	claiming 123:4	clinician 151:18
125:10 130:20	character 169:24	chilling 101:3	claims 7:5 149:21	cliques 40:18
133:21 134:21	172:11	Chillingly 37:8	166:5	cliquey 186:14
139:6,20 141:2	characterisation	chime 117:5	clarifies 68:18	close 103:14
144:15 146:19	114:18	chimes 131:1,1	clarify 13:23	116:22
153:25 154:14,17	characterise	<b>choice</b> 53:17 99:16	clarity 148:13,20	closed 146:21
154:19 159:5	132:12	choke 60:13,20	151:12 156:3	178:13 199:9
176:15,16,21,25	characterised 10:7	67:14	classic 102:1	closely 146:1
177:2 179:18,22	41:17 183:13	<b>choking</b> 186:21	Clayton 60:12	154:23
180:1,9 185:1,3,6	characterising	choose 200:20	172:6,9	closer 153:18
189:16 190:16	130:2	chooses 4:10	clean 74:7 178:11	closing 1:6 13:15
192:5,14 194:3	characteristics	Chris 120:7	180:16	13:22 30:10 49:7
196:14 198:11,17	112:2 135:19,25	Christianity 70:15	cleaning 180:17	54:1 82:2,4 95:4
199:20 201:18	136:2	Christopher 4:1	clear 6:19 8:11,21	108:7 154:18,19
204:8,11	<b>charge</b> 87:11	5:2	23:18 29:21	155:12 177:1
chairing 160:25	138:25	chronology 112:5	33:11 37:16	185:5 204:21,22
chairs 180:12	<b>charged</b> 194:21	Churcher 64:1	39:25 42:10	204:23,24 205:1
challenge 34:9	196:19	66:12 92:14	49:23 54:13 68:4	205:2,3,4,5
101:6	charities 171:10	99:14 201:6	68:15 72:6 108:9	cocky 117:20
<b>challenged</b> 117:20	charity 171:14	cigarette 139:10	124:20 145:6	coerce 67:8,10
128:22,23 159:23	charlatans 149:20	circle 48:12	148:18 152:12	coercing 56:16
challenges 169:8	Charlie 60:12	circles 48:11,18	156:22 157:19	67:6
challenging 40:24	172:5 185:6,7	circulated 1:12	159:14 184:18	coercion 67:22
47:4,5 163:25	186:9,15	circumstances	188:4 194:3	coercive 32:11
164:22 181:23	<b>charter</b> 30:6 32:18	3:24 10:10 11:20	clearly 21:11	38:24 41:18
Chamber's 27:16	71:7,9	13:1,6 44:17	25:23 61:10,12	67:16
chance 134:13	chatting 170:17	57:10 64:9 83:10	69:3 79:1 84:24	coexistence 6:18
chances 124:4	Chaudhary 77:2	93:6 95:14	100:21 113:18	coffee 170:17
<b>change</b> 17:4 49:11	79:22 81:8 88:25	102:22 106:10,24	117:23 121:19	coherent 98:25
51:23 52:6 53:5	89:5,21 90:18	145:8 148:17	122:5 136:19,19	102:10
53:8,20 94:5	92:7 96:24 102:8	161:15 164:22	140:22,22 147:12	coherently 11:25
110:2,3,13,16	102:10,14	173:3 175:2	156:7 177:17	cohesion 157:12
111:21 120:10	cheap 168:20	cited 28:11 59:10	189:18	cohort 146:23
124:4,17 126:17	check 85:25	citing 99:4	client 110:25	coincidental 24:16
126:20 133:20	132:13 140:16	<b>citizenship</b> 136:12	117:7 118:5	coincidentally
143:19 145:4,15	checked 120:16	136:14	185:24 186:22,23	149:11
145:22 148:11,12	checking 132:1	civil 5:7,19,22 6:12	187:19 188:14,25	coke 101:7

				Page 212
11107.1	102 0 112 17	105 0 110 15	1 22.2	50 15 60 0 50 00
cold 127:1	103:8 113:17	105:8 119:15	concern 22:3	59:15 69:8 72:22
collapse 23:20	164:13 168:5	complainant 9:1	24:19 96:4	73:2 75:9 78:12
colleague 171:13	184:11,12 199:5	complainant's	109:21 120:9	99:22 161:15
171:19	Commission's	8:25	155:13 160:11	173:10 174:8
colleagues 83:9	58:2	complainants 2:9	161:17 174:21	194:10,14 195:12
163:21 170:3	commissioned	complained 50:18	192:5 201:13	196:11 197:12
171:25	89:13	complained-about	concerned 5:7	conduct 4:8 57:20
collecting 7:4	commitment	119:13	26:18 27:11	79:24 177:23
College 37:12	165:23 167:22	complaining 153:7	82:16 102:20	189:19 191:18
46:23 92:22	committed 57:17	187:22	112:8 142:4	197:16 199:12
Collier 18:15	114:7 146:4	complaint 9:5 86:7	146:1 161:15	conducted 58:9
31:18 69:4 78:16	167:11	86:8,8 107:6	191:8	170:13
78:19 133:16	Committee 24:18	118:9 119:1	concerning 82:4	confidence 53:1,6
138:21 139:8	44:25,25 51:16	180:13 199:13,17	106:17 107:6	125:23 126:11
160:22 191:24 Collier's 61:1	133:24 <b>committees</b> 26:5	complaints 18:21 23:22 52:24	concerns 22:24	169:23 confident 53:3
collusion 119:4			28:12 51:13,13	
combat-related	common 172:13	86:10 203:20	87:25 99:6 117:14 118:18	confidentiality 77:5
86:3 90:24	176:2 182:7,9 communal 176:4	<b>complete</b> 18:16 23:20 30:3 35:4	160:13 174:18	confined 57:14
combination 32:11	communicate 73:3	45:5 68:8 86:1	179:15 180:5	confirm 21:1 77:3
56:10,11 58:7	158:21	96:15 102:2	198:23	176:12 200:5
59:11 65:11	communication	132:5	concerted 52:23	confirmed 21:7
combined 37:3	85:8 159:14	completed 80:12	conclude 14:16,23	43:21 69:17
184:20	182:7	96:24	26:8 47:10	70:19 89:5,14
come 46:14 52:2	community 95:22	completely 35:12	154:10	93:5 187:4
82:10 98:23	97:12 150:17,19	39:7 49:25 95:11	concluded 4:2	188:22 191:8
114:9 118:8	151:1 170:24	113:15 117:6	35:3 78:21	193:23 199:23
125:16 126:23	companies 174:25	174:6	concludes 42:10	confirms 63:12
129:16,24 140:9	companies 174.23	completing 192:19	conclusion 6:22	152:11
141:11 142:2	174:17,19 189:14	complex 86:3	8:7 26:2,10	conflict 40:1
145:11 153:13	compare 174:7	90:23 165:7	47:12 69:6	confront 15:17
161:4 187:24	compared 7:24	compliance 44:4	conclusions 1:22	20:9
197:25	103:8 196:21	60:23 67:15	2:2 6:14 44:23	confronted 67:3
comes 24:16	compassion	compliant 105:25	117:24	156:17,21 164:20
119:23 121:12	170:15 188:22	complicated 87:14	conclusively 11:7	169:3
125:2 129:19	compassionate	complicit 15:25	concocted 60:22	connected 54:16
147:20 182:14	130:22,24 144:25	116:17	concordant 6:19	connection 6:22
<b>coming</b> 118:22	compellability	complicity 39:21	8:11	85:7
145:24 149:12	144:1	40:22	concurs 43:20	Connolly 42:23
198:2 199:25	compelling 30:22	complied 11:22	condition 55:8	122:15,16,18,21
<b>command</b> 157:22	40:23	<b>comply</b> 61:19	76:22 77:19	144:3
commenced	compensation	67:20 72:4 81:10	79:15 192:21	conscious 172:23
104:24	70:1 83:13	87:5 194:24	195:25 196:1	174:20
commend 17:12	competent 185:25	compromise 27:19	conditions 7:5,7	consecutive 82:14
46:24 57:7 155:3	competing 119:14	compromised 72:2	7:10 17:7 21:20	82:22
commensurate	complacency	77:10	24:5,10 27:17	consensus 28:4
17:13	84:17	computer 73:15	29:16,24 30:20	consequence 25:19
comment 4:25	complacent 15:25	concealment 64:4	32:7,22 38:8	61:21 70:22
comments 41:25	complain 11:25	concentric 48:18	41:10 45:12	134:25 142:15
	1	1	1	<u> </u>

				Page 213
101.24	20004:447 10	51.20		114.17 140 10
181:24	constitutes 7:10	51:20	cool 74:8	114:17 142:12
<b>consequences</b> 30:5 44:19 50:10 52:7	12:5	contract 20:22	cop 184:8	168:11 181:14
	constrain 25:22	21:5,19 52:10,12	cope 39:7 41:23	counselling 203:13
58:23 61:14	44:8	131:23 132:23	49:11 98:3	counter 9:25
103:12 160:1	constraints 39:19	146:16 180:24	169:10 198:17	counteract 155:2
consequent 36:6	<b>consulate</b> 99:6	197:3	copied 24:14	countries 149:9,12
65:15	contact 85:6 112:8	contracting 6:12	coping 147:12	149:14 175:14
consider 7:12 8:20	118:4 171:16,17	125:1	182:12	204:4
32:4 46:6 56:7,9	contagion 113:7	contractor 20:6	core 1:12 13:16	country 67:8 84:2
59:5 82:24	contain 35:24	25:7	14:2,10,12 16:4	84:3 165:25
181:16	203:6,8	contractors 48:14	40:17 69:22	200:8
considerable	contained 154:1	107:4 184:25	170:7 185:13	couple 129:6 153:2
174:4 175:22	159:5	203:3	186:12 190:6	coupled 157:1
considerate	containing 1:11	contracts 52:20	195:23	course 1:19 15:10
172:10	containment 20:23	203:5,8	corner-cutting	17:2,18 19:4
consideration 8:16	37:9	contractual 21:17	21:18	26:15 27:11
11:24 39:12	contains 144:21	24:3	corners 38:6	39:17 47:17
45:25 57:4,6	contemplated	contradicts 9:8	coroners 21:9	48:15 80:17,18
58:11 64:12	89:25 99:20	contrary 2:4 59:4	corporate 16:1	82:13 89:16,23
106:24 192:2	contemplation	97:14	20:12 47:1 52:8	102:14,21 108:14
considerations	97:10	contravening 58:6	87:13 93:22,23	109:6,19 111:8
23:24	contemporaneous	contributed 2:15	174:19 200:7	113:12 114:25
considered 1:21	128:9 138:11	15:8 27:6 95:23	201:24	124:22 127:3
6:1 9:16 31:5	contending 163:24	158:7 173:22	correct 1:15 3:16	130:5 131:6,11
33:19 55:5 57:16	content 41:6	178:10 179:2,6	11:13 45:5 48:11	134:3,17 135:2
57:23 58:4 59:7	162:20	181:17	86:7 132:14	135:17 137:5
86:11 160:14	context 14:1 28:12	contributes 152:4	141:3	139:2 142:23
195:21	29:14 30:6 32:8	200:23	corrected 114:13	163:9,12 164:25
considering 1:25	32:16 37:10	contributing 152:8	correctly 133:18	165:17 177:19
3:16 10:10 13:6	38:16 39:20 40:6	196:16	correlation 23:18	181:10
22:10 44:21	40:15 41:9 42:8	contributory	37:16	courses 190:20
182:14	44:20 45:11 47:7	16:22 32:5	correspondence	<b>court</b> 6:4,6,9,17
considers 43:1	48:10 59:18	control 25:13	63:16,18 68:17	7:2 9:19,22 11:4
52:2	65:23 83:1 85:12	38:14,19 50:18	corroborated 89:2	34:10 36:12
consistency 151:22	130:8,9 166:5	76:16 77:13	corroborating	57:13,15,23 58:9
consistent 7:7 8:13	continue 33:8	162:10 191:20	8:18	68:10 76:12,12
9:1 70:20 84:6	46:17,18 48:23	controlling 38:25	corrosive 113:15	136:6 173:2
84:12	52:9,12,17 53:17	controls 156:5	114:14	177:11
consistently 145:1	107:11 153:3	175:10	<b>corrupt</b> 50:4 53:13	court's 6:9 58:3,12
199:15	163:8 186:24	convenience 21:4	74:22	<b>cousin</b> 168:20
consisting 57:25	continued 34:17	37:10	corrupted 19:10	cover 124:13
<b>constant</b> 31:9 60:8	67:2 109:12	convenient 48:22	42:5 190:11	189:19 190:1
63:6 64:22,24	144:9 161:3	Convention 6:13	<b>cost</b> 16:6 38:6	198:9
73:7 97:17	174:10	6:25 37:2 56:4	176:7 196:21	cover-up 19:17
109:17,17 133:1	continues 28:8	57:21 147:22	cost-cutting 21:6	50:10
constantly 197:21	69:18 81:1 91:12	conversations	<b>counsel</b> 1:8 13:15	covering 187:21
constitute 29:9,18	155:8	184:13	13:17 27:9 28:11	cramped 73:1
58:25	continuing 23:8,11	<b>convey</b> 104:12	29:3 82:6 95:7	crash 133:22
constituted 75:20	35:10 49:12 51:2	convicted 166:20	109:3 113:7	<b>create</b> 158:22
	·	•	•	•

				Page 214
200:17,18	<b>Cs</b> 36:10 80:7	<b>cut</b> 139:5 173:20	88:4,9,24 89:6,7	<b>David</b> 111:7 119:1
created 3:6 31:3	97:24 143:3	cutting 38:6 79:20	89:12,21 90:1,4	119:5
32:6 179:1 193:4	CSU 10:3 39:18	cycle 23:25 66:15	90:10,14,14,19	dawned 163:1
199:21,24	61:19	<b>Cycle</b> 23.23 00.13	90:22 91:2,8,12	day 24:17 35:15
creating 41:9	CTI's 55:15 141:4		92:10 93:7,8	51:17,21 60:10
credibility 3:9,17	cuff 139:13	<b>D</b> 204:20	94:5 110:25	65:10,16 77:20
184:8	cuffed 63:3 71:10	<b>D1234</b> 18:5	119:9 192:23	77:23 83:1 91:9
credible 2:4 7:9	cuffs 139:13	<b>D1275</b> 95:5 98:21	D643's 82:25	91:9 96:23 97:6
8:14,19 14:7	culpability 20:5,12	98:22 100:1	83:16 94:2	98:19 107:11
177:21	cultural 49:22	<b>D1275's</b> 99:7	<b>D687</b> 117:7 118:5	128:5 138:25
cries 139:16	culturally 120:11	191:7	133:10 136:2,16	156:9 162:12
criminal 4:6 5:17	culture 23:9 40:7,9	<b>D1473</b> 95:6 105:14	137:13 138:4	166:23 168:11
6:12 8:4 14:6	40:15,18 41:1,9	106:3,12 107:6	139:2,21 140:6	175:6,18 181:3
79:12 166:20	42:5,20 47:2,4	<b>D1527</b> 13:17 42:1	140:22,25 141:17	181:15 183:18
177:11 193:18	49:21 50:5,11,13	54:2,9 58:20,23	143:10	185:12,13 186:8
202:24	50:16,22 51:8	61:5,13,17 62:7	<b>D728</b> 185:20	191:6,12 193:7
criminals 41:16	53:9,14 74:22	63:20 64:16 66:6	187:18 188:9	194:16 197:7
173:17 201:2	84:5,13,17	66:9 67:10 68:5	<b>D801</b> 95:5,17,18	198:3,4 199:23
202:16	101:13 102:21	68:21 69:9,10,19	96:6,9,14 97:1,3	200:22 201:11
crisis 158:13	105:12 135:8	70:6 185:20	97:14	204:17
197:23	143:4 148:11,12	186:19 187:2,16	<b>D801's</b> 97:20 98:9	day-to-day 19:2,2
criteria 191:25	158:8 162:11	<b>D1527's</b> 54:6,22	<b>D865</b> 74:15	days 71:16 74:5,14
critical 15:14	188:15 189:10	57:2 59:4,11	daily 66:25 126:2	76:5 82:12,14,22
23:23 25:1 36:16	190:12 193:13	60:21 63:1 69:25	167:16 172:1	83:2 90:17,22,25
38:16 42:20 43:4	196:4 199:17	<b>D1538</b> 13:18 54:2	damage 25:4	96:10 100:8,10
64:15 133:6	201:19 203:24	72:13,13,21	91:11,11	121:25 144:20
critically 46:13	cumbersome	73:12,19,23,25	damaged 149:13	162:6 183:7,7
criticised 33:22	201:23	74:8,12,23	damages 82:19	192:24
38:21 131:3	cumulative 22:24	<b>D1538's</b> 74:1,7	92:11	<b>DCM</b> 61:8 62:13
195:19 201:10	31:22 57:6	<b>D1713</b> 95:6 101:24	damaging 158:15	67:19 73:25 74:6
criticisms 21:7	cumulatively 2:18	102:12,17	175:7	101:1 119:16
164:12	29:16 75:7	<b>D1851</b> 30:21 31:14	<b>Dan</b> 79:10	139:6 157:4
critique 96:6	curiosity 87:22	<b>D1914</b> 13:18 54:3	<b>Dando</b> 148:19	166:10,17 167:13
cross 58:24	current 25:7,21	75:16 76:1 77:11	dangerous 15:7	174:16 186:7
cross-application	35:6,7 43:23	79:7 81:21	78:16 79:25 80:1	DCMs 83:25
38:17	70:12 175:15	<b>D1914's</b> 76:10	113:25 191:15	122:12 139:1
cross-refer 88:7	currently 45:18	80:16	193:17 201:2	158:11 160:9
crucial 22:15	48:3 107:12	D197 73:24	202:16	168:19 169:3
77:14	146:2	<b>D2054</b> 106:20 <b>D2077</b> 13:18 54:2	dangerously 21:19	181:5 188:18
cruel 10:9 13:5	cursory 104:15	70:11 71:12 72:6	73:16	<b>DCO</b> 60:9 73:13
55:18 57:19	custodial 38:24	<b>D2158</b> 95:6	<b>Danskin</b> 158:3	73:16,24,24 74:5
93:20,21	custody 16:20	D2158 93.0 D2158's 103:20	160:24	77:17 79:20
cruelly 100:25	19:14 26:14	<b>D2158 \$</b> 103.20 <b>D2159</b> 18:6	dare 129:23	101:1 103:8
cruelties 85:1	27:23 39:6 40:13	<b>D313</b> 13:18	dark 93:16 128:4	134:11,15 157:4
cruelty 87:3 90:16	47:16 57:14	<b>D390</b> 31:19 173:2	<b>Darren</b> 74:11	163:19 165:20
90:24 94:2,4	105:4 171:15	<b>D523</b> 13:18	118:21	166:10,17 167:10
182:25	178:2	<b>D643</b> 42:25 82:4,5	data 79:23	167:17,23 174:16
crushed 123:23	customed 91:22	82:10,12 83:5	date 51:25 96:3	185:7,25 190:20
crushing 30:24	customer 89:10	85:12 86:5,13	140:17 204:3	195:14
		05.12 00.5,15		

				Page 215
<b>DCOs</b> 61:9 79:8	deeming 81:8	dehumanised 41:8	45:5 58:1,1,5	desperation 193:5
92:23 111:3	deep 121:20	138:19	102:2 107:11	despite 20:4 31:21
122:12 124:19	deepest 85:10	dehumanising	deprived 95:11	41:5,16 72:18
148:17 158:11	deeply 85:11	114:15,15,20,23	183:16	85:21 86:14,19
160:9 168:19	defaced 159:7	115:3,16 118:19	depth 110:18	87:13 89:7 90:7
169:3 181:5	199:1	delays 45:23 73:4	157:22	90:8,13 99:3
191:13,17 192:15	default 37:9	delegate 68:19	deputy 157:16	103:5,21 116:12
192:18 194:6,20	defence 67:14	delegates 68:22	194:8	132:6 138:23,23
199:18 202:10	83:14	deliberate 10:5,8	Derek 101:1 162:7	138:24 190:25
de 39:17 74:9	<b>defend</b> 79:22 92:9	13:4 29:19 55:17	170:13	destroyed 31:25
97:15	deferral 48:2	59:12,13,20,24	dereliction 36:6	detail 93:17
dead 85:3	defiance 69:17	60:3,4 61:2 62:6	derogatory 18:9	110:21 117:7,10
deal 1:15,20 40:12	76:4	62:8 63:15,21,23	29:7 41:4,25	118:9 128:14
141:2 145:2	deficiencies 35:9	64:4	101:1 103:7	140:10 141:4
177:3 185:10	deficient 33:14	deliberately 61:3	188:2	145:22 160:4
188:11,14 192:21	defined 25:23	deliver 16:12	describe 49:14	185:11 186:5
194:12 196:7,9	definition 56:4	21:25	98:25	189:21
202:10	60:1	delivered 165:18	described 19:7,10	<b>detailed</b> 7:9 8:15
dealing 113:24	definitive 108:9	196:21	23:6 35:23 38:20	8:21 46:20,25
133:10 177:5	deflect 19:17	demeaned 105:5	41:14 50:2 60:20	186:5
193:14 202:7	<b>deform</b> 76:17	demeaning 103:7	66:23 76:20	detain 25:22 76:20
203:22	degrade 12:14	105:6	79:21 84:14	103:24 153:22
dealt 184:6 191:12	141:15	demograph 39:2	95:11 99:17	<b>detained</b> 2:22 8:17
<b>Dean</b> 111:9,19	degraded 54:9	demonising 32:21	120:4 129:25	10:3 11:16 12:17
117:3 199:13	60:7 138:18	demonstrated	137:16 165:24	12:21,24 15:16
<b>death</b> 78:10	139:21 140:25	154:25 173:4	172:8 180:7	16:14 17:24 18:4
debase 11:5	degrading 2:6	demonstrates	181:17 182:16	26:15 29:20
debasing 11:2	7:10 9:17,20	100:22	186:22 189:8	31:14 44:9,18
13:13 18:9 41:6	10:23,25 13:11	denial 15:24 19:5	198:5	47:18 48:6 50:2
debate 116:2	17:24 28:1 29:9	22:4 64:3	describes 79:16	54:19,20 55:3
135:9,15	29:18 54:10,14	denials 20:20	80:25 84:5,8,17	58:11 64:2 66:14
debilitating 83:14	56:25 64:19	denied 60:14	84:25 88:24	67:9 68:5,6,14
Deborah 51:14	72:11 75:21	73:14 138:8	132:4	70:18,25 71:9
December 87:2	80:17 81:18	department 55:2,9	describing 115:16	72:11,13 75:17
170:20	98:11 107:2	70:9 72:4 125:1	140:12	76:1,5,18 77:3,4
decide 4:16	119:25 134:25	202:22	description 7:9	77:8,12 80:11,21
decided 71:7	degree 10:15	depending 63:25	84:6	81:9 82:14,15
181:11	55:21 110:8	depends 64:9	desensitisation	89:6 90:22 93:6
decides 25:2	130:12 146:9	deployed 65:21	39:10 40:8 41:21	94:1 95:19 102:7
deciding 4:13	203:2	78:17,18 107:3	193:14 201:5	103:7,22 104:4
decision 34:8	degrees 120:9	deportation 76:6	desensitised 40:14	105:3 111:24
76:20 81:3 85:5	dehumanisation	76:10 84:15	deserve 201:3	115:8,10 116:24
decisions 99:21	40:8 41:1,14,22	165:22 184:16	designed 37:21	116:25 118:18
Decisive 45:15	50:11 53:15	deportees 193:18	39:1 66:2 67:8	126:24 129:10,12
declined 97:12	101:14 191:19	202:24	67:11 80:4,23	129:12 130:25
decried 78:20	200:10,13,23	depression 95:20	153:24 166:12	135:18 148:14
deed 42:14	201:5	103:17	178:20 183:3	151:8 153:17,20
deeds 32:16	dehumanise	depressive 136:8	despair 66:15	155:4,10 156:11
deemed 77:11	131:13	deprivation 23:6	desperately 130:7	156:15 157:6
	•	•	•	·

				Page 216
160 16 10 20	102 5 21 104 7	127 14 120 21 22	l., ,	1 06 6
160:16,18,20	193:5,21 194:7	127:14 129:21,22	development	diligently 86:6
161:16 162:1,9	194:13,20 195:6	134:6 135:4	167:18	diminished 23:4
162:14 163:20	196:7,10 200:2	137:3,11,13 146:22 147:15	developments 173:13	dire 169:8
164:16 165:1,2,4	200:10 201:7			direct 16:18 19:9
165:8,13,24 166:4,7,19 168:6	202:9,11,18,20	148:18,22,25 149:2 150:3,13	dexterity 118:16	70:1 80:21 127:5 182:3
168:7,10 169:4	203:7,22,25 204:2	150:13,23 151:9	diagnose 55:7 86:2 diagnosed 31:24	direction 25:10
171:5,7,13,15,20	detainees' 151:19	150.13,25 151.9	66:4 86:15	119:17 130:21
171.3,7,13,13,20	179:7 183:19	151.15 152.2,7	169:19	156:22
174:10 175:2,7	detainer 124:25	155:10 156:4,6	diagnosis 86:21,25	directions 71:5
175:11,20,23	detaining 81:4,7	156:12,24 165:5	90:23	directly 42:24
176:14 179:9	93:20	166:4,6,13,15,19	diary 138:12	50:11 79:25
181:18,23 183:17	detains 21:12	166:22 167:19	dictate 63:7 66:10	102:17 111:18,18
186:1 197:21,23	<b>detention</b> 6:6 7:5,8	168:22 174:15	dictates 62:18	115:8
202:12	7:10 22:18 25:20	175:16 176:10	die 78:15 83:10	director 20:1,18
detainee 11:24	27:14,17 28:6,9	178:23,25 183:1	dies 77:17,17	138:25 140:5
42:24 54:24	28:14,18,21,22	183:10,13 184:20	101:4,4 197:5	157:15
56:24 61:17	28:24 29:1,16	191:22 192:17	diet 58:5	disabled 34:14
62:10 73:24	33:7,16 34:9	194:9,15 195:7	dietary 105:1	138:13,14
81:22 87:8	35:9 38:5 41:19	195:10,11,20	difference 28:13	disagree 93:2
100:13 178:22	42:11 43:20 44:1	196:3,3,13 201:8	141:5,6 162:2	147:16
186:20 187:6,20	44:5,15 45:2,13	201:9,14,16	different 3:22	disagrees 114:18
187:24 188:3,4	45:13 48:5 51:22	202:13 203:15	25:16 28:18 32:2	disappeared 86:10
197:4,5,10	52:21 53:11	204:1,3	41:3 76:11 80:5	disappointment
detainee's 65:2	54:21 55:10	deteriorate 100:16	105:3 117:6	144:21
188:2	56:11 57:1,2	195:9	118:22 142:9	disbelief 84:5
detainees 2:2	59:8,15,23,23	deteriorated	146:22,22,23	102:21 196:5
11:12,14,15 19:9	60:1,3 65:9 67:7	102:12	151:23 152:15	disbelieve 91:21
20:24 21:5 23:7	68:21 69:21,25	deteriorating 90:3	166:15,18,23	discharge 106:19
23:15,20 26:12	70:21,22 71:3,3,4	105:2 138:12	184:6	177:14
29:20 30:1 31:1	71:21,24 72:10	deterioration 37:4	differently 187:16	discharged 83:12
33:25 34:18 35:1	73:6 75:12,20	97:19 100:22	191:10	99:11
36:22 38:2 41:13	76:15,23 77:1,9	determination	difficult 100:16	discharging 4:18
41:14 47:14 50:9	79:7,15 80:17,18	4:22 5:5 12:4	118:19 128:7	disciplinary 9:23
61:7 71:23 74:13	80:24 81:19	58:3 152:10,12	135:11 137:1	discipline 63:13
80:24 84:9,10,14	82:20,22 85:17	determinative 9:6	142:20,22 148:23	disciplined 52:22
84:19 85:13	85:19 87:4,6,9	determine 56:8	148:23 158:19	disclaimer 77:16
87:16 88:17	89:14,19,19,20	58:15 177:10	164:22 168:15	disclosed 66:8
92:18 93:5	90:9,11,21 91:8	determined	178:1 191:16	102:7
102:16 105:10,13	91:14 92:10,11	124:11	197:12	disclosing 79:23
106:19 107:12	92:20 93:19	determines 177:16	difficulties 7:3	disclosure 103:6
165:21 170:16	95:16,23 96:7,9	determining 7:22	8:17 89:8 92:25	disconcerting
171:3 173:16	96:12,19,23 97:1	deterred 34:24	136:10 140:14	19:13
178:2,9,24,25	97:5,10,11 98:6	detrimental	201:7	disconnect 24:23
179:5 180:13,19	99:22,23 100:3,8	169:10	difficulty 176:1	35:2 148:5
182:9,11 184:21	100:10,23 101:22	develop 30:10	dignity 15:24 19:6	disconnected
186:2,4,17	103:16,21 104:16	167:14 188:16	29:8,11 32:1,25	35:12
188:11 190:14,22	104:21,22 106:7	developed 168:22	38:7,12 70:8	discouraging
191:3 192:6	110:12 113:5	developing 31:23	106:11 170:15	199:25

				Page 21 /
discrete 57:4	distance 131:14	134:1 136:23	145:18 199:16	20:13 35:5
discretionary	distinguish 187:6	191:2 202:2	draining 198:5	155:17,22 184:17
28:18	187:11	doled 105:5	draw 117:23	194:4 201:20
discriminated	distress 27:18	domestic 138:21	132:19 199:3	194.4 201.20
100:4	31:17 37:5 40:11		drawn 9:13 170:11	
discrimination	41:13 75:10	domestically 139:25	dread 193:25	E 39:18 62:4,7,13
56:17 67:7		dominant 40:18	dreadful 173:16	65:15,18 66:9
discuss 160:14	84:11,16 90:9 91:10	41:1 189:4,14	drink 58:1	74:8 77:23 78:11
discussion 115:23	distressed 18:13	dominated 40:17	drive 130:12	97:16 186:13
115:24 160:25	101:19 195:3		drive 130.12 driven 21:2	188:24 195:1,6
		<b>Donnelly</b> 120:7 <b>door</b> 33:20 85:2	driving 130:12	204:20
disfunctionality 201:21	distressing 74:25 169:25 172:24	127:25 138:15	S	earlier 55:16 65:8
	distribution 6:22	184:24	<b>drop-ins</b> 128:12 128:19	66:13 144:20
disgusted 154:24 dishonest 75:14	distribution 6:22 distrust 130:13	doors 104:9	drove 135:13	earliest 96:17
			Drs 88:25	early 118:4 136:3
dishonestly 74:3 disincentive	disturbance 9:25 disturbed 31:15	193:23		137:16 179:14
		Dorset 139:17	drug 31:17 169:15	194:18 203:16
174:20	disturbing 19:4 div 101:2	double 66:12 doubt 6:7 18:24	193:22 194:1	earning 167:23
disinterest 21:7			drugs 38:14	ears 76:25
dislocated 57:5	Divisional 76:12	23:25 60:25 63:9	163:22 173:18	earshot 188:2
dismantling 53:10	divorced 32:21	89:9 98:9 159:17	202:16	earth 111:24 127:8
dismiss 140:19	Dix 19:24 34:23	doubt' 5:16	DSO 68:22	134:9
dismissal 140:24	52:16 61:8,14	downstairs 63:3	dual 40:1	easier 131:12,12
dismissed 52:17	62:13 63:11,24	<b>Dr</b> 19:10 23:6 33:3	dubbed 122:14	131:13,15
104:25 116:5 138:3	66:8 67:19 69:14	35:3,7,23 36:11	<b>Dublin</b> 104:1	easily 189:4
	77:21 81:12	36:16,17 37:8,14	109:15 147:8,22	easy 136:16
Disney 158:11	120:7	37:15 39:21,24	due 46:2 50:10	198:22
disorder 39:3 83:8	Dix's 61:23	39:25,25 45:2,6,9 45:10 64:25	61:18 62:2	eat 71:13 98:13
136:9,10 169:19 disorders 11:14	<b>DL000231</b> 72:19 <b>doctor</b> 71:18 77:2	66:23 68:24 77:2	114:25 157:23 184:19 197:12	eating 98:15
				echo 66:12
disorientation 57:23	77:3,5 89:10	77:7,10 78:24	duly 78:13	ECHR 54:10
	90:4 102:16	79:22,22 80:11 81:8,8 87:24	<b>Duncan</b> 14:3,10 47:25 51:14	Ed 179:16 180:6
dispirited 170:5 displayed 93:24	doctor's 40:2 doctored 122:14	· ·	157:17 158:2	edge 128:12
94:2	doctors 39:21 80:2	88:3,9 89:5,21 90:1,10,18 91:7	duration 10:11,19	edges 51:18 202:2
disproportionate		92:7,8,23 93:4	12:10 66:4	editorial 120:17
84:22	85:23 89:15,17 91:24 137:10	95:10 96:6,14,24	106:11	effect 12:15 22:24
dispute 33:23	153:12	96:25 97:3,6	duties 21:11 54:25	64:12 98:7
disregard 15:23	<b>document</b> 80:13	98:6,10,12	72:7 75:23,25	103:18 184:21
19:12	documentary	100:12 102:8,10	81:10,22 191:18	199:18 203:23
disregards 36:14	18:19 196:18	100.12 102.8,10	duty 11:13 26:18	effective 22:21
disrespect 19:11	documentation	104:15 133:3	36:6 40:3 74:19	33:15 35:16 44:3
53:14	71:2	137:20 138:2,5	74:20,23 75:14	45:10 48:13
disruption 62:3	documented 86:20	190:11 191:6	87:7 138:25	168:16 199:17
174:5	documents 17:18	194:16,22 195:5	140:5 168:12,25	203:20
dissatisfaction	114:8 171:8	200:12,15 201:14	dying 78:8	effectively 28:5
181:18	dog 103:8 171:14	203:15	dynamic 127:20	44:8 48:14 55:7
dissembling 20:19	doing 48:13	draconian 128:12	127:22	166:9 177:3
dissent 101:16	117:13 124:16	drafted 203:6,8		199:2
dissimilar 20:1	132:15 133:25	dranted 203:0,8 dragged 143:22	dysfunction 30:3 dysfunctional	effects 10:12 31:22
uissiiiiiai 20.1	134.13 133.43	uraggeu 143.22	uysiuncuonai 	57:6 58:10 59:8
	<u> </u>	<u>l</u>	<u> </u>	37.0 30.10 37.0

				Page 218
00 14 101 5	1.2.4.1.5.10	01.504.5102.22		
83:14 101:5	113:4 115:19	81:5 94:5 102:23	equipment 180:15	everyday 41:5
106:12 194:1	emphasised 72:24	157:5 161:10	180:17	170:18
effort 162:3	93:11 167:4	174:14 175:9	equipped 165:7	evidence 1:17,18
efforts 171:4	emphasises 69:19	203:3	188:14 194:12	2:4 6:15 7:1,4,14
<b>Egyptian</b> 171:22	emphasising	ensured 54:18	erode 31:23	8:13,18,21 9:2,4
EHRR 55:24,24	114:19 118:3	ensuring 21:13	error 184:2	9:6,7,8,10,11
57:9,22	employed 178:2	55:3 156:11	escalating 105:2	14:7 18:8 19:9
eight 144:23	192:1	entail 143:15	escalation 150:20	19:15,16 20:20
Eighth 12:19	employees 178:2	entailed 71:15	escapes 197:4	20:25 22:5,14
either 27:5,25	184:2	entered 86:13	especially 31:5	23:2,22 24:8,17
46:15 86:10	empowered	90:23 139:22	107:2	25:1,19 26:12,13
132:17 135:11	159:25	entering 101:25	essential 3:8 85:2	30:9,21,23 32:24
137:20 175:6	enable 4:21 5:4	entire 22:25 82:15	essentially 141:6	33:5,18 34:12
177:21 183:23	191:14,18 198:9	201:19	149:6 201:21	35:8 36:16,20
201:1	enacted 65:24	entirely 86:11	establish 165:6	37:25 39:14
El-Masri 55:24	encounter 164:23	123:11,15 124:20	established 6:17	40:23,25 41:24
59:10	encouraged	187:16	8:24	42:6,8,15 43:9,11
elaborate 7:6 8:13	176:13	entirety 96:23	establishing 115:5	43:21 44:2,14,23
elastic 98:2	ended 71:10 91:12	entitled 70:7	establishments	45:2 46:11 47:14
electric 104:11	193:1 204:8	150:24	135:23	47:16 48:1 49:16
element 12:12	endorse 107:8	entity 200:7	estate 51:22	49:23,25 50:6,15
156:11 157:14	201:25 202:4	entrenched 107:3	113:24 114:1	50:17,23 51:1,3
191:23 195:17	ends 138:20	135:10 143:18	147:15	53:7 54:13 58:18
elements 7:8 8:14 eleventh 13:1	endured 55:13 61:5	entrenches 110:10 entrusted 20:22	et 2:15,18 133:4 145:5,6	61:23,23 63:12 64:25 67:4 68:3
elicit 62:11	energise 147:2	entrusted 20.22 entry 85:24 87:2	ether 86:10	69:2,4 72:24
eliminated 45:23	energise 147:2 energy 147:7	entry 85:24 87:2 environment 3:6	ethics 77:11 79:23	77:15 78:16,24
emaciated 18:5	enforcement 17:10	19:11 21:25	ethos 38:4 158:20	82:11 83:5 84:7
email 128:10	20:7 21:3 25:5	26:11 30:25	199:21	87:24 88:3 89:2
emails 111:16	32:12,19 125:1	31:10 32:9 36:24	EU 76:3	91:7 92:14,18
embedded 41:8	135:10,15 144:7	38:1 39:8 41:23	European 6:4,9,16	93:10 95:22 96:7
144:25	engage 27:19	47:13 72:22	7:2 9:19,22 11:3	97:18 98:6
embellished	134:15 165:21	85:17 92:15,21	57:13,23	100:12 101:8
182:19	engaged 139:8	100:4,16 114:5	evacuation 180:9	102:21 108:21,24
embodiment 83:16	157:8 159:11	118:19 134:23	180:12	102:21 108:21,24
emerged 84:7	177:22	135:12 146:11	evaluate 191:25	110:19 111:2,7
Emergency 171:22	engagement 86:9	158:9 176:12,14	evaluating 28:16	112:22,23 115:9
emerges 118:8	160:21 165:1	178:1,8 181:24	evaluation 6:14	116:11,19,23
emotional 58:22	engages 27:23	196:24 199:21,24	evasion 20:19	117:1,6,11,21,22
191:5	37:2 203:16	200:18	evenings 181:4	118:8,11,23
emotions 191:20	engaging 164:13	episode 10:18 61:5	event 25:22 44:7	121:23,24 122:9
empathetic 131:4	engendered 40:20	93:16 103:17	65:13 68:24	122:12 125:19
empathy 18:12	English 85:15	episodes 75:4	180:11 204:3	126:25 127:4,5,6
131:8 153:19	88:10 135:20	epithets 79:10	events 22:13 57:13	127:19 128:9,15
156:15 165:6	enjoyed 81:13	equal 15:19	64:4,17,17 184:3	129:7 130:6,7,9
191:19 201:10	161:25	Equality 34:14	195:22	130:16,23 131:3
emphasis 129:5	enormous 116:23	equally 19:13	eventually 193:6	131:5,17 137:10
161:20 162:10	ensued 71:12	52:12 152:2,10	ever-present 42:18	138:6 144:25
emphasise 32:8	ensure 16:4,13	equip 41:23	everybody 132:3	145:10 147:18
	, -			
	I		I	I

148:7 150:17,21
151:14,16,22
152:13,14 154:11
154:23 155:4   159:1,10 160:12   74:17 83:7 95:12   exposure 57:25   capress 4:9 137:1   facing 124:6   168:3 169:25   170:1,20 171:7   172:4 173:1   151:6,7,10,18   173:4   173:1   151:6,7,10,18   177:21 179:12   examples 49:19   153:16,21 166:21   expressing 134:20   expression 5:23   expression 4:23   34:1 36:12 39:10   examples 49:19   166:20 171:11   173:5   expression 6:23   expression 4:23   34:1 36:12 39:10   expression 4:23   159:22 160:11   expression 5:23   expression 4:23   expression 4:23   34:1 36:12 39:10   expression 5:23   expression 5:23   expression 6:23   expression 6:23   expression 6:23   expression 6:23   expression 6:23   expression 6:23   expression 4:23   5:15,23 144:21   fo:21 76:21 78:20   expression 5:23   expression 6:23   exp
156:15,21 160:23
166:1 169:6
170:1,20 171:7   172:4 173:1   151:6,7,10,18   153:16,21 166:21   expressing 134:20   examples 49:19   167:21,24 168:2   expression 5:23   expression 5:24   expression 5:23   expression 5:24   expression 5:24   fig.13   fig.13   fig.13   fig.13   fig.13   fig.13   fig.13   fig.13
172:8,18 173:4   189:9   153:16,21 166:21   expressing 134:20   expression 5:23   8:1,12 26:13   182:7,12,16,20   83:18 89:3   168:3 174:24   expression 4:23   34:1 36:12 39:10   183:8 184:18   106:20 171:11   192:7   experienced 7:3   159:22 160:11   76:21 78:20   expression 5:23   expression 4:23   34:1 36:12 39:10   5:15,23 144:21   62:2 69:24 71:3   185:10,12,21   173:5   experienced 7:3   159:22 160:11   76:21 78:20   extended 99:9   91:1 97:20   extended 99:9   91:1 97:20   extended 99:9   91:1 97:20   extended 99:9   91:1 97:20   extension 52:11   100:14 101:7   191:21 192:16,18   exceptionally   167:11 168:18   extensive 17:20   199:6 111:9   199:3   42:4 63:24   133:13,25 136:12   exchange 115:25   exchange 115:25   exchange 115:25   exchange 187:18   excitement 30:17   extended 99:9   91:1 97:20   109:6 111:9   13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:1
177:21 179:12
182:7,12,16,20
183:8 184:18
185:10,12,21       173:5       exaperienced 7:3       159:22 160:11       76:21 78:20         186:3,8,23 187:4       188:4,19 189:3,7       193:5       85:21 101:21       extended 99:9       91:1 97:20         189:17 190:7       excellent 171:3       123:20 161:23       extension 52:11       100:14 101:7         191:21 192:16,18       177:25       169:3 172:25       18:8 118:23       112:24 114:9         194:3 195:1,8,24       excessive 24:6       174:2 195:22       extent 34:22 41:7       121:25 130:22         196:20 197:7,10       105:15       199:3       42:4 63:24       133:13,25 136:12         199:13,23       exchange 115:25       experiences 16:8       100:22 109:23       146:21 149:3,19         199:13,23       excitement 30:17       excitement 30:17       169:6 172:24       143:9       159:3,22 161:2         evidence-based       excitement 30:17       194:13       excreal 174:22       164:9 167:1         evident 69:2       exemplary 123:15       exemplary 123:15       exererice 25:24       exererice 25:24       172:14       extradition 76:2       183:2 192:17         evidently 60:14       exercise 25:24       exercise 25:24       190:23       extradition 76:2       183:2 192:17         evidently 60:14       exercise 25:24       exerci
186:3,8,23 187:4         exasperation         16:5 73:12 85:17         expressly 123:13         84:16 90:13,14           188:4,19 189:3,7         193:5         excellent 171:3         excellent 171:3         extended 99:9         91:1 97:20           189:17 190:7         exceptionally         167:11 168:18         extension 52:11         100:14 101:7           191:21 192:16,18         177:25         169:3 172:25         18:8 118:23         112:24 114:9           194:3 195:1,8,24         excessive 24:6         174:2 195:22         extent 34:22 41:7         121:25 130:22           197:13 198:12         105:15         199:3         42:4 63:24         133:13,25 136:12           199:13,23         exchange 115:25         199:3         42:4 63:24         133:13,25 136:12           199:13,23         122:15         65:7 98:25         113:12 115:20         156:3 157:1,14           evidence-based         exchanges 187:18         103:15 160:9         143:9         159:3,22 161:2           evidenced 29:5         excent 185:19         194:13         external 174:22         164:9 167:1           evident 69:2         exemplified 41:24         190:23         extradition 76:2         183:2 192:17           evidently 60:14         exercise 25:24         190:23         extraordinary         97:1
188:4,19 189:3,7       193:5       85:21 101:21       extended 99:9       91:1 97:20         189:17 190:7       excellent 171:3       123:20 161:23       extension 52:11       100:14 101:7         191:21 192:16,18       177:25       169:3 172:25       18:8 118:23       112:24 114:9         194:3 195:1,8,24       177:25       169:3 172:25       18:8 118:23       112:24 114:9         196:20 197:7,10       105:15       199:3       42:4 63:24       133:13,25 136:12         197:13 198:12       exchange 115:25       experiences 16:8       100:22 109:23       146:21 149:3,19         199:13,23       122:15       65:7 98:25       113:12 115:20       156:3 157:1,14         evidence-based       exchanges 187:18       103:15 160:9       143:9       159:3,22 161:2         evidenced 29:5       excuse 185:19       194:13       external 174:22       164:9 167:1         evident 69:2       exemplary 123:15       102:6 111:23       extradition 76:2       183:2 192:17         evidently 60:14       exercise 25:24       190:23       extraordinary       97:15         67:22       28:19 44:8,9       47:14 98:10       extreme 44:19       29:12 37:19 43:4         exacerbate 27:19       195:18       103:18 160:22       65:17 119:7       193:13
189:17 190:7       excellent 171:3       123:20 161:23       extension 52:11       100:14 101:7         191:21 192:16,18       177:25       169:3 172:25       18:8 118:23       112:24 114:9         194:3 195:1,8,24       excessive 24:6       174:2 195:22       extent 34:22 41:7       121:25 130:22         196:20 197:7,10       105:15       199:3       extent 34:22 41:7       121:25 130:22         199:13,23       122:15       exchange 115:25       experiences 16:8       100:22 109:23       146:21 149:3,19         199:13,23       122:15       65:7 98:25       113:12 115:20       156:3 157:1,14         evidence-based       exchanges 187:18       103:15 160:9       143:9       159:3,22 161:2         evidenced 29:5       excuse 185:19       194:13       external 174:22       164:9 167:1         evident 69:2       exemplary 123:15       experiencing       179:14       178:17 182:10         evidently 60:14       exercise 25:24       190:23       extraordinary       97:15         evidently 60:14       exercise 25:24       190:23       extraordinary       97:15         exacerbate 27:19       76:15 178:12,13       47:14 98:10       extreme 44:19       29:12 37:19 43:4         exacerbate 27:19       195:18       103:18 160:22
191:21 192:16,18
193:7,17,24
194:3 195:1,8,24       excessive 24:6       174:2 195:22       extent 34:22 41:7       121:25 130:22         196:20 197:7,10       105:15       199:3       42:4 63:24       133:13,25 136:12         197:13 198:12       exchange 115:25       experiences 16:8       100:22 109:23       146:21 149:3,19         199:13,23       122:15       65:7 98:25       113:12 115:20       156:3 157:1,14         evidence-based       exchanges 187:18       103:15 160:9       143:9       159:3,22 161:2         evidenced 29:5       excitement 30:17       169:6 172:24       external 174:22       164:9 167:1         evident 69:2       exemplary 123:15       194:13       extra 171:25       173:9,23 174:3         evidently 60:14       exemplified 41:24       102:6 111:23       extradition 76:2       183:2 192:17         evidently 60:14       exercise 25:24       190:23       extraordinary       97:15         evidently 60:14       exercise 25:24       190:23       extreme 44:19       29:12 37:19 43:4         67:22       28:19 44:8,9       47:14 98:10       extreme 44:19       29:12 37:19 43:4         exacerbate 27:19       195:18       103:18 160:22       65:17 119:7       193:13 196:16         66:2       exercises 203:2       172:18       extremely 91
196:20 197:7,10       105:15       199:3       42:4 63:24       133:13,25 136:12         197:13 198:12       exchange 115:25       experiences 16:8       100:22 109:23       146:21 149:3,19         199:13,23       122:15       65:7 98:25       113:12 115:20       156:3 157:1,14         evidence-based       exchanges 187:18       103:15 160:9       143:9       159:3,22 161:2         evidenced 29:5       excitement 30:17       169:6 172:24       external 174:22       164:9 167:1         evident 69:2       exemplary 123:15       experiencing       179:14       178:17 182:10         evidently 60:14       exercise 25:24       102:6 111:23       extradition 76:2       183:2 192:17         evidently 60:14       exercise 25:24       190:23       extraordinary       97:15         evidently 65:2,9       28:19 44:8,9       47:14 98:10       extreme 44:19       29:12 37:19 43:4         exacerbate 27:19       195:18       103:18 160:22       65:17 119:7       193:13 196:16         66:2       exercises 203:2       172:18       extremely 91:19       factors 16:22 32:4
197:13 198:12   exchange 115:25   experiences 16:8   100:22 109:23   146:21 149:3,19   156:3 157:1,14   159:3,22 161:2   excitement 30:17   excitement 30:17   excuse 185:19   194:13   exchange 185:19   188:7   exemplary 123:15   exemplified 41:24   exercise 25:24   exercise 25:24   exercise 25:24   exercise 25:24   exercise 25:24   exercise 27:19   66:2   exercises 203:2   exercise 16:8   100:22 109:23   146:21 149:3,19   156:3 157:1,14   159:3,22 161:2   external 174:22   external 174:22   164:9 167:1   extra 171:25   173:9,23 174:3   179:14   extradition 76:2   173:9,23 174:3   179:14   extradition 76:2   183:2 192:17   extradition 76:2   183:2 192:17   facto 39:17 74:9   extraordinary   97:15   factor 11:5 23:7   extraordinary   extraordinary   65:17 119:7   193:13 196:16   extremely 91:19   factors 16:22 32:4
199:13,23
evidence-based         exchanges 187:18         103:15 160:9         143:9         159:3,22 161:2           43:25         excitement 30:17         169:6 172:24         external 174:22         164:9 167:1           evidenced 29:5         excuse 185:19         194:13         extra 171:25         173:9,23 174:3           41:3 156:18         188:7         experiencing         179:14         178:17 182:10           evident 69:2         exemplary 123:15         exemplified 41:24         extradition 76:2         183:2 192:17           evidently 60:14         exercise 25:24         190:23         extraordinary         97:15           67:22         28:19 44:8,9         expert 26:12 35:3         58:13         factor 11:5 23:7           EWHC 55:2,9         76:15 178:12,13         47:14 98:10         extreme 44:19         29:12 37:19 43:4           exacerbate 27:19         195:18         103:18 160:22         65:17 119:7         193:13 196:16           66:2         exercises 203:2         172:18         extremely 91:19         factors 16:22 32:4
43:25       excitement 30:17       169:6 172:24       external 174:22       164:9 167:1         evidenced 29:5       188:7       experiencing       179:14       178:17 182:10         evident 69:2       exemplary 123:15       102:6 111:23       extradition 76:2       183:2 192:17         evidently 60:14       exercise 25:24       190:23       extraordinary       97:15         67:22       28:19 44:8,9       expert 26:12 35:3       58:13       factor 11:5 23:7         EWHC 55:2,9       76:15 178:12,13       47:14 98:10       extreme 44:19       29:12 37:19 43:4         exacerbate 27:19       195:18       103:18 160:22       65:17 119:7       193:13 196:16         66:2       exercises 203:2       172:18       extremely 91:19       factors 16:22 32:4
evidenced 29:5         excuse 185:19         194:13         extra 171:25         173:9,23 174:3           41:3 156:18         188:7         experiencing         179:14         178:17 182:10           evident 69:2         exemplary 123:15         102:6 111:23         extradition 76:2         183:2 192:17           evidently 60:14         exercise 25:24         190:23         extraordinary         97:15           67:22         28:19 44:8,9         expert 26:12 35:3         58:13         factor 11:5 23:7           EWHC 55:2,9         76:15 178:12,13         47:14 98:10         extreme 44:19         29:12 37:19 43:4           exacerbate 27:19         195:18         103:18 160:22         65:17 119:7         193:13 196:16           66:2         exercises 203:2         172:18         extremely 91:19         factors 16:22 32:4
41:3 156:18       188:7       experiencing       179:14       178:17 182:10         evident 69:2       exemplary 123:15       102:6 111:23       extradition 76:2       183:2 192:17         evidently 60:14       exercise 25:24       190:23       extraordinary       97:15         67:22       28:19 44:8,9       expert 26:12 35:3       58:13       factor 11:5 23:7         EWHC 55:2,9       76:15 178:12,13       47:14 98:10       extreme 44:19       29:12 37:19 43:4         exacerbate 27:19       195:18       103:18 160:22       65:17 119:7       193:13 196:16         66:2       exercises 203:2       172:18       extremely 91:19       factors 16:22 32:4
evident 69:2         exemplary 123:15         102:6 111:23         extradition 76:2         183:2 192:17           evidently 60:14         exercise 25:24         190:23         extraordinary         97:15           EWHC 55:2,9         76:15 178:12,13         47:14 98:10         extreme 44:19         29:12 37:19 43:4           exacerbate 27:19         195:18         103:18 160:22         65:17 119:7         193:13 196:16           66:2         exercises 203:2         172:18         extremely 91:19         factors 16:22 32:4
evidential 15:5,16         exemplified 41:24         114:10 176:2         76:13         facto 39:17 74:9           evidently 60:14         exercise 25:24         190:23         extraordinary         97:15           67:22         28:19 44:8,9         expert 26:12 35:3         58:13         factor 11:5 23:7           EWHC 55:2,9         76:15 178:12,13         47:14 98:10         extreme 44:19         29:12 37:19 43:4           exacerbate 27:19         195:18         103:18 160:22         65:17 119:7         193:13 196:16           66:2         exercises 203:2         172:18         extremely 91:19         factors 16:22 32:4
evidently 60:14         exercise 25:24         190:23         extraordinary         97:15           67:22         28:19 44:8,9         expert 26:12 35:3         58:13         factor 11:5 23:7           EWHC 55:2,9         76:15 178:12,13         47:14 98:10         extreme 44:19         29:12 37:19 43:4           exacerbate 27:19         195:18         103:18 160:22         65:17 119:7         193:13 196:16           66:2         exercises 203:2         172:18         extremely 91:19         factors 16:22 32:4
67:22       28:19 44:8,9       expert 26:12 35:3       58:13       factor 11:5 23:7         EWHC 55:2,9       76:15 178:12,13       47:14 98:10       extreme 44:19       29:12 37:19 43:4         exacerbate 27:19       195:18       103:18 160:22       65:17 119:7       193:13 196:16         66:2       exercises 203:2       172:18       extremely 91:19       factors 16:22 32:4
EWHC 55:2,9 exacerbate 27:19       76:15 178:12,13   47:14 98:10   103:18 160:22   66:2       extreme 44:19   65:17 119:7   193:13 196:16   193:13 196:16   172:18
exacerbate 27:19         195:18         103:18 160:22         65:17 119:7         193:13 196:16           66:2         exercises 203:2         172:18         extremely 91:19         factors 16:22 32:4
66:2   exercises 203:2   172:18   extremely 91:19   factors 16:22 32:4
exactivated 27.14   exections 07.21   explain 33.24   113.24 103.23   32.3 43.1 43.11
65:1,16 <b>exhibited</b> 81:16 56:11 59:1 98:17 184:21 59:1,14,18 81:2,5
exacerbating   119:8   160:19   eyes 103:14   166:16 173:21
11:18 29:12   exhibits 80:1   explained 5:12   eyes 103:14   100:10 173:21   195:18,19
65:19   exhibits 80.1   explained 3.12   F   facts 3:11,21 4:22
exacerbation 36:7   existed 9:11   37.8,13 37.8   F 119:20   5:5 6:16,24 8:23
exact 51:1   existence 72:3   44:13 61:18,20   face 19:16 90:18   15:6 173:6
exactly 36:8 49:16   expand 46:23   64:25 128:18   123:19 162:8   177:15
examination 85:24 expect 126:8 139:19 168:14 factual 3:23
173:6   150:22   explanation 34:16   faced 40:10 161:5   fade 147:7
examine 140:10,11   expected 93:25   60:22 76:9   facetious 184:11   fades 147:7
141:23 151:5   147:19 181:12   explicit 29:6   facie 7:11   Fagbo 117:25
examined 84:12 expeditiously exploited 101:9 facilitate 34:7
90:13 129:25
examining 89:7   experience 16:9,19   exposed 17:8   facilitating 34:20   87:15
124:10 142:23
179:3 30:23 40:24 74:20 169:12 <b>facilities</b> 85:8 38:11 40:4 96:21
178:4 184:22

				Page 220
102 22 104 20	6 . 11 . 70 10	155 10 160 1		5211716
102:23 104:20	fatality 78:19	155:19 169:1	firefighting 134:14	5:3,11 7:16
161:13 190:15	fault 157:9	198:19	firmly 44:6	152:13
194:19,22 202:23	favour 148:14	filled 132:25 174:1	first 1:14 3:11 7:16	flight 32:18 71:7
failing 19:19 81:10	favoured 7:17	filleted 158:5	8:21 11:12 12:6	71:10 85:4
132:20 188:13	fear 11:1 13:12	filling 127:11	13:3 14:9,19	flights 30:6
failings 20:10	31:3 40:21 50:10	filmed 60:11 121:4	15:5 23:19 30:21	floor 160:7
83:17 183:9	70:25 91:23	121:13 122:12	32:8 35:14 45:20	flourished 40:16
190:11	103:12 105:13	filming 120:18,21	49:9 51:5,11	flow 6:15 123:12
fails 25:21	fearful 74:12	121:3	52:3 56:22 58:18	flows 27:12 135:1
failure 2:17 18:20	fearing 103:14	filtered 50:16	59:25 71:20 83:6	fluent 85:15 88:10
20:2,16 22:2	fears 175:20	<b>final</b> 140:3 176:11	94:16 95:17	fluid 59:17
25:9 27:22 34:17	<b>feature</b> 43:12	176:11	119:15 123:13	<b>fly</b> 77:4,8,11 81:9
35:4 37:17 43:5	70:17	finally 1:20 8:16	128:14 135:20	89:7 90:11
45:16 48:8 54:16	featured 189:12	11:23 13:10	136:25 137:22	focus 9:20 132:3
54:23 59:16 68:8	features 29:25	14:11 33:12 42:8	155:16,22,23	174:11 191:17
71:12 75:15	37:24 156:6	47:10 75:16 80:9	160:12 168:4	203:22
81:20 85:24 86:1	February 54:9 71:2 90:1 125:7	80:11 90:7,17	173:11,14,15,22	<b>focused</b> 155:13 172:14 191:13
87:5 88:4 99:25		93:8 104:15	174:13 177:7	
107:4 141:20	<b>feeding</b> 134:8	105:14 107:10	181:14 190:17	focuses 27:10
158:15 159:2	160:8	122:21 174:12	194:9 200:1	<b>folded</b> 87:19
160:5 163:14	feel 81:2 91:19,25	203:25	first-floor 61:18	follow 1:13 6:18
164:4 167:3 173:24	92:2 104:11 138:9 145:3	<b>financial</b> 167:21 196:18	<b>firstly</b> 56:7 69:20 73:12 74:20	26:9 47:12 86:7 <b>followed</b> 7:14
		find 8:10,19 10:2	fishing 182:17	11:10 14:4 61:3
<b>failures</b> 2:24 3:3,5 3:6 13:25 21:8	175:1,17 <b>feeling</b> 11:18 91:3	29:23 69:7 72:6	fit 20:21 33:7 77:4	65:13,17 71:16
27:3,4 35:11	128:6 159:25	72:12 75:19	77:4,7,8,11 81:8	154:23
36:18,21,23	181:6,19 198:14	81:17 89:1 99:13	81:9,9 89:6,7,14	<b>following</b> 7:13
69:14,22 72:9	feelings 11:1 13:12	100:15 131:14	90:11,11,22	8:20 12:2 34:2
74:21 85:22,23	78:25	132:10 172:21	161:19 169:24	56:6 60:10 66:22
196:9	feels 136:18	find' 5:18,22	172:12	69:19 71:20
fairly 4:5,16 80:13	155:14 178:19	finding 3:9 5:24	five 22:21 57:23	77:23 98:1 159:4
faith 91:16	feet 129:2	11:7 26:2 55:17	66:22 71:15	181:10 202:25
fall 204:6	feigned 76:22	69:9 76:4 131:19	105:16 125:14,25	204:17
falls 59:7	felt 31:9 49:11	142:24 189:25	139:11 144:20	follows 126:15
falsely 59:15 80:22	78:5,9,14 98:18	findings 1:9,24 3:4	202:6	155:16
familiar 42:22	98:19,20 103:9	4:17,24 16:12	five-minute 143:1	<b>food</b> 58:1 59:17
71:11	104:7,25 115:11	27:3 33:11 46:6	fixed 96:3 179:20	65:21 67:2 83:20
familiarly 100:24	127:20 128:1	48:16 54:11	204:3	98:15,18 104:24
families 175:3	162:2 165:16	108:9 134:5,6	fixes 197:3	180:21
family 44:14 45:11	170:23 181:2	141:1,8,9 143:10	flagrantly 33:8	footage 17:16,17
76:11 136:14,17	female 118:12	155:8 190:2	flash 103:15	58:24 62:11,12
far 23:2 102:19	fester 188:16	202:3,5	flashback 65:25	63:2,12 66:8
111:15 142:21	fiction 135:3	finds 3:21 136:5,6	flashbacks 70:22	67:13 74:1 77:15
153:21 174:16	fictions 124:13	fine 154:16 176:20	92:4 102:6 103:3	78:19 79:9 84:12
176:3 178:13	fiddling 112:18	197:4	103:6	94:16 100:24
189:16	Fiddy 73:16	finger 89:17	flat 134:12	110:20 113:17
Farrell 73:25 74:6	fifth 8:10 9:7	finish 106:1,15	flawed 163:3	116:8,9,10,13
<b>fashion</b> 203:3	12:13 56:18	finished 185:2	fled 70:13	122:2,14 133:14
fast 48:6	67:24 69:24	fire 30:11 98:19	flexible 4:11,20	136:22 138:24
	, , , <u> </u>			
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 221
140.0 0 100.0	fostor 152.10 10	friend 117:25	174.11 100.11	120.22 24 120.2
140:8,9 180:8 182:22 187:19	foster 153:18,19 fosters 149:22	friend 11/:25 friends 83:9 118:1	174:11 199:11 204:9	129:23,24 130:3
	Fosu 108:19	118:1,2,7	Furthermore	130:13,18 153:16 154:3
footing 15:19 footnote 21:5	foul 177:24 182:4	front 140:20	49:25 202:18	general 29:23 31:8
force 17:25 18:16	found 4:20 5:16,20	frontline 15:21	future 62:19 94:14	72:22 106:25
	6:9 9:23 22:23	frustrate 187:20	142:17 160:17	
18:17,19 23:18			173:13	generalisations 49:23
23:23 24:7 30:2 30:5 37:7,9	23:16 25:21 28:6 31:18 33:22	<b>frustrated</b> 60:21 170:2 191:9	1/3:13	
38:18 39:11,23	34:10 54:8 60:6	198:15	G	generally 52:21 124:22 134:7
40:7 49:20 50:17	60:10 72:22 73:2	frustration 85:6	G 132:2,2 197:3	158:16 181:2
60:11 61:16,21	73:3 100:7 137:1	167:25 179:1,10	<b>G4S</b> 16:2 20:11,16	185:24
67:21 68:22	143:24 183:25	181:19 183:16	20:20 23:10	generations 94:14
	192:7 199:15	frustrations	26:14 34:22	S
73:13 74:1,3 77:18,21 81:9	200:4 201:22	183:22	42:15 43:8 47:1	generic 13:25
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			47:16 49:12,19	gentle 114:3 127:9
84:22 92:5	four 74:5 75:17	fuck 136:17	50:5 52:9,13,14	genuine 156:17 187:11
105:18 106:12 107:1 127:14	82:13 89:4 91:5 92:2 97:24 112:9	149:24	62:9 63:17 68:1	= :
132:1 133:5,7,9	121:25 139:11	<b>fucking</b> 60:16 67:11 83:23	83:22 105:21	genuinely 113:18 Germany 103:25
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		fulfil 17:13	121:9 124:22,23	· ·
133:10,11,21 138:20 139:3,9	144:16,16 <b>fourth</b> 8:6 9:4		128:22 129:15	getting 90:11 186:25 200:8
139:25 140:1	11:23 12:11	<b>fulfilling</b> 45:21 <b>full</b> 4:21 5:4 15:6	130:15 131:3	Ginn 44:14 47:8
143:3 156:13	37:18 56:15 67:5	18:21 31:19 57:2	132:20 178:14	Giraldo 171:18
	82:13 86:14	62:8 122:2 177:5	181:1 184:25	
158:17 160:15,21 <b>forced</b> 110:2	154:1 155:18	fully 19:23 92:2	187:15 189:21	give 3:11 15:16 25:11 63:2 82:10
	167:8 196:14	fully-kitted 77:20	190:8,13 191:1	85:23 89:12
forcibly 106:21 forcing 98:7	fragility 101:19	function 22:15	192:9 196:15	92:16 93:10
foreign 173:17	framework 26:17	42:11 96:12	197:7,8,10	94:22 102:10
200:14	France 57:8	150:3	198:15 201:10	111:2 128:14
	Francis 60:12		<b>G4S-Home</b> 197:3	179:19 189:20
foreigners 32:12 forestall 26:20	172:5 185:6,7,12	functionality 127:2	Gage 5:10	given 8:16 9:2,18
	185:15,19 186:7	functioned 102:24	gain 60:23 67:14	25:15 31:9 33:1
forget 87:18	186:18 187:8,23	functions 17:13	165:4,18	93:10,13 104:14
<b>forgive</b> 136:5 <b>forgotten</b> 73:10,10	188:5,7,19 189:3	20:23 177:14	gained 200:16	119:14 121:24
form 29:11 70:4	189:11,17 190:19	fundamental	Galappathie	144:19 150:5
103:2 133:12	193:16 194:6	19:12 20:2 23:1	103:18	161:7 164:3
183:12	197:20 198:5	28:13 40:3 51:19	<b>gambling</b> 173:19	166:5 167:3
formal 70:1	197.20 198.3	115:2 143:19	gaps 127:11,12	184:4 189:21
former 15:16	Francis' 187:13	146:12 150:9	132:25	191:13 192:15
34:19 92:23	188:10 189:2	fundamentally	Gasson 34:23	194:6
110:25 153:17	192:16 194:3	25:16 42:6 52:6	52:20 68:19	giving 24:17 31:6
165:2 184:2	196:6 202:25	112:18 114:20	126:21,22,23	89:10 95:7 129:2
189:2	Fraser 60:12	funeral 138:10	127:24 128:23	145:2 154:19
formerly 155:4	172:6,9	funny 170:25	131:10 132:14	156:15,20 160:23
forms 27:8 42:21	free 4:16 6:14	further 13:2,7,10	gatekeeper 71:4	189:17
67:22 74:3 80:5	freedom 158:22	44:4 50:14 53:4	Gatwick 34:18	glad 185:1
147:1 171:8	166:22	55:11 62:8 63:22	49:20	glasses 98:16
<b>fortiori</b> 56:1	frequently 30:25	65:17,18,19 76:6	gay 74:12 118:12	glimpse 71:22
forum 160:13,25	99:7	79:6 92:1 129:5	Gayatri 118:21,25	gloss 55:19
forward 47:11	fret 85:4	140:25 145:22	GDWG 100:2,7	go 14:24 16:23
101 Wai U 7/.11	11000.7	170.43 173.44	119:2,5 127:6,8	gu 17.27 10.23
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>

				Page 222
40.10 (1.10 (2.1		an:14 6.12	hammy 77.12	140.5
48:10 61:19 62:1	grab 74:7	guilt 6:12	happy 77:12	140:5
62:23 63:5 78:15	grabbed 73:25	guilty 16:20	hard 23:6 35:3,23	he/she 4:16
83:23 84:3 93:17	grade 167:10	116:19 184:10,10	36:11,16 37:8,15	head 35:6 60:8
94:25 103:13	Graham 42:23	guinea 101:10	39:21,25 45:6,9	64:22 73:17 74:1
112:21 113:10	83:22 118:21	guise 63:10	64:25 68:24	74:4,7,8 78:6
119:19,20,21,22	162:7	Gurney 42:24	78:24 82:9 88:3	115:21
138:16 140:14	<b>Grand</b> 27:16	guys 170:22	88:9 91:7 92:23	head's 129:2
141:3 143:20	grandmother	186:15	93:4 95:10 96:14	headings 1:14
145:17 152:13,22	138:11	Н	98:3 100:12	<b>heads</b> 94:17
153:1 154:10	granular 110:21	-	102:16 109:3	health 10:13 11:17
197:16,24 199:8	graphically 17:8	HA 55:1	136:5 138:2	12:22 27:19
201:15	105:15	Hajrulahu 58:13	148:17 150:9	36:25 55:4 64:10
<b>goal</b> 15:14	Grass 159:8,9	half 61:7 100:21	191:6 193:11	81:1,6 84:16
goes 59:1 89:23	199:1	105:16 112:9	194:16,22 195:5	85:24 86:3,15,18
90:5 115:21	<b>grateful</b> 13:20,21	133:12 137:4	201:14 203:15	89:8 90:3,9
118:20 124:15,24	93:9,15 123:16	half-naked 78:11	<b>Hard's</b> 96:6 138:5	91:16 92:25 99:1
138:14 140:3	204:12	hallmarks 40:9	hard-nosed 188:21	99:3,11,18
189:10,16	gratitude 123:22	43:2 44:20	harder 121:25	100:21 102:3
going 1:15,20	grave 4:8 16:20	<b>Hamish</b> 101:18	135:21,24 151:11	105:3 138:4
14:21,25 24:19	gravity 36:5 41:16	hand 59:14	hardest 121:8	146:25 151:20
30:19 47:11	great 145:2,12	handcuffs 78:11	hardship 27:18	163:22 164:5,7
60:16 62:15	greater 11:17	78:21 79:8	harm 20:10 23:7	165:11 169:17,20
67:11 73:9 95:15	69:16 120:8	handed 134:7	25:4 27:8 28:25	171:23 175:8
107:18,19 108:2	159:19 203:2	handful 16:20	33:18,19 36:7,8	179:7 183:20
112:16,21 113:10	greatest 88:23	handheld 17:17	37:1 44:19 45:14	187:9,18 188:9
113:10,11 121:6	greatly 167:20	handover 106:22	45:19,24 46:19	188:12 190:18
121:11 134:9	grinding 110:20	hands 104:8	66:18 79:6,18	191:1,7,16,23
141:3 142:3	groaning 78:12	Hanford 33:2	94:11 100:14	192:12 194:14
143:14 146:5	gross 50:3	131:2 157:12	102:2 187:12	195:25 196:10,25
150:4,4 176:17	<b>ground</b> 24:6 32:15	171:1 201:9	196:2	201:7 202:13
176:18 180:1	42:13 139:11	hanging 74:16	harm's 102:17	203:10,19
186:24 187:25	181:1,5	happen 46:5 94:6	harmed 26:24	healthcare 25:7
201:12	grounds 71:4	101:11 105:12	93:5 96:1 123:6	35:6 41:21 46:9
good 1:3,3 89:10	76:19 106:5	110:16 128:21	harmful 30:4	46:12 50:1 84:6
94:12 96:14	127:15	147:19	Harmondsworth	85:9 86:9,19
97:15 131:7	group 34:19	happened 15:6	72:20	87:11 89:12
139:23 161:18	164:21 180:13	47:22 65:5 66:22	harms 93:19,21,25	90:15 91:2,4,18
181:3 186:9,9,16	189:2 200:14	69:10 93:14 94:5	Harrison 13:21,22	91:24 92:7 97:4
191:3	groups 40:17	106:3 109:9,13	13:23 14:15,16	104:13 138:23
Goodman 14:10	44:16 116:7	123:23 140:8	14:23 15:3 30:18	194:19,22 196:5
53:23 54:1,2	growing 116:18	141:8,10,11,12	30:19 48:21	hear 14:18 19:8
81:25 204:24	181:18	141:25,25	115:7 204:22	31:1 62:13 66:11
Gordon 20:18	grown 23:5	happening 87:22	Harrison's 107:9	83:21 138:17
gotten 121:8	grudging 129:3	98:8 120:16,18	harrowing 19:8	144:2,2,4,6
governing 166:14	grudging 129.3 gruelling 128:11	132:18,23 134:16	harsh 21:20 37:24	145:16 152:21
governing 100:14 government	guarantee 72:4	147:25 149:3,16	39:7	176:19
200:17 202:22	guards 84:5,20	160:7,23 183:21		heard 22:6 40:16
	,	happens 62:19	harshly 191:3 hatch 187:21	
<b>GP</b> 35:7,11 45:20 91:15 102:6	guiding 63:3	109:22 110:11		46:12 50:6,15,23 51:1 55:16 66:9
71.13 102:0	guileless 114:4	137:25	Haughton 130:16	31.1 33.10 00:9
		157.25		I

				Page 223
			l	1
83:5,13,18 84:2,8	23:16 29:25 30:1	25:14 31:6 33:23	hooding 57:25	72:23 73:10 75:9
86:13 92:23 93:3	34:10 36:12 39:2	34:23 35:25 36:2	hope 14:16 108:4	75:18,20 79:3
94:6 97:17 105:9	55:21 58:25	36:14 38:3 40:2	121:10 126:13	80:25 82:12,15
108:18 109:12,16	66:25 68:10	43:7,24 44:24	136:4	82:20 83:17
110:21 111:6,6	76:12 164:3	45:7 46:9,15	hopeful 155:8	84:13 86:13,19
112:1 113:9	173:2 181:8	47:2 48:13 51:16	hopeless 124:21	87:2,4,12 90:23
115:8 121:24	high-levels 39:9	55:1,9 63:16	hopelessness	91:18,22,25 92:4
131:9 145:11	169:13 193:22	67:4 68:1,18	181:19	92:10 94:7,7
157:11 161:1	high-risk 38:25	70:9,23 71:2,6	hopes 53:19	96:5 98:12,22
162:23 169:25	high-security	72:4 73:21 76:5	horrendous 72:9	99:3,10 100:11
170:9 171:6	113:23,25	76:7,19,25 77:1,6	83:10	101:4,14,18,25
183:9 187:23	higher 162:3	79:6 80:6 81:3	horrific 186:23	102:5 103:13,15
188:5 194:17	200:12	82:19 83:23	horrified 198:20	103:16,23 104:20
199:12 204:13	highest 96:1	87:18,25 89:6,11	horrors 76:7	105:13,14,18,20
hearing 31:16	highlight 155:25	89:18 90:10,19	hospital 83:11	107:12 109:8
143:9 176:17	highlighted 15:4	92:13 93:1 95:18	91:16 97:12	111:23 116:3
hearings 1:20	39:25 168:12	95:20,22 96:17	139:17 171:24	117:17 119:13
16:10 170:12	192:16 193:16	97:4,7,24 99:6	hospitalisation	120:5 137:5
heart 16:10 32:4	highlighting 33:2	100:5,9 102:18	100:20	138:18 139:23
76:22,24 77:19	51:7	102:23 104:21	hospitalised 76:23	146:5 152:23
79:14 80:14	highly 28:22 65:10	105:21 107:4	79:14	153:4 155:11,20
104:6,18 156:25	74:24 115:17	108:12 112:11	hostile 32:9 91:21	156:2,7 157:7
heavily 33:21	171:18 191:15	124:24 126:8,11	129:3 134:22	158:10,11,12,16
141:16	him/herself 4:9	127:18 128:22	176:12,13 199:21	158:16 160:23
heinous 71:24	hindsight 92:9	129:16,17 130:15	199:24 200:17	161:6 162:11
held 2:2 27:15	histories 111:13	130:19,24 131:7	hostility 32:25	163:18 166:7
37:22 38:12 48:7	history 25:25 39:4	131:18,20,22	130:13	167:6 168:5
52:6 57:15 121:9	44:10 53:7 55:4	134:21,22 135:2	hour 14:19,25 61:7	169:1,6,12,21,22
179:5	70:16 88:8 102:4	135:8,16 136:18	hours 14:17 45:21	170:9,10,14,19
hell 48:19 103:13	192:3	136:18 143:21	68:7 99:18 102:5	172:17,20 173:10
help 89:22,23 90:2	hitting 74:4	144:8,13 146:2	105:16 153:23	173:15 177:25
90:3 91:10 98:3	<b>HMIP</b> 26:4,10	147:21,23,24,24	156:9 175:5	178:10,18 179:11
99:1 127:10,11	44:24 47:12	148:7 149:17,24	180:25 183:7,14	179:12,16 180:6
134:18 135:11	192:13 203:12	150:22 153:7	197:25	180:8,11,22
165:3 193:15	hoc 67:20	165:25 180:24	house 2:3 10:4	181:2,22 182:5
<b>helped</b> 179:13	hold 15:20 18:6	183:9,12 184:24	15:6 16:15 17:5	182:13,24,25
helpful 115:24	60:13,20 67:14	190:13 192:10	17:7 19:21 20:14	183:3,14 184:19
198:13	119:24 124:16	197:24 199:20,22	22:14,23 24:11	185:8 186:1
helping 130:12	139:15	199:24 200:2,6,7	26:8,25 29:22	188:13,16,20
171:8	<b>holding</b> 124:7,16	201:1,4,6,9,12,20	30:23 31:15,24	189:10 190:7,10
Hewer 25:11	hollow 159:22	201:22 202:2	32:7,23 35:8,16	190:15 192:14,19
69:17 109:16	HOM000251	203:1,16,24	35:22 36:19	192:24 193:1,2
147:17	61:15	<b>Homey</b> 101:7	37:18,20 39:22	194:4,8,24 196:5
<b>Hibiscus</b> 125:8,10	<b>HOM002917</b> 67:1	homicide 5:7	40:5,10 41:23	196:8,14,17
125:13	HOM0332161	homophobic 12:12	43:4 45:3 47:11	197:2,6,8 199:14
hide 169:23	63:17	74:24 84:19	48:19 50:20,24	200:3 201:19,22
<b>hiding</b> 62:11	home 16:2 20:25	honest 121:2	51:2,21,21 52:13	202:21
hierarchical 85:16	21:23 22:4 24:9	honesty 148:24	54:5 69:25 70:18	Houses 153:3
high 2:21 10:14	24:18,21 25:10	150:1	71:11 72:14,18	housing 184:20
	•	•		•

_				Page 224
H105.7	40.0 54 02 01 01	100.10		l
Howe 185:7	48:9 54:23 81:21	immature 168:16	impaired 34:8	improvements
howling 78:7	86:2 88:7,11	immediate 100:20	imperative 23:4	173:10 174:11
huge 85:12 163:1	102:4 117:10	128:3 159:12	28:8 43:22 71:25	176:9
165:8	159:15 162:17	immediately 1:10	96:16	impunity 16:16
human 15:24 19:6	163:5,14 174:21	130:2 145:6	imperatives 21:2	41:9 47:3 50:9
19:13 26:23	identifying 2:10	173:25	implausible	101:13
29:11 32:1 41:15	2:11 25:2 161:21	immense 93:14	122:22	in-combination
44:25 55:18 70:7	identity 138:9	immigrants 32:14	<b>implement</b> 45:16	58:10,11 59:8
103:10 186:2	158:13	immigration 20:7	47:23	inability 73:3
189:1	ignored 52:24 66:5	25:4 28:5 32:12	implementation 2:19 47:20	inaccurate 74:2
humanity 32:25	97:25	32:19 38:5 42:11		75:14
53:20 115:2	ill 28:9 83:20	43:20 44:1,2	implemented 203:21	inaction 48:16
139:6 154:25 humiliate 11:5	84:15 93:20	51:22 53:11		inactions 124:10
12:13	153:3,10,13	75:18 76:8,16	implementing 22:10	inadequacies 118:24 142:5,8
	192:6 202:11	81:6 85:5 100:23	-	,
humiliated 31:25	ill-equipped 39:7	101:21 113:5	implicated 120:5,8	178:4
78:13 103:9	ill-health 92:21	126:18 127:14	implications 48:5	inadequacy
humiliating 11:2 13:13 72:23	135:20 ill-treatment 6:5	132:4 137:3 146:21 148:22,25	importance 15:11 17:14 46:21	166:25
105:7 106:14	7:11 26:20 37:15	,	115:1 158:21	inadequate 24:11
humiliation 10:15	37:17 39:5 55:13	150:3,13,13 151:13 152:25	167:3	36:3 46:11 50:1
				85:8 110:22,23
10:20 15:23 18:4 63:21 65:18	96:11 98:22	155:10 156:4,5,6	important 10:14	110:23 142:17 169:18 192:16
hundreds 88:17	100:19 114:21,22 116:16 182:25	156:12,23 165:17 165:20 166:4,6,9	15:15,17,19 22:8 24:8 52:2 131:11	
hunger 71:13	illegal 84:24	165:20 166:4,6,9	133:15,16 158:21	inadequately 38:11 196:7
hurdles 36:1	illness 11:9 23:17	168:21 171:9	172:19 174:16	inappropriate
hyper 169:15	26:1 27:13 28:4	174:15 175:10,15	185:18 189:17	26:11 38:1,21
<b>Hyper</b> 109.13	31:24 34:7 36:8	174.13 173.10,13	190:3	47:13 77:18
I	39:4,9 44:11	195:19 202:23	importantly 106:2	159:18,23 162:10
Ian 147:14 158:3	59:16 76:22	203:25	importantly 100.2	178:21 186:19,20
160:24	164:4 169:11	immune 41:21	imposed 37:6	189:13,13
ICIB 44:1,24	187:8 192:2	42:3	66:12 75:5	inappropriately
idea 43:10	illuminated 50:14	impact 21:21	imposition 9:23	159:25 172:4
ideal 175:16	illustrated 41:7	35:25 36:25	imposition 3.23	inattention 96:15
ideation 102:8	105:15 107:5	58:10 66:6 67:12	66:11 88:14 93:4	incapable 194:15
143:6 195:4	illustrates 162:13	73:6 74:18 75:8	152:24 194:24	incapacitated
ideations 91:5	illustration 102:1	78:3,24 80:19	impoverished	129:10
identifiable 2:15	image 159:7	81:1 85:10	21:20	incarcerated 19:3
3:11	174:19	104:16,21 138:4	imprisoned 59:15	incensed 79:8
identified 2:23 3:2	imagine 118:16	142:16,25,25	80:22	incidence 17:11
17:2 18:16 24:11	122:6,7 137:17	155:19,20 165:5	improper 10:5	23:16 37:17
25:12 39:16,19	137:17 138:7	169:1,10 175:1	improper 10.3	incident 3:12 8:4
42:6,15 43:2,4	175:17	178:25 181:20	154:5 167:19,20	58:20 59:4 60:7
45:6,13 71:21	IMB 17:7 22:23	183:24	improved 22:1	60:9 74:6,25
91:3 106:9 152:4	24:9 25:12	impacted 151:19	44:4 132:24	121:7 125:12
159:6 162:5	130:12 146:8	183:19	174:8,23	159:4 186:21,22
179:4	147:3,8,14	impacting 143:8	improvement 51:4	incidental 28:25
identify 2:24 15:6	IMB's 23:16 29:21	impacts 21:12	51:6 155:9	56:21 68:3 75:11
15:9 16:21 22:15	imbalance 168:12	58:11 137:11,13	160:10 174:13	incidentally
25:15 42:19 43:8		30.11 107.11,13		
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

5 April 2022

				Page 225
116:10	137:10 174:13	<b>induces</b> 67:13	informs 149:23	43:15,17,21 44:7
incidents 7:22	179:15 180:2,5	inducted 86:1	ingrained 158:3	45:9 46:11,21
18:18,25 19:7	192:13 203:11,17	induction 86:23	inherent 29:1	47:7,10,19,19,24
30:1 31:16 58:15	indescribable	160:3	56:20 68:2	48:12 49:17 50:6
59:6 69:7 70:14	106:16	inductions 86:15	inherently 29:8	50:15,23 51:1
75:7,15,22 81:19	indeterminate	ineffective 143:5	inhibited 177:14	52:1 53:19 54:3
88:22 92:5 132:7	37:1 137:12	ineffectiveness	inhuman 2:5 9:17	54:7 55:15 57:7
163:23 164:3	151:9 152:2,7	159:1	9:20 10:8,22,24	58:9 59:2 66:19
168:9 189:11	204:1	inefficiency	13:4,7 27:25	66:21 68:9 69:2
190:9 203:4	indeterminately	183:10	54:12,14 56:25	69:23 72:6,12,24
inciting 19:19	100:3	inertia 110:10,10	64:19 65:6 72:11	81:17 82:7,8,11
include 35:11	indicate 5:25	122:24 143:20	75:20 80:16	82:16 83:1,2,18
49:20 106:20	46:15	inescapable	81:18 196:24	84:7 88:21 89:3
192:2	indicated 88:4	101:22 197:11	inhumane 17:7,24	93:8 94:16 95:7
included 52:11	160:22	inevitable 40:12	22:25 24:5,10	95:8 98:21 101:8
188:23	indicates 42:4	91:7 95:12	29:15,18 30:20	108:11 109:3,20
includes 116:7	indication 14:25	100:13	32:7 49:14,16	110:5 113:7
including 2:10 5:6	36:13 92:12	inevitably 41:13	98:11 107:2	114:2,16,21
6:15 24:1 27:12	94:23	164:23 183:16	114:22,24 115:5	119:24 120:20
33:2 49:22 59:14	indicative 88:6	inexcusable 87:17	135:1 177:20	121:23 122:10
70:20 78:18	indifference 19:12	inexperience	inhumanely	123:21 126:2
83:19,25 86:3	84:18 88:25 89:1	161:7	147:16	128:16 133:6
101:2 109:14	94:2 141:20	inexperienced	inimical 106:11	136:4,21 142:12
111:11,17 122:2	indifferent 21:13	157:2 168:15	initial 163:9,12	142:23 154:23
143:9 156:2,13	75:2 87:3	181:9	164:25	155:5,7 157:8,11
159:13 166:18	individual 1:22	infer 150:24	initiated 105:20	161:1 162:23
182:10 192:12	3:6 14:12,22	inference 132:19	injuries 12:18	163:11 164:7,12
195:3	16:4 27:4,25	inferences 6:15,19	<b>injury</b> 55:23	166:2 167:4
incoherent 99:5	29:20 37:3 56:7	8:11 9:13	160:16	169:25 170:8,9
inconsistent 38:4	56:9 59:19 69:7	inferiority 11:2,19	<b>input</b> 195:7	170:12,21 171:1
incontrovertible	81:19 129:21	13:12	inquest 42:16	171:4,6 172:8,14
19:16	134:17 137:22	<b>inferred</b> 177:15,17	inquests 108:18,25	172:19,19 173:8
increase 21:17	140:17 141:18,19	infested 173:17	inquiries 3:18,21	177:9,11,13
134:13 146:18	141:24 142:14	inflicted 10:16	4:8,19,25 5:3,6	179:3 181:14
147:19,20 176:7	183:15 195:24	56:12,15,18	7:18 47:21 177:8	182:14 184:5
197:18	individual's 30:19	59:22 60:2 67:5	inquiry 1:19 2:8	185:15 186:1,3
increased 11:20	Individually 75:7	67:9,24	3:19,21 4:1,3,14	189:8,25 190:2
23:18,22 24:3	individuals 14:6	infliction 18:3	5:9,10,12 7:19,24	191:6,11,24
65:2 142:6	17:19 18:12,25	26:22 56:13	13:15 14:1 15:4	192:10 198:20,24
increasingly	25:6 43:10 45:18	influence 175:3	15:12,15 16:10	199:8,22 202:6
127:20 200:21	46:18 52:8 107:8	inform 15:9 22:11	17:12,15,21,23	204:7,17
inculcate 40:20	139:2 144:4,5,6	141:9	18:23 19:23 22:5	inquiry's 1:8,10
indefinite 91:8	158:6 161:17	informally 149:10	22:11 23:3 25:1	4:18 5:13 22:14
93:19 178:24	165:4 172:3	information 35:25	25:15,20 26:6,8	23:24 27:1,9
183:1 184:20	177:22 192:25	68:12 96:17	27:2,10 29:23	28:11 29:3 35:3
202:12	194:21 200:6	132:12 189:21	30:9,22 33:5,11	46:4 48:16 155:7
independent 9:2	203:17	informed 77:6	34:12 38:16	155:8 160:22
34:6 45:8 98:10 100:6 103:18	individuals' 39:13 induced 58:23	86:19 90:19 91:2 204:2	39:16 40:25	168:11
100.0 103:18	muuceu 30.23	∠U4.∠	42:18,22 43:2,12	inquisitorial 7:24
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1

				Page 226
	(2.12	10.21.67.22	45.11.06.15	1. 05.0
inside 31:13 98:14	63:12	40:21 67:23	47:11 86:17	items 85:2
insight 34:22	intentional 60:14	193:20	96:25 192:2,11	$J$
118:18 160:6	60:25 63:10	intimidatory	200:4 203:5,9,12	Jacobs 185:4,5,6
164:5 165:5	intentionally	67:12,15	203:18	204:11 205:5
insights 118:7,8	10:16 33:15	intrinsically 6:23	IRCs 42:13 49:20	James 127:6
Inspector 34:4	56:12 59:22 60:2	54:16 182:23	85:17 200:25	171:15
43:23	60:24	introduce 146:24	203:2,21	January 89:21
Inspectorate	interaction 162:1	introduced 38:10	Ireland 55:23	111:19 117:17
178:15	interactions	introduction	57:22,24 59:9	120:14 152:10
instance 10:3	137:18 138:2	167:17	64:10	Jeremy 178:14
instances 2:16	172:22	intrusive 103:2	ironically 160:13	183:18
instigate 189:6	interest 134:2	inverted 139:15	irony 21:23	Jerry 20:11 51:15
instigated 73:15	161:16 165:23	invest 193:11	irredeemably 26:23	111:19 151:16
instill 158:20	interested 120:20	investigate 2:9		Jill 148:19
Institute 148:19	124:8,9 161:14	75:15	irrespective 99:16	Jimmy 108:18
institution 196:19	163:6 200:8	investigation 2:14	Island 146:5,8	<b>Jo</b> 41:24 60:12
institutional 13:25	interesting 150:15 182:22	18:20 32:10	isolated 18:25,25 43:10 65:13	job 123:20 161:9
14:8 18:11 23:8	interference 201:3	43:25 54:4 105:1		161:18 163:13
29:2,4,14 32:4 37:19 40:6 42:5		126:5 159:15 174:22 179:15	88:22 168:9 190:9	167:18
	interim 46:6 47:22 69:20 107:9			jobs 170:6
42:9,20 43:3,12 47:4 49:22 50:4	interminable	180:2,5	<b>isolation</b> 56:8,23 58:17 61:4 63:25	John 42:23
53:13 74:22	95:16	investigations 15:13 25:17		join 84:21 123:23
institutions 16:19	internal 71:1	108:14	64:17 65:1,15,18 65:24 78:25 79:2	joined 101:7,12
	Internal /1:1		issue 5:25 28:15	173:11
<b>Instone-Brewer</b> 73:14 116:21	165:18	investigative 3:5	38:16 42:20	Joint 44:25
117:13 137:15	internet 85:7	75:13,24 invite 2:1 6:2	67:25 105:1	jointly 46:8
instructed 185:7	180:14,19	13:16 29:23	126:3 133:6	joke 170:17
instructing 47:25	internment 193:3	58:15 122:7	145:17 151:17,19	joking 170:25
insufficient 26:21	internment 193.3	141:1 143:11,14	156:1 183:19	Jon 160:22 191:24
insults 60:17 63:21	interpreters 73:3	invited 69:7 81:17	190:25 191:12	judges 21:9
64:3	interpreters 75.5	involve 53:10	190.23 191.12	judgment 27:16
	36:17	involved 20:7	194:7,10 196:14	132:13
integrity 26:23 31:25 72:1	interrogations	32:12 59:11	198:19 199:5,22	judgments 36:14
intelligence 62:10	57:24	133:8,25 134:8	issued 46:1 80:7	judicial 108:22
117:2	intervene 26:21	165:19 178:1	86:23 87:20	128:16 143:23
intended 14:23	84:20	190:1 192:14	144:19	juggling 197:21
36:9 141:15	intervened 73:16	involves 55:20	issues 2:16 13:25	Jules 52:16 118:2
182:8 183:3	186:3	56:1,5,25 62:5	14:8 24:25 51:2	118:6,9 158:2
intense 10:24 13:8	intervening 51:6	66:20 195:17	51:7,9,19 99:1	July 68:21 72:16
17:9 30:6 101:20	intervention 71:17	involving 4:8	100:15 121:20	74:14 79:15 80:8
intensified 32:17	interview 188:17	38:14 58:20	142:1 150:10	80:8,8,9,10 89:12
intensity 29:17	200:1	60:11	155:13 163:22,22	117:18 133:12
104:12 108:21	interviews 131:2	Iran 70:13,21	165:11,19 169:20	187:19
113:12	intimidate 67:10	149:11	171:23 174:23	jumping 62:21
intensive 58:23	67:12	Iranian 99:5	184:4 187:18	65:22
intensive 38.23	intimidating 56:16	Iraq 83:6,9 85:20	188:12 190:17	June 68:11 70:23
intent 103.0 189.9	67:6 105:6	149:11	Istanbul 59:1	72:15,15,16
13:24 61:10	intimidation 23:9	IRC 26:9 39:1	item 62:11	73:13,23 74:11
15.2 : 01.10	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	1110 20.7 37.1	100m 02.11	80:8 89:5 100:24
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 22/
innian made	90.20 07.20	40-24-02-17	90.25 01.11	162.16 200.2 20
jurisprudence 6:5	80:20 97:20	40:24 92:17	80:25 91:11	163:16 200:3,20
28:11	186:4	101:9 172:6	102:2 103:17	leaving 73:8,9 96:9
justice 15:20 16:16	kills 79:13	176:13 201:12	lastly 70:6	170:4
17:20 20:8 37:12	kind 1:20 25:3	knows 43:17	late 4:1 23:2 66:8	lectern 154:15
43:18 45:9 46:22	29:6,13 36:8	Kosovo 83:6	116:14	led 23:25 37:19
47:9 51:10 71:18	40:1 47:5 56:17	<b>KPI</b> 132:6,9 133:2	latest 149:14	39:10 40:7 41:13
154:4 194:23	65:4 90:25 95:13	146:17	laughing 84:9,11	65:9 72:9,20
justification 18:2	98:5 100:14	<b>KPIs</b> 132:5,23	117:21 125:8	79:24 80:14
73:21 79:24	101:15 117:11	$\frac{}{}$	170:25	158:16 159:24
105:22 141:13	134:9 135:23		lavatories 198:25	169:22 183:16
156:8	142:18 161:6	lack 18:11 38:8	law 6:17 9:19 29:4	189:4,5 193:13
justify 138:22	kinds 123:11	51:24 68:25	54:16 69:17 72:5	193:20 200:9
161:3	151:23	72:25 73:1 75:9	80:3 141:2	201:4
	<b>Kingdom</b> 183:5,23	86:9 88:1,3,7	165:17 166:9	Lee 14:11 33:2
K XX X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	knew 24:14 89:11	99:20 100:6	177:12	82:1,2,3 94:20
<b>Kalvin</b> 172:5	95:14,18,20 97:4	111:17 154:25	lawful 18:1 29:1	110:24 119:6
Karen 64:1 66:12	100:9 145:11	156:3,22 157:11	39:15 56:21 68:3	131:2 157:12
92:14 99:14	147:25 157:18	157:20 160:2,5	68:4 69:4 75:11	171:1 192:23
201:6	160:1 186:16	161:7 167:21	81:14 175:10	201:9
Kate 179:16 180:3	knife 128:12	169:23 170:2	lawfully 68:5	left 23:13 68:21
180:6	173:20	180:14,14 187:17	196:8	100:1 117:17,18
<b>Katona</b> 36:20	knits 117:11	187:22 190:18	laws 67:20	139:7 162:25
169:7	119:10	laid 184:23	lawyers 71:17 85:7	174:16 181:5
Katona's 58:18	knock 115:21	Lake 79:10	100:11	192:18
keep 86:5,6 95:2	know 15:12 16:18	Laming 47:21	lay 183:1	legal 6:10 7:25
104:22 107:19	24:18 25:7 33:15	Lampard 179:16	lead 35:7 46:1	21:11 26:17
113:11	35:14,17 37:20	180:3,6	48:19 53:4 155:9	34:20 36:14,14
keeping 107:17	46:12,16 62:2	landed 62:24	174:11	57:8 64:21 69:11
Kelly 176:17,20,25	73:8 88:1,19	language 29:6	leader 119:12	73:4 82:7 93:11
177:1,2 179:18	99:1,24 100:24	41:5,7 42:22	leaders 156:23	115:13,15 138:21
179:21,23 180:5	102:14 105:8	54:10 67:19	leadership 51:7	165:19,21 171:9
185:3 192:22	108:16,16 113:1	113:9,22 114:12	125:3,3,4 155:17	legality 28:14
205:4	113:16,20 120:20	114:23 115:1,1	155:22,23 156:2	<b>legion</b> 143:17
Kent 51:15	121:2,6,7 129:15	115:14,20 119:18	157:10,12,23,25	legitimate 28:25
kept 36:24 89:19	132:15,16 133:6	125:9,9,12	158:4,13 159:2	69:1
147:21,23 178:10	135:20 139:16	135:20 141:14	159:13,24 160:5	legitimised 78:2
178:11 195:11	148:21 149:3	149:24 161:2,5	160:10 161:10	length 90:9 100:14
key 22:14 23:25	153:11 154:8	164:15 177:24	162:15	145:12 153:23
29:25 33:11	170:23,23 178:18	182:4,10,12	<b>leading</b> 32:5 33:19	166:6,18 178:23
34:24 40:6,25	179:8 185:15	186:20 188:3	37:6 179:1	179:4 185:10
43:1,12 70:17	193:10	189:14	leads 37:19 40:6	lengthy 87:4
109:21 113:3	<b>know-how</b> 40:11	languish 100:1	learn 133:20	lesser 120:8
133:11 145:10	knowing 73:7	large 113:20 143:9	learned 20:8 22:20	lessons 20:8 22:19
175:12	126:18 151:20	150:18,25 158:17	167:6	let's 87:18 94:25
keys 104:10	183:21	170:14 188:18	learning 136:9	153:1
kicked 105:3	knowledge 16:18	largely 166:11	144:17 164:21	letter 46:8 47:24
kicking 143:22	99:25 105:20	193:23	leave 30:13 53:17	89:6
145:18	129:14 169:9	larger 150:16,25	62:15,16 67:8	level 6:20 10:9,17
kids 79:12	known 36:24	lash 193:6	73:6 142:3	10:19 13:5 27:4
kill 58:21 74:15		lasting 74:18		
	•	•	•	•

37:1 62:2 68:16   144:24 171:20   177:24 178:13   184:22   178:13   184:22   178:13   184:22   178:19   195:25 96:1 106:6   111:21 117:10   163:18   25:23 44:12   25:23 44:12   160:44:15 16:17   26:25 102:22   130:4 157:9   151:3   40:10 47:4 52:7   166:3 124:7   47:24 63:7 66:10   164:3 175:19   200:2   130:4 157:9   91:9.9,11 94:23   114:16 116:25   178:19   191:20   185:16   181:20   193:4 203:9,14   185:16   186:32 6:23   175:18 178:9   185:16   181:19 186:10   185:16   181:19 186:10   185:16   181:19 186:10   185:16   181:19 186:10   181:19 186:					Page 228
Till.; 1, 15, 8, 22 7 3:21   177:24   178:13   logs 9 9:3   logs 99:25   logs 99:3   loss 62:23   loss 62:23   loss 62:23   loss 62:23   loss 124:7   loss 128:19   loss 129:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:19   loss 128:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:19   loss 128:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:19   loss 128:29   loss 129:19   loss 128:29   loss 129:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:29   loss 129:19   loss 129:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:19   loss 129:19   loss 128:29   loss 129:19   loss	27.1.62.2.60.16	1442417120	1 125.10		1 110.15
95:25 96:1 106:6   184:22			C		
111:21   117:10   163:18   25:23   44:12   164:3   175:19   151:3   166:24   37:13   166:24   37:13   166:24   37:13   166:3   175:19   200:2   91:9.9.11   94:10   176:6   181:20   176:6   181:20   176:6   181:20   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:16   185:15   185:16   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:15   185:16   185:23   185:15   185:16   185:23   185:15   185:25   18			C		_
163:18			C		
levels 17:11 21:19					
40:10 47:4 52:7   130:4 157:9   20:2 193:4 203:9,14   164:3 175:19   20:2 193:4 203:9,14   164:3 175:19   21:4 132:0   137:14 144:15   137:15   13			<u> </u>		
62:5 102:22					•
164:3 175:19					
176:6 181:20					
193:4 203:9,14			· ·		
Lewis 14:3,10					
47:25					C
Isabilities 8:1					
liability 6:12					
177: 1,15 190:3   lips 71:14   list 1:23 116:18,20   37:25 121:21   lover 159:9   low 21:19 24:4   liberty 147:9   120:2,3 135:19   146:14   long-er 45:3 64:2   list need 93:12   145:10   listening 1:13   137:24 172:16   list 153:25 154:5   life 11:16 76:11,17   79:19 83:11   93:16 136:11   137:24 172:16   lists 153:25 154:5   life-threatening 16:8   life-threatening 16:8 life-threatening 18:14   138:13,24 139:12   listening 1:18   ligature 64:20   138:13   life-changing 16:8 life-threatening 18:34   life-threatening 18:34   life-threatening 18:34   life-threatening 18:34   life-p:18 13:10   listening 1:13   listening 1:13   listening 1:13   life-threatening 16:8 life-threatening 16:4:11 li95:7,16 light-ri2 15:5 lock-in 105:10 lock-i					
list   103:25   165:14   116:18,20   116:22   117:25   143:18   130:21   120:23, 135:19   146:14   146:14   146:14   15ten   19:14   169:21   15tened   93:12   15tened   93:12   15tened   93:12   137:24   172:16   135:25   123:10   137:24   172:16   135:25   123:10   137:24   172:16   135:25   135	•			S	-
165:14   116:22 117:25   143:18   longer 45:3 64:2   66:14 79:17   175:15   listen 19:14 169:21   listen 19:13   listen 19:13   listen 19:13   listen 19:14 169:21   listen 19:13   listen 19:13   listen 19:13   listen 19:14 169:21   listen 19:13   listen 19:14 169:21   listen 19:13   listen 19:14 169:21   listen 19:15   listen 19:13   listen 19:14 169:21   listen 19:15   listen 19:14 169:12   listen 19:14 169:15   listen 19:14 169:14   listen 19:14 169:15   listen 19:14 169:14 169:14 169:15   listen 19:14 169:14 169:15   listen 19:14 169:15   listen 19:14 169:14 169:15   listen 19:14 169:14 169:15   listen 19:14 169:14 169:15   listen 19:14 169:15   listen 19:14 169:15   listen 19:14 169:15   listen 19:14 169:15   listen 19:15   listen 19:14 169:15   listen 19:15	*	_			-
Isberty 147:9   183:16		_			
183:16   licence 77:18   listen 19:14 169:21   124:15,15   lioyaltics 40:1   77:18 85:14 86:5   153:25 203:18   licence 77:18   listening 1:13   145:10   listening 1:13   137:24 172:16   137:24 172:16   198:22 200:18   litigation 108:17   108:21 129:18   177:18   ligature 64:20   18:13   138:13,24 139:12   light 7:12 15:5   38:9 46:11 93:16   198:22   118:16   199:21   199:7,16   188:16   199:21   199:19   likeable 136:4   lighter 139:10   likeable 136:4   lighter 139:10   likeable 136:4   likeable 136:3   locker 159:9   locking 103:8   likeable 136:3   locker 159:9   locking 103:8   likeable 136:4   likeable 136:3   locker 159:9   locking 103:8   locking 103:8					0
licence 77:18         listen 19:14 169:21         122:1 124:15,15         loyalties 40:1         77:18 85:14 86:5           lie 70:9         life I1:16 76:11,17         79:19 83:11         listening 1:13         23:10         longest-serving         lucky 121:13         99:19 136:4           93:16 136:11         53:21         look 21:16 89:15         181:3,4         186:25 187:7         188:9           137:24 172:16         lists 153:25 154:5         litigation 108:17         114:25 118:13,14         Luh 14:14 94:22         188:9         man's 76:17         manage 55:7         188:9         manage 55:7         59:16 166:24         195:3 203:13         manage 55:7         59:16 166:24         195:3 203:13         linch 94:21         195:3 203:13         manage 55:7         59:16 166:24         195:3 203:13         manage 28:7         59:29 137:4         195:3 203:13         manage 55:7         59:16 166:24         195:3 203:13         manage 55:7         59:16 166:24         195:3 203:13         manage 55:7         59:16 166:24         195:3 203:13         197:18 85:14         195:3 203:13         197:18 85:14         195:3 203:13         197:18 85:14         195:3 203:13         197:18 85:14         195:3 203:13         197:18 20:11         195:24         195:3 203:13         197:18 20:11         197:18 20:11         195:2 303:13         197:18 20:11         <	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· ·	S	· /	
lie 70:9         listened 93:12   153:25 203:18         loyalty 174:24   ucky 121:13   186:24 97:8         91:8 92:24 97:8   99:19 136:4           79:19 83:11   93:16 136:11   137:24 172:16   137:24 172:16   198:22 200:18   life-langing 16:8   life-changing 16:8   life-changing 16:8   life-threatening 18:14   ligature 64:20   18:14   ligature 64:20   131:8 135:5   132:3 134:18,18   light 7:12 15:5   38:9 46:11 93:16   98:23 123:14   lives 32:20 182:1   lives 32:20 182:1   lives 32:20 182:1   living 65:25   103:12   living 65:25   103:12   living 65:25   103:12   likeable 136:4   likeble 136:4   likeble 136:4   likeble 136:4   likeble 136:4   likeble 136:4   likeble 136:5   lock-in 105:10   lock-ins 72:25   177:15   likeble 125:17 137:15   likevise 27:22   46:3   locked 156:8 168:8   175:13,18,21,23   locked 156:8 168:8   175:13,18,21,23   locked 156:9 160:40   189:14   lock ing 103:8   locking 103:8					
life 11:16 76:11,17					
Total Part					
93:16 136:11   137:24 172:16   lists 153:25 154:5   95:24 113:13   108:21 29:18   114:25 118:13,14   108:21 129:18   124:8 125:2,6,6   177:18   life-threatening 18:14   131:8 135:5   132:3 134:18,18   ligature 64:20   74:16 97:21   138:13,24 139:12   light 7:12 15:5   38:9 46:11 93:16   lives 32:20 182:1   living 65:25   103:12   lighter 139:10   lighten 158:8   lighten 158:8   lighten 158:8   lighten 158:8   lighten 158:8   lighten 157:15   lock in 105:10   like 32:57 137:15   lock 138:15   lock 136:14   load 99:12   lighten 157:15   lock 138:15   lock 136:14   load 99:12   lighten 157:15   lock 138:15   lock 156:8 168:8   175:13,18,21,23   limited 21:16   locking 103:8   lo	T				
137:24 172:16   198:22 200:18   litigation 108:17   114:25 118:13,14   108:21 129:18   124:8 125:2,6,6   126:21,22 131:16   137:15   195:3 203:13   181:4   131:8 135:5   132:3 134:18,18   138:13,24 139:12   195:7,16   138:13,24 139:12   light 7:12 15:5   38:9 46:11 93:16   198:22 0182:1   living 65:25   103:12   living 65:25   living 56:25   living 56:17   living 56:25   likea ble 136:4   liked 86:5 171:18   likelihood 66:25   177:15   likewise 27:22   46:3   limited 21:16   locking 103:8   locking 103:		_			
198:22 200:18   litigation 108:17   108:21 129:18   124:8 125:2,6,6   126:21,22 131:16   137:15   195:3 203:13   131:20,23 132:2   131:20,23 132:2   132:3 134:18,18   107:15 205:1   195:3 203:13   131:20,23 132:2   131:20,23 132:2   100ch 94:21   107:18					
108:21 129:18					
life-changing 16:8         177:18         126:21,22 131:16         137:15         195:3 203:13           life-threatening 18:14         little 9:21 37:23         131:20,23 132:2         lunch 94:21         managed 28:7           ligature 64:20         164:11 184:8,11         134:19 141:11,12         Lyden 83:25         99:2,8 123:18           74:16 97:21         195:7,16         141:17,25 142:2         lying 176:5         150:16,19,25           138:13,24 139:12         live 79:18 82:10         143:21 146:1         Macedonia 55:24         150:16,19,25           38:9 46:11 93:16         185:16         148:11 149:4,7         Macedonia 55:24         195:6         management 15:7           98:23 123:14         living 65:25         103:12         looked 74:12         machinery 94:3         machinery 94:3         machinery 94:3         macho 162:11         152:3 155:13         155:13         155:14,20 166:12           likeable 136:4         look 138:15         lock 138:15         66:20 78:9         188:15         Macpherson 43:2         47:7         Macpherson 43:2         47:7         Madgwick 171:13         managers 15:25         20:12 23:11           likewise 27:22         175:13,18,21,23         162:5 178:7         152:5 178:7         Madgwick 170:7         74:7         Madgwick 170:7         Madgwick 170:7		<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		O .
life-threatening   18:14					
18:14	life-changing 16:8	177:18	126:21,22 131:16	137:15	195:3 203:13
164:11 184:8,11	life-threatening	little 9:21 37:23	131:20,23 132:2	lunch 94:21	managed 28:7
74:16 97:21       195:7,16       141:17,25 142:2       lying 176:5       150:16,19,25         138:13,24 139:12       83:5 135:9       143:21 146:1       M         38:9 46:11 93:16       185:16       148:11 149:4,7       Macedonia 55:24         98:23 123:14       lives 32:20 182:1       149:10,25 152:17       58:13       20:3,14 33:21         129:19       living 65:25       162:16 171:6       machinery 94:3       38:24 106:9         lighter 139:10       livingston 117:4       looked 74:12       186:14       150:23 155:13         liked 86:5 171:18       lock 138:15       lock 138:15       66:20 78:9       149:10,25 152:17       188:15       157:14,20 166:12         177:15       lock-in 105:10       113:22 114:2       188:15       169:21 170:3       175:4 199:14         175:13,18,21,23       175:13,18,21,23       141:10 142:17       Macpherson 43:2       68:20 171:15         likewise 27:22       175:13,18,21,23       141:10 142:17       Madgwick 171:13       managers 15:25         16:3       10cker 159:9       152:5 178:7       174:7       174:7       34:23 47:2 52:14	18:14				80:9,20 97:14
138:13,24 139:12   live 79:18 82:10   83:5 135:9   143:21 146:1   148:11 149:4,7   98:23 123:14   129:19   living 65:25   103:12   livingston 117:4   lighter 139:10   likeable 136:4   liked 86:5 171:18   likelihood 66:25   177:15   likes 125:7 137:15   likes 125:7 137:15   likewise 27:22   46:3   limited 21:16   locking 103:8   limited 21:16   locking 103:8   likelihood 138:8   locking 103:8   like 120:21 43:20   l43:21 143:20   l43:21 146:1   l43:21	ligature 64:20	164:11 184:8,11	134:19 141:11,12	<b>Lyden</b> 83:25	99:2,8 123:18
195:6   195:	74:16 97:21	195:7,16	141:17,25 142:2	lying 176:5	150:16,19,25
185:16	138:13,24 139:12	live 79:18 82:10	142:20,22 143:20		184:23 194:15
98:23 123:14         lives 32:20 182:1         149:10,25 152:17         58:13         20:3,14 33:21           129:19         living 65:25         103:12         looked 74:12         machinery 94:3         38:24 106:9           lighter 139:10         Livingston 117:4         looked 74:12         macho 162:11         10:23 113:19           likeable 136:4         load 99:12         looking 26:17 64:6         macho-aggressive         40:15 50:22         157:14,20 166:12           likelihood 66:25         lock-ins 72:25         lock-ins 72:25         124:23,23 125:3         Macpherson 43:2         Macpherson 43:2         manager 62:22           likewise 27:22         175:13,18,21,23         141:10 142:17         Madgwick 171:13         managers 15:25           limited 21:16         locking 103:8         180:9 187:14         174:7         34:23 47:2 52:14	<b>light</b> 7:12 15:5	83:5 135:9	143:21 146:1		195:6
129:19   living 65:25   162:16 171:6   looked 74:12   likeable 136:4   lock 138:15   lock-in 105:10   likes 125:7 137:15   likewise 27:22   46:3   locking 103:8   locking 1	38:9 46:11 93:16	185:16	148:11 149:4,7		management 15:7
lighten 158:8         103:12         looked 74:12         macho 162:11         110:23 113:19           lighter 139:10         Livingston 117:4         load 99:12         looking 26:17 64:6         macho-aggressive         152:3 155:13           liked 86:5 171:18         lock 138:15         66:20 78:9         40:15 50:22         169:21 170:3           likelihood 66:25         lock-in 105:10         113:22 114:2         Macpherson 43:2         manager 62:22           likes 125:7 137:15         locked 156:8 168:8         125:15,17 137:6         47:7         Madgwick 171:13         managers 15:25           likewise 27:22         175:13,18,21,23         141:10 142:17         Madgwick 171:13         managers 15:25           46:3         locker 159:9         152:5 178:7         main 15:4 170:7         20:12 23:11           limited 21:16         locking 103:8         180:9 187:14         174:7         34:23 47:2 52:14	98:23 123:14	lives 32:20 182:1	149:10,25 152:17		20:3,14 33:21
lighter 139:10         Livingston 117:4         132:4         186:14         152:3 155:13           liked 86:5 171:18         lock 138:15         lock 138:15         66:20 78:9         40:15 50:22         169:21 170:3           likelihood 66:25         lock-in 105:10         113:22 114:2         Macpherson 43:2         manager 62:22           likes 125:7 137:15         locked 156:8 168:8         125:15,17 137:6         Madgwick 171:13         manager 62:22           likewise 27:22         175:13,18,21,23         141:10 142:17         Madgwick 171:13         managers 15:25           limited 21:16         locking 103:8         180:9 187:14         174:7         34:23 47:2 52:14	129:19	living 65:25	162:16 171:6	_	38:24 106:9
likeable 136:4         load 99:12         looking 26:17 64:6         macho-aggressive         157:14,20 166:12           likelihood 66:25         lock-in 105:10         113:22 114:2         Macpherson 43:2         Macpherson 43:2         manager 62:22           likes 125:7 137:15         locked 156:8 168:8         125:15,17 137:6         Madgwick 171:13         manager 62:22           46:3         locker 159:9         152:5 178:7         Madgwick 170:7         Madgwick 170:7         20:12 23:11           limited 21:16         locking 103:8         180:9 187:14         174:7         34:23 47:2 52:14	lighten 158:8	103:12	looked 74:12		110:23 113:19
liked 86:5 171:18       lock 138:15       66:20 78:9       40:15 50:22       169:21 170:3         likelihood 66:25       lock-in 105:10       113:22 114:2       Macpherson 43:2       Macpherson 43:2       manager 62:22         likes 125:7 137:15       locked 156:8 168:8       125:15,17 137:6       Madgwick 171:13       managers 15:25         likewise 27:22       175:13,18,21,23       141:10 142:17       Madgwick 171:13       managers 15:25         46:3       locker 159:9       152:5 178:7       main 15:4 170:7       20:12 23:11         limited 21:16       locking 103:8       180:9 187:14       174:7       34:23 47:2 52:14	<b>lighter</b> 139:10	Livingston 117:4	132:4	186:14	152:3 155:13
likelihood 66:25       lock-in 105:10       113:22 114:2       188:15       175:4 199:14         177:15       lock-ins 72:25       124:23,23 125:3       Macpherson 43:2       manager 62:22         likewise 27:22       175:13,18,21,23       141:10 142:17       Madgwick 171:13       managers 15:25         46:3       locker 159:9       152:5 178:7       main 15:4 170:7       20:12 23:11         limited 21:16       locking 103:8       180:9 187:14       174:7       34:23 47:2 52:14	likeable 136:4	load 99:12	looking 26:17 64:6		157:14,20 166:12
177:15       lock-ins 72:25       124:23,23 125:3       Macpherson 43:2       manager 62:22         likes 125:7 137:15       locked 156:8 168:8       125:15,17 137:6       Madgwick 171:13       manager 62:22         46:3       locker 159:9       152:5 178:7       Madgwick 170:7       manager 15:25         limited 21:16       locking 103:8       180:9 187:14       174:7       34:23 47:2 52:14	liked 86:5 171:18	lock 138:15	66:20 78:9	40:15 50:22	169:21 170:3
likes 125:7 137:15   locked 156:8 168:8   125:15,17 137:6   47:7   68:20 171:15   likewise 27:22   46:3   locker 159:9   locking 103:8   180:9 187:14   174:7   34:23 47:2 52:14	likelihood 66:25	lock-in 105:10	113:22 114:2	188:15	175:4 199:14
likes 125:7 137:15   locked 156:8 168:8   125:15,17 137:6   47:7   68:20 171:15   likewise 27:22   46:3   locker 159:9   locking 103:8   180:9 187:14   174:7   174:7   34:23 47:2 52:14	177:15	lock-ins 72:25	124:23,23 125:3	Macpherson 43:2	manager 62:22
likewise 27:22	likes 125:7 137:15		-	47:7	
46:3   locker 159:9   152:5 178:7   main 15:4 170:7   20:12 23:11   limited 21:16   locking 103:8   180:9 187:14   174:7   34:23 47:2 52:14			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Madgwick 171:13	
limited 21:16   locking 103:8   180:9 187:14   174:7   34:23 47:2 52:14				main 15:4 170:7	<u> </u>
				174:7	
68:12 109:1   175:5   194:21   maintain 124:12   158:11 159:24		_		maintain 124:12	
149:23				149:23	
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 229
167:12 169:5	141:10	127:7,22,23,24	187:17 188:9,12	mindset 22:8
171:4	meaning 9:19	128:6,8,11	190:18 191:1,7	mine 146:15
managing 20:18	77:17	meetings 128:6	191:16,23 192:2	minimal 191:13
23:19 38:25	meaningful 126:20	129:25 133:24	192:11 194:14	minimai 171.13
202:18 203:19	201:23	meets 64:14	195:25 196:10	124:12
mandated 80:3	means 18:21 42:18	Mehraa 118:21,25	201:7 202:13	minimum 10:9,17
mandatory 168:23	88:16,17 124:3	member 118:12,14	203:10,19	13:5 28:17
192:11 203:9,10	126:16 153:17	159:11,19 200:13	mentality 49:24	162:21
manifest 143:17	156:5 202:18	members 40:20	mentally 28:9	Ministry 83:13
manifestation 50:4	203:19	91:4 188:20	84:10 93:20	minor 53:7 107:7
113:21 128:25	meant 36:23 68:9	189:5,15 193:15	114:6 153:3,13	141:6
manifestly 106:6	82:10 96:12,18	199:15 201:5	192:5 198:5	minority 116:12
manipulative 37:6	measure 29:1	memory 19:16	202:10	145:5 170:12
41:17	156:4,25	men 22:9 38:12	mention 86:17,25	minute 139:5
manner 91:22	measures 17:6	85:3,6 94:6,15	89:4 148:9,10	minute 137.3
March 63:17,18	30:5 38:23 42:19	110:24 111:3	mentioned 93:9	misapplication
76:5 90:7,17	45:5 47:6 55:6	113:25 114:3,4	160:3	10:5
95:19 97:3 102:1	mechanics 117:9	115:10,13 139:11	mentioning 7:8	misbehaviour
113:14 121:1,18	mechanism 81:4	147:23 184:9	8:14	125:11
185:12	96:18 182:13	189:1 202:11	mere 72:3	misconduct 16:21
marginal 200:14	193:14	menacing 173:19	merely 26:21	19:17,20,22
marginalise	mechanisms 97:23	mental 9:25 10:11	184:16	20:10 107:7
202:23	160:8	10:25 11:9,14	merits 173:7	misrepresenting
marked 16:17	media 32:14	12:15,19,19,22	message 32:24	19:19
19:11 70:25	medical 15:23	13:9 15:22 19:5	134:10	missed 99:13
80:19	16:16 17:20	23:17 25:25	messages 158:21	129:22
<b>Marsden</b> 179:16	26:13 27:22,23	27:11,13,19 28:4	messaging 161:11	missing 9:12
180:6	36:4,20 37:12	29:17 31:22,23	met 69:8	mistaken 164:8
Mary 24:9 121:18	40:4 43:18,18	32:6 34:7 36:7	meted 50:9	mistreat 131:13,15
145:8 147:11,20	45:1,9,12 46:21	36:25 39:4,9	method 152:2	mistreatment 2:4
151:11 179:4	47:9,15,16 68:1	44:11 55:3,22	182:7	2:11,12,16 3:2,13
masculine 50:13	71:17,18 72:25	56:2,14 57:16	methods 2:14	3:14,18 7:23 8:5
material 18:15,19	76:19 77:11,16	59:16 64:7,10	38:17,19 39:11	8:22,25 9:5,16
28:22 110:18	78:12 79:23,23	70:19 81:1 84:16	Michelle 23:10	14:7 15:8,9,18
117:4 119:10,17	81:7 85:25 87:1	85:24 86:2 89:8	111:9,11 117:3	16:5,22 20:17
126:4 130:20	88:8 89:18 91:16	90:2,9 91:10,16	157:19 171:21	21:14 22:15
131:1 145:12	95:22 99:15,21	92:21,25 95:12	microphone	27:10,11 29:12
182:22	137:9 153:6,8,9	99:1,10,18,20	179:19	29:19 32:6,10
materially 142:6	154:4 194:23	100:6,21,22	microphones	33:7 34:25 36:18
materials 119:2,9	195:23 203:17	101:19,20 102:2	108:3	36:22 37:20 40:8
129:8 147:9	medically 191:25	104:12 105:2	migrant 146:4	41:10 53:8 54:5
matter 93:22	medication 187:23	106:13 135:19	200:19	56:1 58:21 59:6
99:15 127:2	medico-legal 87:1	138:4 146:25	migration 135:10	59:13 62:8 67:5
192:5	89:13 90:8	151:20 163:22	135:15	72:8 74:21 81:2
matters 81:13	<b>Medway</b> 17:1 51:5	164:4,5,7,10	mile 172:1	105:14 151:6
111:15 143:12	51:6,9 52:13	165:11 169:11,17	mind 3:15 5:25	152:4
MD 55:8	112:9 125:16	169:20 171:23	12:2 13:1 103:16	mistrust 131:12
mean 4:9 24:14	meet 1:17 165:7	175:7 179:7	113:11 124:3	misunderstanding
46:17 129:4	meeting 91:20	183:20 187:8,9	140:6 182:15,20	79:11
	•	•	•	·

				1 age 230
misuse 17:25	14:20 115:7	N 119:21 204:20	need 30:12 43:25	108:23 114:3
18:18 23:23	119:7 120:7	N-word 159:9	45:4,19,22 61:19	133:4 134:11
31:17 39:14 40:7	202:1	naked 18:4 106:21	63:22 69:13	167:1 181:10
69:15 77:22	<b>Morris</b> 14:4 49:3,4	name 37:23 51:12	90:20 94:23	nevertheless 7:6
106:18 169:16	49:7,8 53:22	116:21	107:9 134:24	8:8
181:21	202:1 204:23	names 51:12 63:21	138:5 141:8,9,12	new 40:20 42:17
<b>Mitie</b> 20:7	mortified 198:20	88:18 118:22,23	141:17 142:13,14	119:23 162:16
mix 126:24 140:1	motivate 193:11	Naomi 34:12,19	142:15,16,21	167:24 198:2
mixed 166:19	motivation 141:13	100:2 129:7	143:10,24,25	Newland 188:17
mixing 193:17	196:18 198:17	narrative 98:9	144:2,4,6 145:17	197:7
mock 101:12	Motivational	200:15,25 201:2	148:13,24 150:11	news 85:4
mocked 61:6	161:19	201:4,4	150:12 151:24,25	NGOs 45:8
74:13 83:24	<b>motived</b> 161:18	narrow 55:21	151:25 153:3,4,5	NHS 46:8
100:25	mould 40:21	narrowness	153:13 156:13	Nick 73:24
mockery 101:6	mount 110:11	140:23	160:20 162:17	Nigeria 55:1
mocking 60:18	124:18	Nathan 13:19 14:5	163:4 164:17	nigger 83:23
63:21 84:9	mounted 122:11	16:16 49:5 60:19	166:7 169:8,15	night 85:3 103:14
modelling 161:12	<b>Mousa</b> 5:9 7:18,19	101:1 127:1	174:18 176:6	105:9 139:18
models 168:18	mouse 60:18	144:3 177:22	184:5	171:24 175:21
modest 161:25	186:25	180:22 184:9	needed 10:17 17:4	nightmares 104:7
Molyneux 24:9	move 9:15 91:23	national 6:10	86:21 89:22	Nikki 171:13
147:11,20	122:24 146:20	75:17 76:3	102:11 126:16,17	Ninth 12:21
moment 78:9	moved 10:3	166:11 171:22	127:11 130:7	no-notice 30:7
112:14 118:16	122:19	173:17	144:7 171:8	32:18
123:25 147:17	movement 111:22	Nationality 48:3	173:6 190:21	noise 57:25 134:13
179:19	movements 166:22	145:23	needs 23:1 25:15	noisy 38:13 73:2
moments 122:3	moves 110:20	nationals 200:14	39:1 42:18 46:5	non-attendance
money 116:25	147:6	natural 38:9	50:1 146:23	99:17
163:16	moving 115:19	naturally 27:12	161:19 164:1	Non-compliance
monitor 54:24	126:21,22 146:19	nature 2:20 6:24	165:8,8 167:9,22	106:9
81:21 197:17	Mubenga 42:16	7:24 41:1 42:11	167:25 171:6	non-compliant
monitoring 81:14	108:18	66:4 98:21	194:20	181:23
132:21 161:11	much7 123:19	113:16 137:12	negative 30:25	non-criminal
monitors 147:3	mucking 118:11	175:8 183:1	36:25 50:21	193:21
month 87:19,19	multi-source	near 66:24	138:3 176:5	non-exhaustive
181:11	119:10	nearby 74:4	188:15	12:3
months 31:15	multi-sourced	nearest 127:24	neglect 15:23	non-intentional
75:17 80:11 89:9	117:1 118:25	nearly 24:15 80:10	69:22	59:14
120:23 121:10	multiple 31:19	80:20 100:8,21	negligent 75:1	nonsense 88:23
125:14,25 133:12	33:10 70:14	112:6 136:11	neither 81:13	123:10
134:1 137:3	multiplied 67:3	necessarily 11:19	99:19 188:14	nonsensical 124:2
138:8 183:11	mundane 84:25	108:25	netting 61:6,18,25	normal 135:22
193:1	152:23,25 153:1	necessary 6:21	62:3,21 65:23	182:5
moral 26:22 31:24	Murphy 14:3,13	10:19 15:10	never 6:9 18:22	normalisation
43:22 200:25	101:1 162:7	21:13 34:16 98:5	48:18 60:14	18:3 107:1
201:2	170:13	165:16 175:9,13	72:11 76:1 79:18	normalise 40:22
morale 182:2	museum 94:13	neck 73:17 74:1,8	82:18 87:25	normalised 40:16
morbid 94:8	myth 183:14	138:14 139:13	88:19,19 92:11 98:23 106:3	41:5 101:15
morning 1:3,4,7	N	Neden 20:11 123:3	70.45 100.5	normally 28:15
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 231
Northern 57:24	109:10 112:7	24:5 27:13 45:14	202:2 203:1,16	older 123:20
Norway 175:14	object 165:10	51:19	202.2 203.1,10	omissions 100:18
notably 175:14	objective 7:3	occurs 29:13	Office's 24:9,21	omit 57:5
note 1:11 10:14	obligations 8:1	offences 114:7,7,8	76:25 201:1,4,6	once 17:14 26:1
27:9 29:3 55:15	27:24 36:15	166:20	201:22	54:20 67:9 68:6
55:20 77:14	oblivious 22:7	offended 168:5	officer 63:3 64:23	76:18 87:25
112:5 123:8,9	obs 133:1	Offender 166:12	83:22 84:2	104:4 149:17
137:19 141:4	observation	offending 150:20	110:25 119:13	163:1,17
189:17	187:21	offensive 29:6	126:8 136:24	one-hour 198:6
noted 57:13	observational	182:8 189:14	166:17 167:15	one-off 126:12,13
130:11	195:23	offer 70:4 76:8	171:12 186:9,10	126:15
notes 28:12 86:5	observations 59:3	office 16:2 20:25	197:16,18	ones 121:20,21
120:15 122:2	observed 23:13	21:23 22:4 25:10	officers 16:20	178:17
138:11 159:8	41:12 69:13	25:14 31:6 33:23	19:14,21 26:14	ongoing 122:10
notice 24:10 31:7	<b>Observer</b> 147:9	34:23 35:25 36:2	31:19 32:22 39:6	onlookers 60:17
notion 33:20	obtain 80:10 88:13	36:14 38:3 40:2	40:13 42:1,23	Oozeerally 35:7
183:13	<b>obtained</b> 13:5 23:3		40:13 42:1,23	39:24 45:2,10
notwithstanding	obtained 13:3 23:3 obviate 75:23	43:7,24 45:7 46:9,15 47:2	63:2 67:19 74:2	77:7,10 79:22
51:4	obvious 5:20 20:5	48:13 63:16 67:4	77:16 79:3,9	80:11 81:8 87:24
November 23:13	90:8 123:10	68:1,18 70:23	81:12 83:19,24	88:25 90:1,10
47:24 70:24 83:3		71:2,6 73:21	84:9,14 105:4,11	92:8 104:15
120:19	125:5 156:8,10 175:21	76:5,7,19 77:1,6	105:19 106:19	133:3 137:20
nuanced 4:22 5:5		79:6 80:6 81:3	121:8 125:23	
	obviously 61:24,25	82:19 87:18,25		<b>open</b> 3:4 10:1 38:10 137:19,20
<b>number</b> 34:4,11 41:3 54:11	62:6,17,18 63:6 66:10 113:15	89:6,11,18 90:10	126:4,18 160:17 168:20 169:5,23	146:20 174:4
110:11 116:7	115:20 124:24	90:19 92:13 93:1	170:16 171:3,7	
120:5 122:8,10			170:10 171:3,7	<b>opened</b> 137:23 173:15 174:1
120.3 122.8,10	127:10,12 129:10 133:6	95:18,20,22 96:17 97:4,7,24	178:2 180:17	opening 13:24
145:20 148:12	occasion 78:18	99:6 100:5,9	181:3 182:16	15:3 43:17 45:24
156:14 161:24	82:14 86:14	102:18,23 104:21	186:13 187:21	49:18 52:4 56:5
162:4,23 166:16	156:13	102.18,23 104.21	188:25 189:6	104:9 113:4
		103.21 107.4	190:21 197:14,15	
180:19	occasionally 198:9 occasions 34:4,11	124:24 126:8,11	197:22 198:7,16	152:22 155:6
numbers 21:17	66:15,16 72:15	124.24 120.8,11	197.22 198.7,10	181:15 185:14
24:3 29:25	82:13 84:2,23	127.16 126.22	offices 16:1	openly 33:8 80:2
121:19 147:17,25	86:20 91:2,5	130:15,19,24	official 43:7 56:19	122:5
147:25 149:5,6,7	105:4 156:14	130:13,19,24	80:4 130:24	openness 148:24
150:16,19,25	161:24 169:14	131:7,18,20,22	141:20	opens 137:25
165:13 175:15	177:24 182:11	134:21,22 133:2	officially 10:16	operate 35:5 44:7
numerous 15:13	186:4	144:8,13 146:2	officials 20:25	44:12 71:23
26:5 63:20 91:2	occur 3:7 7:23 8:5	147:21,23,24,24	36:4 47:2 48:13	85:16 141:21
171:11 196:10	22:19 37:15 52:8	147:21,23,24,24	67:25 68:1	156:25 203:3
nurse 64:1 101:6	occurred 4:10	150:22 153:7	165:24	operated 19:1
103:4 191:10	16:23 20:17	180:16,24 182:6	offshore 146:3	39:18 40:9 79:3
nurses 39:21	36:18 160:13	183:9,12 184:24	Oh 129:20	194:17 197:6
nursing 194:18	occurrence 26:21	190:13 192:10	okay 62:16,19,20	operating 24:10
nursing 174.10	occurrences	190:13 192:10	62:23 63:4,5	43:13 135:12
0	170:18	197:3 199:20,22	154:17	194:18
Oakington 16:25	occurring 21:15	201:9,12,20	old 123:18,18	operation 68:8
32:11 108:15		∠U1.7,1∠,∠U	viu 123.10,10	operation 00.0
52.11 100.15	l		l	l

				Page 232
76.24 90.15	original 21.10		20.16 26.10 00.5	nass 14.21 120.5
76:24 80:15 167:2	original 21:18 196:21	<u> </u>	20:16 36:10 80:5	pass 14:21 139:5
		<b>page</b> 72:19	80:7 97:24	passed 83:21
operational 27:3,6	othering 50:12	pages 17:17	113:20 119:18	87:19
54:17,23 74:23	ought 1:21 9:11	paid 82:19 134:12	136:7 143:3	passive 106:23
81:20 142:10	159:12	pain 18:3 56:12,13	144:12 151:7	patch 137:4
operations 21:21	outcome 53:19	56:15,18,20	155:22 157:23	patently 19:15
operators 203:5	142:9,18 150:11	57:18 64:7 68:2	165:3 183:17	95:25
opinion 58:2	outlawry 63:9	75:10 78:7,8	participant 8:2	Paterson 19:10
opportunities	81:16	98:20 105:10	170:8 185:13	33:3
200:3	outlaws 79:2	118:17 139:16	186:12	patient 77:5,6
opportunity 15:17	<b>outline</b> 1:8 14:9	pain-inducing	participants 1:12	patient's 99:16
35:14 93:10,13	55:13	69:3 139:15	13:16 14:2,11,12	patients 40:3
96:18,21 160:19	outlined 92:6	pains 76:20	16:4 69:23	pattern 22:3 65:17
164:25 167:9	outset 87:5 92:17	<b>pair</b> 98:16	participants'	71:11
opposed 32:25	95:9 154:22	palpitations 104:6	190:6	patterns 17:23
158:9	155:25 185:18	104:18	participate 34:8	176:6
opposite 34:1	outside 39:18	pandemic 150:15	participating 52:1	Patterson 190:11
oppressive 30:5	135:5,6 151:4	150:18	particular 3:23	200:12,15
option 28:15 199:8	198:25	panel 4:3 106:9	6:21 12:1 15:11	paucity 18:19
oral 17:19 19:14	outstanding 106:4	panic 67:13	25:24 39:8 44:10	Paul 52:20 68:19
30:9 55:12 61:23	overall 58:10	panorama 17:15	81:2 92:5,7	127:24
63:11 96:7	81:19 131:21,22	17:21 23:3 50:3	95:14 121:7	Pause 179:20
100:12 108:21,23	overcome 36:2	52:11 109:9	137:11,13 143:25	pausing 88:16
122:12 127:18	overcrowded	112:10 115:22	145:21 178:19	89:16
131:2 147:18	179:11,12 180:7	116:4,6 121:17	192:21	pay 161:25 176:8
151:16 156:15	overcrowding	125:14,15,25	particularly 12:25	penalty 197:2
orally 55:16	178:5	140:21 170:11	22:22 57:18 65:3	pending 48:2
orchestrated	overdose 95:21	185:9,20 186:18	67:19 81:12	183:4
77:21	override 40:2	189:12 193:19	88:24 127:21	people 24:15 28:21
order 8:19 10:17	overseen 202:21	194:11 196:18	139:24 141:16	31:16 33:6 34:7
55:16 76:6,10	oversight 18:20	200:11 203:5	156:24 158:17	36:23 51:12 52:6
117:10 122:24	20:3 21:9 34:24	pants 78:14	162:1 164:4	52:25 68:18
132:9,11 143:23	45:8 52:15 203:2	panes 78.14 paper 187:22	168:15,16 169:17	69:21 71:24
144:1 145:16	overstayed 165:9	paperwork 64:5	169:25 180:25	85:19 93:1,19,21
148:12 149:2	overstayers	parade 110:23	196:2	100:6 111:5,18
166:9 168:1	166:21 193:19	111:3	parties' 6:16	111:21,24 114:1
169:24 197:9	202:15,23	paradigm 138:5	partly 70:24	114:5,8 115:2,8
ordinary 5:19 9:19	overt 42:21	paradigm 138:3 paragraph 5:13	Partridge 51:14	115:10 116:5,7,8
11:15 33:6	overuse 17:25	23:11 27:1 44:14	157:17 158:2	116:16,24,25
192:17	overwhelmed		parts 51:22	118:3,6,13,15
organisation 43:5	170:5	49:8 55:2,15,20	party 129:17	119:2,15 122:9
43:18 116:12	overwhelming	55:25 57:12 58:3	Paschali 60:12,20	123:2,3,3,6,19
127:13 158:5	173:23	58:19 64:11 78:4	60:22 144:1,2	124:8,9,12
202:19	overwork 182:2	79:16	170:13 182:16,18	126:25 127:9,10
organisational	overworked 181:6	paragraphs 28:2	186:21 188:23	133:1,17 134:8
51:8	Owen 19:6 40:19	52:3	189:22	134:19 135:18
organisations	111:6 154:20	parliament 48:4	Paschali's 61:1	143:8 149:12,20
51:12 145:14,15	186:13	parliamentary	67:13 189:19	149:20 150:8,19
origin 204:5	owing 201:16	26:5	198:21	150:25 151:8,8
01 igiii 204.3	J WING 201.10	part 5:8 15:19	170.41	130.23 131.0,0
	l			l

				Page 233
	 	l		 
152:15 153:9,17	persist 24:20	<b>Peter</b> 20:11	<b>Pincus</b> 154:2	124:20 127:15
153:23 154:8	124:1	Petherick 20:11	pinned 31:20	130:21 137:22
155:1,11 161:16	persisted 33:9	51:15 111:19	<b>pique</b> 87:21	139:6,15 141:18
161:21 162:7	122:13	117:16 151:16	Pitchford 4:2 5:2	141:19 143:16
163:6 165:9,11	persistence 124:7	178:14 183:18	place 17:6 29:2	149:1 164:14
167:15 168:1	persisting 123:4	petty 84:25	42:19 45:14	172:17 176:11
169:8,11 174:14	person 10:3 12:17	<b>phase</b> 30:22 47:20	53:18 55:6 92:24	177:7,18 189:7
175:15,22 176:1	18:6 25:24 27:18	83:2 115:8,9	94:11,11,16	190:3 197:1
179:7 183:3	28:25 29:9 32:2	phases 15:5,16	117:17 119:16	199:20 201:1
187:12 193:15	43:7 44:9,18	<b>Phil</b> 21:16,23	172:22 173:16	<b>pointed</b> 44:1 45:17
195:8,11 197:22	57:17 68:14	144:10 183:12	178:5 190:14	pointing 119:17
199:25 200:8	106:25 129:10	Phillips 51:15	193:3 194:9	pointless 76:15
201:14	130:25 133:8	<b>phone</b> 180:20	197:15 200:1	points 2:13 130:20
percentage 120:2	148:15 153:20	<b>phones</b> 180:20	<b>placed</b> 106:22	135:21 141:5
120:3	160:16,18,20	photographs	159:8 161:20	177:6 197:2
perception 49:15	165:24 168:10	159:5	162:10 196:2	202:7
perfect 37:14	193:12 195:21	phrase 101:3	<b>places</b> 131:23	poisoning 83:20
202:9	197:23	119:23 130:1	134:4 149:7,10	Poland 149:7
perform 163:25	person's 7:25	142:10	placid 189:1	polarised 135:10
<b>period</b> 2:3 18:17	12:21,24 106:11	physical 3:12	<b>plain</b> 29:5 33:5	polarising 135:14
28:24 51:3,6	171:14 177:10	10:11,15,24 12:7	45:4	<b>police</b> 51:15 57:12
57:14 72:14	personal 16:6	12:15,17,21 13:8	plainly 102:12	57:14 189:20
82:16 88:18 91:9	68:25	15:22 19:5 26:22	<b>plank</b> 161:19	<b>policies</b> 2:14,18,19
92:12 95:23	personally 70:3	27:10,13,20	planned 63:10	2:19,25 15:7
96:10 104:24	183:5	29:17,19 31:25	94:24 138:22	21:8 25:5 26:24
109:13 120:21	persons 2:22 8:17	32:6 38:7 55:21	plastic 78:14	32:19 38:17,23
121:14 130:23	15:17 17:24	55:22 56:2,14	<b>plates</b> 197:21	44:7,18 72:3
132:7 135:4	34:14 118:18	57:16 59:12 60:4	play 24:2 33:1	196:12 203:23
137:7 139:24	155:4 156:12,16	64:7 65:17 70:19	41:2 43:3,13	<b>Policing</b> 4:1 7:18
149:2 163:10	157:6 162:1,9,14	75:8 78:22 79:25	164:13,14	policy 22:18 25:21
173:12 175:18	163:20 164:16	85:23 101:24	played 39:22	28:8,20 31:6
185:8 190:10	165:1,2,4,8,13	104:12 106:13	113:20	32:8 33:13,20,24
192:7 194:17	166:4,7,19 168:6	113:20 163:21	playing 170:17	35:2 44:5,5,12,15
195:10 197:9	168:7 169:4	178:4	please 9:15 131:6	44:20 46:7 54:17
periods 37:1 82:17	171:5,7,16,20	physically 62:4	plot 62:23	62:1,9 69:12
99:9 107:3	172:23,24 173:1	96:8 98:20	plough 148:7	71:1,8 72:1 97:9
111:13 150:12	174:10 175:2,7	105:11 158:18	<b>ploughs</b> 149:18	102:20 152:3
174:7 202:12	175:11,20,24	pick 133:23	<b>pm</b> 107:22,25	184:16,20 195:15
permanently	176:14 181:18,24	picked 113:17	176:22,24 204:16	195:16 200:17
188:1	persuade 108:9	128:13	point 2:8 5:8 6:3	politely 127:9
permissible 4:23	145:7 160:19	picking 81:15	7:20 10:14 14:20	political 21:2
permitted 4:25	persuading 175:22	133:13,24 176:11	28:16 31:10,23	25:18 32:21
perpetrated 15:21	persuasion 6:21	picks 134:5	45:12 48:22	131:21 134:22
perpetuated 50:7	persuasive 145:7	picture 18:22	62:12 65:20	150:6
50:21	pervaded 101:14	172:16	66:24 79:17	politics 152:22,24
perpetuating	pervasive 18:9	piece 60:16 70:7	89:17 96:19	<b>pool</b> 170:18
49:13	42:15 50:23	144:18	113:3,3 115:6,6	poor 2:20 38:7,9
persecution	perversity 197:1,5	<b>pig</b> 101:10	115:19 120:11	85:7 103:19
165:12	perverted 63:13	<b>pilot</b> 79:5	121:12,23 122:22	118:23 161:5
	_	=		
	l ————————————————————————————————————	I	I .	I

<u> </u>				Page 234
174:21 178:4,8	powerlessness	198:13	86:23 106:24	problematic
178:12 179:7	65:20 67:3	presentation 191:9	203:17	195:17
180:19,19,20	powers 32:11	presented 106:1	priorities 40:2	problems 46:16
population 22:25	125:1 144:2	pressed 71:25	174:17	86:3 109:12,19
24:4 29:21 50:2	PPE 31:19 78:21	121:25	prioritisation	143:16 146:17
166:19 178:22	PPG 25:8	pressing 23:5 48:1	203:7	169:17 173:18,22
portrayed 184:14	practically 88:14	pressure 30:6	prioritised 38:6	178:11 179:2
pose 11:16	practice 28:9 35:2	147:8 197:19	196:25 202:19	181:17 183:2
posed 59:25	80:1 99:23 152:3	pressures 109:14	prioritising 197:10	184:19 188:10
position 11:12	152:8 175:14,20	Presumably 126:7	priority 16:3	190:9 191:7
32:16 37:11,25	204:1	presumption	157:5	194:5 197:22
46:22 59:5 69:16	practices 2:14,18	33:16 195:20	prison 28:16 37:21	202:13 203:20
81:6 109:5	2:25 15:7 17:3	presumptions 6:20	37:23 38:17,23	procedural 54:15
114:24 124:16	17:10 21:8 22:18	8:12	73:10 85:18	72:7 75:23 81:20
163:25 183:6	26:25 41:8 58:7	pretending 83:23	86:16 94:9,9	132:12
187:14 196:6	78:17 81:7	84:1,15 149:1,17	113:24,25 114:1	procedure 18:21
positive 54:25	174:21	pretty 114:11	114:4 135:3	61:25
158:20,23 160:18	practitioners 40:4	116:22 130:13,14	146:20,21 148:20	procedures 86:7
172:22 174:9	167:11	146:1 191:13	157:7 158:1,3	159:16 192:6
175:1	pre-departure	prevailed 189:2	166:14,17 168:20	199:18 203:21
positively 93:5	44:13	prevent 15:10 17:4	178:20,20 184:21	proceedings 7:24
175:3	<b>Pre-detention</b> 45:6	17:6 21:14 24:5	prison-style 158:8	7:25 8:2 128:20
possibility 8:9	pre-existing 31:21	25:23 27:7 28:9	prison style 136.6 prisoner 178:10	157:8 164:12
11:24 119:4	101:25	44:9 71:24 74:4	prisoners 7:4 9:24	167:4
possible 92:15	pre-pandemic	95:19 97:19	20:24 38:25	process 23:21
164:15	17:11	103:1	73:11 173:24	24:22,23 35:18
possibly 198:3	pre-screened	prevented 109:7	prisonisation	39:10 45:11 62:4
post 19:24 23:3	103:21	previous 16:25	37:18 38:20	71:12 72:17
52:22 85:2	preceding 65:14	25:16 66:1 85:25	prisons 28:12	80:13 88:5 106:1
109:12	121:15	86:14,20,21 88:8	166:13 178:15	120:17 148:3,4
<b>Post-It</b> 159:8	precisely 48:7	90:23 95:23	privacy 38:11 73:1	161:20 163:5,8
post-traumatic	88:11 122:6	109:7 166:21	private 20:6	163:22 165:22
39:3 83:7 169:19	pregnant 44:15	185:13	174:17,19 184:13	process-driven
poster 159:5	premeditated	previously 48:6	probabilities 5:20	85:16
198:24	61:11	86:22 109:10	7:21 8:8	processes 88:6
posters 93:24	premise 114:17	price 176:8	probability 149:8	159:16 160:3
posts 52:18	premises 105:20	<b>pride</b> 161:21	probably 108:13	processing 146:3
potential 146:10	prepare 163:12	168:24 174:25	172:12	produce 142:18
potentially 18:13	prepared 20:19	prima 7:11	probationary	150:11,22 153:6
61:21 176:8	106:8 181:1	primarily 124:23	163:10	produced 90:6
194:1	presage 113:4	195:6	problem 24:24	91:6 119:8
power 25:22 28:19	prescriptive	primary 40:2	43:6 62:23 127:8	128:16 150:20
39:14 44:8	180:25	51:25 59:5,22	130:1,2 147:24	produces 142:15
103:24 144:7	presence 42:1	188:10	148:6,25 150:7	producing 116:13
168:12 177:10	160:6	<b>Prince</b> 108:19	157:1 179:6	116:14 142:8
powerful 30:22	present 17:9 47:7	principles 3:15	184:1 188:10	<b>product</b> 101:20
powerfully 119:11	51:17 101:6	7:12 11:10 166:8	190:7 192:22	production 130:5
powerless 103:10	138:23 158:18	<b>prior</b> 51:19 53:16	193:16 199:11	130:6,9
199:2,18	172:16 196:8	71:9 76:5 77:23	201:25 202:17	profession 168:20
			·	·

				. 1 age 233
professional 54:7	200:16	173:18	psychotic 61:5	pursued 25:5
60:6 155:18	promised 16:11	protagonist 69:15	95:20	pushed 85:2
167:8 168:25	promising 126:19	protect 23:7 28:20	PTSD 31:24 66:4	pushing 73:16
195:23	145:13	33:6 36:9 54:23	70:15 83:8,15	put 60:16 64:22
professionally	promote 92:21	80:23 81:21	86:4,15,17,24	65:1 67:11 93:13
161:11 168:13	promoted 19:25	87:16 174:19	88:12 90:20,24	102:16 109:14
professionals 36:5	119:16 162:13	189:22	92:25 93:4 95:21	110:6 126:1,6
46:9,12 91:17	promotion 158:6	protection 96:4	101:25 111:1	128:1 138:7
92:7	prompt 28:10 46:1	protections 33:25	136:9 187:9	139:4 142:7
professor 26:12	prompted 169:7	Protocols 59:2	188:12 192:12	147:1 149:9
33:3 36:20 38:20	prompts 147:1	prove 7:2 8:2	201:15 203:10	154:6 178:23
40:13 41:12 42:9	proof 1:16,18 3:17	proven 74:13	public 4:3,19 5:3	180:23 184:3
43:20 47:15	3:20,23,25 4:4,7	<b>provide</b> 3:20 7:6	20:23 56:18	201:24
48:10 58:18	4:12,14,21 5:4,8	17:21 27:22	67:24 96:4	puts 21:6
113:14 114:14	5:12,18,19 6:4,7	168:24 171:19	200:20	putting 16:9 45:18
116:1 148:16	6:18,23 7:13,17	180:18 198:15	publication 46:4	104:7 179:13
150:14 169:2,7	7:20 150:23	provided 33:18	pull 133:17	puzzled 164:11
172:18 179:4	proper 20:21	34:16 49:18 74:2	pulling 170:3	
191:11 193:7	39:12 43:25	89:18 155:4	punch 188:3	Q
200:22 201:11	64:21 68:7 77:24	164:6 167:1	punish 26:20	qualification
proffered 90:3	85:23 97:8	171:15 175:11	63:13	168:21
<b>profit</b> 174:17,24	120:10 160:2,8	180:17 203:12	punishment 2:6	<b>qualify</b> 10:18,20
196:15 197:9,10	189:24 194:5	provider 52:10	9:18,18,21,24	<b>quality</b> 1:17 7:1,14
202:20	properly 4:24	provides 22:14	10:2,7,12,21 12:6	9:7,9 180:20
profound 58:22	18:22 35:23	177:8,13	12:9,16,23,25	quantity 116:23
84:16	38:19 55:4,7	providing 8:17	13:8,11 18:2	quarters 104:19
profoundly 19:4	57:3 61:1 68:15	41:10 43:11	37:7 39:16 65:22	question 10:22
93:9,15 158:15	87:12 138:15	195:5	73:19 75:6	11:4 14:6 15:20
prognosis 103:19	163:9 164:1	provision 34:6	148:21 177:20	28:14 46:14 53:2
programme 17:15	170:6 188:11	50:1 100:5	punitive 156:4,7	56:22 59:21,23
17:21 165:3	192:20 194:17	159:21 167:3	156:25 175:8	59:25 64:6,8
185:9,20,22	195:12	provisions 131:24	Purnell 42:23	67:5 109:21
186:18 189:12	proportion 39:2	203:6,8	83:22 118:21	122:17 126:7,10
193:20 194:11	proportionately	<b>PSU</b> 18:21 60:10	119:6 162:7	146:18
200:11 203:5	21:24	140:13,15,23,24	purporting 33:24	questioning 110:4
progress 144:20	propose 13:14	<b>PSU's</b> 107:6	<b>purpose</b> 1:7 6:10	<b>questions</b> 1:21 3:8
144:22,24 167:9	55:12 177:3	psychiatric 92:19	11:4,6 16:9 33:7	8:20 12:3 44:5
183:22	185:10	97:15	35:13 45:22	56:6 99:5 102:3
progression	proposed 36:10	psychiatrist 91:15	56:16 67:6 78:1	114:17 122:5
155:18 167:8,14	71:3	91:20 96:25	96:16 108:8	198:11
167:18	proposing 146:3	Psychiatrists	146:22 148:13,14	queues 180:15
prohibit 26:20	proposition 44:22	37:12 46:23	148:18,20 150:2	quite 68:15,24
prohibited 95:13	122:17	92:22	151:13 156:23	113:20 136:5
prohibits 177:19	propping 124:5	psychological	195:5	172:10,10 194:3
prolonged 72:24	prosecution	58:22 59:13	purposes 35:17	quoted 52:4
101:21 105:15	189:23	63:23 66:5 70:5	57:21 68:16 69:1	R
107:3	prospect 142:8	78:3 190:21	70:12 81:14	racial 29:7 140:19
prolonging 65:9	193:25	psychology 146:10	pursuant 68:7	racism 18:10 29:2
prominence	prostitution	psychosis 201:16	77:21	29:5,10,14 32:10
				27.5,10,11 32.10

				Page 236
			I	l
40:24 41:11 42:9	real 22:3 51:23	recall 24:8 30:21	154:1,5 155:9	91:14 99:10
42:15 43:3,9,12	53:4 118:18	31:14 70:12	173:12 177:16	113:7 129:6
49:21,22 119:7	120:9 124:17	75:16 98:6 159:5	203:1	157:13 158:10
racist 12:11 29:6	134:2 142:8	171:11	recommended	173:3 186:7
32:15 41:6 42:13	149:21 150:2	recalls 78:14	43:24 47:6	188:17 198:6
42:21 64:3 79:10	151:17,19 160:6	190:24	191:16	200:15
83:19 84:20	183:19	recategorise 71:7	recommends	referring 74:7
140:21 141:15	realise 161:4	receive 91:15	203:15	79:9 89:8
159:4,11 199:5	realised 49:12	190:21 192:11	reconciled 22:5	refers 157:19
radical 26:1 44:22	120:17 192:20	203:10	reconvene 47:22	177:17
94:5	realises 157:9	received 1:19	record 8:9 76:19	reflect 123:1,25
rainy 128:5	realising 115:13	24:17 33:5 86:22	79:12 86:6 87:2	151:14 169:7
raise 169:20	168:9	88:12 91:18	93:14 123:22,22	reflected 102:20
raised 24:25 47:23	realistic 150:5	92:10,12 164:7	124:3 152:1	106:25 164:17
51:13,13 87:25	164:15	164:10 187:8	recorded 58:3	reflecting 54:9
96:22 99:6 102:9	realities 163:13	191:1 193:24	63:20 70:21	187:14
102:9 111:14,17	reality 156:12	receiving 90:14	118:24 136:20	reflects 26:25
117:16 190:25	162:24 163:1,18	91:10	recording 109:11	27:15 47:15
raising 117:14	187:3 193:2	reckless 107:2	recordings 156:17	<b>reform</b> 70:10
<b>Ramon</b> 171:18	really 96:14	recklessly 38:9	170:16 172:4,15	126:20
rampant 81:16	112:16 128:7	recognise 36:5	records 9:13 61:9	refractory 37:5
ran 157:9 197:8	131:18 132:20	43:6,8 97:7	86:1,18	99:8
random 31:4	138:1 148:25	107:5 164:9	recourse 65:20	refresher 190:20
65:13	149:15 150:9	168:7 181:15	recovered 92:3	refugee 70:13
range 108:20	170:8 172:11	191:19	recovery 92:21	refusal 59:17
122:13 165:8	198:1	recognised 20:15	93:3 103:19	65:21 104:24
181:16	reams 17:18	29:10 32:9 34:16	recreational 174:2	refuse 67:2
ranks 199:9	reason 25:25	70:13 106:6	recruit 167:24	refused 61:20 67:4
rape 79:12	44:10 52:1 74:21	168:19,21 172:17	recruitment	79:15 85:1 89:15
rarely 35:18	128:17 132:17	183:17 192:13	155:17 160:2	100:5 175:24
174:24	136:7 148:23	203:11	161:14,20 162:6	refuses 36:1
rate 134:12	149:5 153:10	recognises 7:23	163:2,3	refusing 71:13
rational 25:18	154:7,9 155:22	recognising 25:4	recruits 162:16	regard 4:14 9:5
187:7	174:8 175:10	172:21	recurrence 15:11	66:21 69:18
ratios 146:19,20	reasonable 6:7	recognition 70:1	27:7	130:18 161:12
razor 79:20	reasonably 7:9	recollection 128:4	recurrent 136:8	164:8 173:13
razors 97:21	8:15	recommend 70:3	recurring 99:3	regarded 57:20
re-experiencing	reasons 69:6	164:24 192:11	101:3 104:17	58:6 77:16
103:1	111:11,12 151:5	recommendation	redetained 96:2	162:15
reach 2:1,21 8:7	151:7 163:7	26:4 152:11	reduced 138:18	regarding 3:9
10:17,19 141:2,8	reassurance 145:3	recommendations	refer 30:19 59:2	180:14
141:9	reassure 144:13	2:7 16:13 22:10	103:5	regime 19:1 21:20
reaching 6:21	145:4	22:12 25:2 26:2	reference 1:10,24	22:18 38:3 95:10
reacting 111:23	reassured 145:23	33:10,12 43:15	2:1,8,13 4:15,18	179:8
reaction 58:22	rebuts 9:9	44:3 46:6,20	27:1 28:3 44:6	regrets 155:1
74:12 168:4	rebuttal 9:11	47:23 48:17	151:4,5 152:6,9	regularly 136:17
read 59:3 94:14	recalcitrant 25:3	69:20 93:17	204:7	138:3
126:4,5 145:8,9	recalibration	107:10 108:10	referred 27:16	Regulations 104:1
read-in 115:9	148:14	143:15 144:23	34:11 35:18	rehabilitation

				Page 237
140.21	l , , , , , , ,	1.00.5.04.100.1		15001540
148:21	relegates 21:4	129:5,24 130:1	33:9 34:3 63:23	150:8 154:2
reinforce 158:22	relevant 2:3,17	130:16 132:15,17	66:4 101:13	184:9 185:6
reinforced 168:17	35:25 51:3 59:1	133:15 136:20	103:5	representation
reinforcing 177:18	65:10 68:23	138:1,11 146:18	repeatedly 35:18	34:21
reintroduced	72:14 81:5 82:15	147:8 198:2	45:7 93:11 99:10	representations
33:20	88:18 109:13	remembered	99:11 163:11	106:5
reintroduction 48:5	115:18 120:21,24	122:20 reminder 51:24	replacing 80:2	representative
reiterated 37:25	120:24 130:23 131:24 132:7		replied 188:5 reply 148:2	121:14 182:23
reiteration 65:25	131.24 132.7	reminding 46:9 removable 106:4	report 5:13,15	representatives 171:10 190:6
reject 123:13	185:8 190:10	removable 100.4 removal 31:7	17:8 19:20 23:16	represented 14:2
rejected 36:11,12	192:7 194:17	32:18,23 41:18	29:21 35:19	14:12 189:22
71:3 189:18	195:10 197:9	63:15 67:17	45:25 46:1,3,5	represents 167:2
relate 1:24	reliable 110:15	68:14 71:5,15	54:8 61:15,16	request 47:19
related 70:14	124:4	75:18 77:23,24	63:11 66:23	requests 69:19
76:16 110:17	reliance 143:3	78:20 81:11 84:1	70:19 71:17	require 2:13
relating 18:16	relied 5:8 104:21	84:24 85:4 94:10	72:19 80:12	141:22 152:23
relation 6:3 69:4	123:5 186:10	96:3 105:17,25	86:23,25 87:1	154:15
76:13 92:5 124:1	relies 75:13	105:25 146:9	89:24 90:6 91:6	required 1:17 3:23
125:12 139:20,20	religious 12:11	149:2,8,16,19	102:9 104:18	4:4 7:1 33:18
143:11 144:22	64:3	165:22 183:4	106:8 116:16	45:15 53:5,10,13
145:24 149:9,13	relive 16:7 98:7	196:24 200:15	122:19 125:13,20	88:11,13 97:5
178:18 187:17	relocated 62:13	removals 30:7	126:1,5,12	102:15 139:9
190:3 192:23	reluctance 189:20	45:11 106:20	132:11 133:3	143:23 144:24
199:5,12 201:1	reluctant 119:15	109:15 149:13	137:21 144:17,20	158:18 163:19
202:3 203:24	remain 19:23 24:1	remove 61:11	145:9 147:2,9,14	171:23 196:8,23
relationship	36:3 97:9 100:10	71:25 96:12	153:6 159:4	197:11 201:18
157:13,15 160:18	109:19 110:12	removed 31:10	199:2,6	202:15
relationships	146:17 149:21	33:16,17 64:21	reported 101:11	requirements 10:1
135:22,24,24	196:3	65:24 79:4 82:18	114:13 123:4	11:16 38:4 69:11
171:2,5 174:9	remained 52:22	100:10	125:24 159:3	167:7
relative 64:8 161:7		removing 62:4	182:2	requires 26:19
relatively 10:18	remaining 22:15	remuneration	reporting 20:4	47:5 124:17
161:24	49:13 204:14	167:21	22:17 42:17 44:2	132:9 166:23
relaxed 38:5	remains 69:15	render 196:1	52:13 75:14	requiring 41:18
relay 96:16	82:18	rendered 2:21	97:23 125:9	203:6,9
release 28:10,15	remarks 1:7,13	196:12	174:22 199:12	resented 181:25
31:11 33:19	13:15 101:2	rendering 80:19	reports 33:10 34:5	reserves 62:10
35:20 36:1 41:20	144:11 186:19	renders 114:24	35:13,21 46:22	reservoir 167:11
46:2,3 67:4 70:23 80:14	remedial 15:10 22:21 23:1 25:8	rendition 58:13 reoccur 22:16	87:20,21 88:1	residential 181:12
97:11 100:12,20	34:1	25:13 36:19	89:13,18 90:8 95:24 104:19	residents 170:15 173:23 174:1
148:21 149:4,5	remedy 34:15	37:15	109:18 133:7,18	183:10 191:14
183:22	37:24	repatriation	133:19 134:4	resign 20:5
released 36:2,24	remember 110:24	183:23	143:2 153:8,9	resign 20.3
54:19 68:6,11	111:1,20 113:22	repeat 21:14 65:25	reprehensible	resilience 155:3
71:18 76:18	117:19 122:3,14	113:11 179:24	123:11	resistance 25:3
80:24 91:1,14	125:10 127:6,22	203:4	represent 14:21	resolved 99:14
195:14 201:8	127:23 128:4,5	repeated 16:6 19:4	109:22 123:8,10	resort 23:19 30:5
		F	120.0,10	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 238
	l		I	l
39:11 193:6	77:13 105:16,19	reviewer 21:10	195:14,18,21	48:8 61:19 62:1
resource 163:2	105:23 106:10,18	reviewing 11:21	200:12,23	63:10 68:14,19
resources 25:10	106:22 107:7	reviews 15:13	risks 39:1	69:1,14,15 70:18
45:19 46:14	162:11	25:17 33:10	robs 115:2	71:12,16 72:17
99:18 141:24	restraints 39:23	103:4	<b>robust</b> 150:9 163:5	72:17 73:22
171:20	89:4 106:23	revising 144:11	202:5	74:10 77:22 78:2
respect 5:25 16:12	restricted 129:9	rewards 94:1	role 6:11 39:25	80:3,10,12 84:23
25:9 29:25 34:25	200:21	rhetoric 32:21	40:4 157:5	86:23,25 87:6,6
38:11 82:20	restrictions 44:17	131:21 134:22	161:12 162:18,24	87:20,21 88:1,5
88:23 134:6	58:5	150:6	163:7,14,18	89:24 90:5 91:5
157:22 177:19	result 12:20 45:25	<b>ribs</b> 139:19	164:1,13,14	96:22,24 97:23
185:14	48:3 70:25 80:21	riddled 38:13	166:3,10,16	102:8,9,15 103:5
respected 171:18	80:22 83:14	67:18	167:14,17,22	104:4,5,14,19
respectfully	91:25 116:5	rife 161:2	168:18 170:4	133:3 143:1,2
152:18 189:24	137:8 165:22	<b>right</b> 6:25 14:18	174:15 181:11	167:2,7 177:9
respects 83:16	195:9 200:16	24:22 62:22	182:15 193:9	194:25
85:12	resulted 17:4	68:16 74:13	roles 52:18 161:22	ruled 34:13
respond 30:3 39:8	158:6 159:12	123:17 140:12,22	roll 85:1 180:18	rules 3:19 10:5
129:20 151:12	162:20	140:22 148:3	Romania 149:8	45:16 68:8,17
161:6 169:15	results 35:19	151:17 163:6,7	Romanian 75:17	69:12 72:4 81:10
190:22 197:22	153:7	163:15 168:1	room 61:8 62:15	87:6,9,9,15 96:16
responded 161:9	resume 17:10	186:12 204:9	62:16 98:14	102:13 144:11
182:18	retain 168:1	rightly 99:24	110:7 113:1	166:14 194:16,25
response 24:9,12	retaining 181:13	rights 7:25 17:14	126:24 131:9,10	ruling 3:25
24:16,21 33:14	retention 167:20	19:12 44:25 64:3	152:21 156:8	run 52:12 135:23
37:8 40:12 41:19	retires 122:19	76:3,11	175:18 183:6	157:7 158:1
41:25 48:16	retraumatised	rigour 17:12	191:10	162:12 196:15
60:21 107:6	192:8	Riley 21:1,16,23	<b>Rooman</b> 11:3,10	202:19
111:17 127:17,17	return 28:10 48:24	22:6 110:1	27:17	running 16:1
129:23 159:13	79:7 91:11	125:22 126:1,7	roommate 31:19	50:20 166:14
responsibility 2:11	165:10 176:19	126:16 135:7,13	rooms 175:12	196:19
6:13 15:9 19:18	returned 103:25	144:10 145:21	202:15	runs 9:25 156:1
20:2,13 22:4	204:4	183:12	root 16:22 183:2	Russia 6:8
27:20 124:11,13	returning 83:8	<b>Riley's</b> 48:1	rooted 42:7	<b>Ryan</b> 73:24
158:14 159:18,20	124:19 204:13	Ring 101:1 144:3	round 48:11,11	
184:23 190:12	Returns 44:14	177:22 180:22	roundly 36:11	S
responsible 15:18	Reverend 13:18	182:11 184:9	routine 30:2 31:20	sacking 16:19
22:9 27:15 43:13	14:5 32:24 49:5	<b>Ring's</b> 60:19	37:7 68:25 81:11	sacrifice 21:3
52:19 64:23	49:8,15,18 50:2	rise 3:11 184:5	84:25 106:17,23	safe 21:25 202:20
116:13 139:3	50:14,17,25	risk 11:17,18 30:2	routinely 159:23	safeguard 33:15
155:24 159:16	51:10,20,25 53:2	31:5 33:13,18	Royal 37:12 46:23	72:7 102:15
184:15	53:9,16,19 189:7	36:7 37:19 38:24	92:22	163:19
rest 136:13	review 17:2 26:3	45:18,24 46:2,7	rule 6:11 11:7	safeguarding 21:4
restorative 15:20	34:2 41:19 47:6	46:18 69:12 71:1	21:25 23:20 30:4	35:13 40:4 71:5
70:5	89:19,19 96:19	71:8 72:1,21	35:11,13,15,17	safeguards 23:6
restrained 73:25	108:22 128:16	78:18 95:25 97:9	35:19,21,24 36:3	25:9 28:20 30:4
105:24 106:21	133:11,17 134:1	102:20,22 104:2	38:5 39:15,19	33:4,6 35:4
restraint 38:19	143:23 159:16	105:23 106:2,6	45:21,22,22,25	36:22 45:6,17
50:19 60:24 74:3	197:17	106:24 142:6	46:1,3,6,10,13	46:17 48:8 54:17
				87:15 95:11
	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 239
	l			
96:11,21 102:3	142:12 143:14	search 62:8 78:13	seeing 31:16 112:8	102:7,18 103:6
102:23 107:11	151:23 152:15	searches 197:17	122:24 185:23	132:6,21 136:19
141:21	154:10 188:3	second 1:16 3:13	seek 99:1 161:3	143:6 147:12
safer 171:15	190:24 198:3	7:19 8:23 11:14	174:21 185:19	148:1 164:3
safety 21:6 24:19	says 23:11 25:13	12:8 13:7 15:15	seekers 32:13 48:6	165:15 171:17
192:1 196:25	53:6,9 55:16	33:4 34:2 51:10	146:3 193:19	181:21 193:6
sake 53:20	61:14 63:1,3	59:21 73:19	202:14,24	195:4
salary 167:24	73:9 114:14	115:19 119:4	seeking 60:23	self-harmed 133:2
salutary 34:22	135:6 139:8	155:17 161:14	130:6 145:7	self-harming
Sam 42:24	197:13 199:14	175:5 188:24	168:23 169:8	62:17 63:6,14
sanction 56:21	201:9	192:14	171:7 187:13	64:2
68:3,4	scale 126:22	secondary 169:2	seen 18:8 46:7	<b>Selmouni</b> 57:8,10
sanctioned 22:19	152:17	191:17,21 201:15	50:19 52:23	59:9
sanctioning 39:23	scandal 17:5 22:23	203:13	58:12 67:12,18	Sen 98:10,12
sanctions 51:25	scandals 16:25	secondly 123:25	77:15 79:9 83:9	sending 80:5
Sanders 60:9	22:20	seconds 62:24	84:8 88:21 89:2	134:10
170:1 172:5	scapegoat 184:2	secret 109:10	89:9 99:8 103:9	senior 15:25 20:11
<b>Sandra</b> 35:6 87:24	scapegoats 184:14	121:6	109:7 111:7,12	20:13,25 26:14
92:18 99:14	scarcely 82:23	Secretary 51:9	111:16,16 112:20	47:17 52:19
100:18 195:8	scared 74:17 103:9	55:1,8 68:20	112:25 116:23	111:9,18 123:3
<b>Sarah</b> 188:17	103:11,13,14	70:3 78:1 196:11	117:1,2,4,5	156:2,23 157:10
197:7	114:6 128:19	secretly 121:3	121:14 122:10	157:12,13,20,22
sat 83:2 110:22	scarring 136:20,25	section 4:25	125:23 128:10	157:24 158:4,10
112:21,23 154:21	scary 73:2	162:22 177:8	136:2,22 150:18	158:13 159:1,13
201:25	scenario 164:19	sections 32:14	152:17 170:9	159:19,24 160:5
satisfaction 167:18	scenarios 164:13	secure 28:10 35:20	191:21 199:3	160:9 161:10
satisfactory 33:21	schedule 132:2,2	77:22 100:12	200:10	162:15 167:17
satisfied 57:15	197:3	190:13	segregate 39:15	170:3 199:14
Saunders 20:1	Schoenenberger	security 31:5	segregation 9:24	sense 63:8,13
51:14 52:16	21:1 52:21	191:14 196:24	18:1,2 23:19	65:19 66:11 67:2
68:20 130:19	Schooled 136:16	201:2	30:2 34:9 37:6	116:17 151:20
131:4,6 157:16	<b>scope</b> 109:1	see 54:12,25 55:8	38:18 39:12,18	163:15 168:24
157:21,25 199:23	152:10,12	55:23 56:5 57:12	39:24 46:2 73:20	182:3 183:20
save 186:4	screaming 31:2	63:2 64:10 65:22	74:9 75:5 97:15	sensible 79:5
saving 38:6	105:10 143:22	72:19 85:3 102:6	99:9 195:2	sensibly 123:16
savings 196:21	145:18	102:12 107:20	202:17 203:18	132:8
saw 18:4 61:17	screened 38:11	111:15 112:13	Select 24:18 44:24	sent 46:8 97:24
120:13 121:2	203:15	116:6,8,9 117:22	51:16	sentences 87:14
124:19 127:3	screening 45:7	118:4,20,25	selection 172:15	separate 36:21
131:16 136:21,23	71:23 81:4 86:18	119:5,8,24 121:4	self-declared	72:14 82:13
157:25 185:21	88:5 102:3	125:5,25 127:1	102:19	89:13 91:5
193:19 196:20	194:18	127:10 130:23	self-evidently	125:11 131:14
<b>Sayers</b> 119:23	script 20:19	131:17,22,24	184:15	separately 58:4
saying 5:14 13:14	scrotum 101:2	132:8 134:3	self-harm 23:17	Separation 10:4
64:1 79:12 83:22	scrutiny 34:24	149:4,25 150:1	30:1,3 31:17	175:25
89:24 90:5	133:24 143:4	158:1 165:4	37:5 41:16 46:2	September 109:9
122:16 123:6	146:6 155:7	168:8 171:2	59:17 65:2,8	Serco's 25:10
128:17 129:3,20	SE1 55:24 57:22	191:14 203:4	66:3,14,15,16	series 57:4,11,11
134:10,14 136:5	Sean 119:23	seeds 42:10	70:16 78:25	60:2 88:22
		-	-	-

				Page 240
. 0.27.10.0	102.22	1, 4, 17, 10	16411767	1 162 6 166 24
serious 9:25 10:8	103:22	shortly 17:10	164:1 176:7	skills 163:6 166:24
13:4 20:16 34:7	sexuality 166:1	70:12 71:6,14	signs 97:2	168:1
36:7,25 46:18	shake 94:17	77:2 163:17	silence 40:22	skin 98:20
51:7 52:7 55:18	104:10	192:19	50:10	Skitt 52:16 119:16
57:18 70:15	shaken 91:17	shot 112:15,17	silent 123:21	120:8 127:23
76:21 77:19	128:6,8	<b>shouting</b> 31:1 78:6	silly 184:11	128:23 158:2
99:25 100:18	shame 94:11	86:12	similar 6:2,19 8:12	sleep 58:1,4 60:16
109:11 116:20	130:18	show 61:9 95:25	8:23 51:2 88:20	67:11 103:14
120:6 122:17	share 88:14	119:11 140:11	103:20 119:5	sleeping 176:1
125:12 128:13	202:15	showed 115:22	163:13	slide 109:24,25
129:20 130:14	shared 158:6,23	136:24	similarities 29:24	<b>sliding</b> 147:6
136:19 145:19	shareholders	showers 180:19	Similarly 57:22	slightly 82:9
165:11 166:20	174:18	showing 118:15	67:17	117:20 129:1
178:25	sharing 170:17	125:4 131:8	simple 59:25 93:12	140:3 142:9
seriously 93:13	Shaw 21:10 26:3	136:23 140:21	simply 5:17 22:4	144:18
97:7 99:19	28:6 32:9 33:14	201:10	26:10 31:12 42:2	slip 107:20
114:18 124:8,9	33:21 42:12	shown 45:10 49:17	47:13 86:17	small 109:15 147:8
125:15,18 146:4	44:24 106:8	50:3,22 53:7	87:10 89:16 94:7	170:12 172:14
151:25 170:4	108:16	150:16 170:11	105:22 128:25	176:8
servants 52:19	Shaw's 17:2 34:2	172:3 185:20	154:10 194:8	smelly 73:2
served 76:6 83:5	sheer 110:20	186:18 190:7	201:25	Smith 125:7,19
167:23	shield 31:20	196:17	Singh 178:15	126:18 137:18
service 41:9 83:9	shields 78:17	shows 23:24 24:3	single 98:19	SMT 118:14
166:12 174:14	shift 190:24	51:3 74:1 79:9	112:25 148:10	199:15
services 52:21	197:24	82:24 101:8	Sir 4:1 5:2,10	snap 98:2 191:4
136:13 200:21	shifts 198:6	117:11 134:2	siren 152:20	snapshot 121:16
serving 76:15	Shin 14:14	140:13 187:19	sit 78:13 202:6	Snitch 199:1
session 125:8	<b>shining</b> 93:15	Shu 14:14	site 52:15 157:18	so-called 60:13
sessions 92:1	Shipman 5:12	shut 94:12,15	sitting 16:1	179:14 195:18
164:21	shit 60:16 70:7	sick 83:24 84:1	situation 25:12	sober 129:9
set 1:14 4:15 51:11	shock 104:11	94:8	29:22 38:13	social 136:13
59:18 67:17	shocked 156:20	side 110:7 130:4	95:15 130:3	157:23
166:23	185:21 198:20	135:17 142:10	147:22 151:21	socialise 98:14
sets 11:10	shocking 17:23	170:11 181:13	168:10 183:25	society 17:3 26:6
setting 1:23 67:19	35:23 79:21 85:11 87:5,7	sight 19:1	192:15 196:16	53:18 135:9
125:5 <b>Seventh</b> 9:11	,	sign 51:23	197:2 198:14 199:16	soft 157:25
12:17	113:13,18 164:4 shockingly 35:21	signal 180:20 significance 43:9	199:10   situational 146:10	softer 150:10 softness 188:22
severe 19:5 55:22	shockingly 33.21 shoelace 97:21	S	situations 18:14	Soham 47:21
56:13 57:17 64:7		115:14,15 167:7	six 24:15 56:6	
64:14 78:9 99:1	<b>shop</b> 160:7 <b>short</b> 10:18 30:15	significant 23:7 53:4,12 62:5	112:7 155:16	<b>solicitor</b> 101:18 109:2
103:17	49:1 55:11 94:4	100:19 104:2		
	107:23 143:19	120:1,3 137:5	181:5 190:17,17 197:25	<b>solicitors</b> 14:3,3,13 47:25 82:6 89:14
severely 98:23 severity 10:10	149:1 165:9	155:9 158:14	sixth 8:16 9:8	95:7 136:21
12:8 13:6 28:17	176:23 177:21	160:4 165:13	12:15 56:20 68:2	solution 110:13
59:19 66:6,18	183:4 184:7,13	167:2 173:9	155:20 170:7	somebody 132:13
69:8 78:2 80:18	· ·	176:9 179:11	199:20	142:24
sewing 71:14	shortages 170:2 shortcut 95:9	188:9 199:22	199:20   skepticism 110:8	song 152:20
sewing /1:14 sexual 101:24	<b>shorter</b> 150:12	significantly 137:8	sketch 177:4	song 132:20 soon 149:4 162:25
SCAUAI 101.24	SHULLER 130.12	significantly 157:8	SACULII 1 / / .4	300H 177.4 102.23
	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	<u>l</u>

speculate 68:10       173:3 174:9,24       168:4       91:13 159:9       182:17,18,19         speculated 21:22       175:22 181:1,5,8       starting 5:8 6:3       statistic 149:14       storm 37:14         spend 134:15       181:13,25 182:2       182:10 184:13       163:17       149:4       story 137:23 140:8         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       starts 110:19       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         85:14 166:7       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strange 99:7         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       stranger 175:23					Page 241
185:19 179:18   spite 33:9   spoke 50:14 61:13   corts 113:16   76:24 88:10   110:1 115:10.13   131:19.23   165:14 166:1   169:2 192:22   spoken 62:22   spoken 62:23   spoken 62:24   spoken 62:25   spoken 62:25   spoken 62:26   spoken 62:27   spoken 62:27   spoken 62:27   spoken 62:27   spoken 62:28   spoken 62:28   spoken 62:29   spoken 62:22   s		Ì	İ	Ì	l
Specifically 29:42   13:15   13:16   13:19:13   13:19:13   13:19:13   15:614   16:13   15:614   15:13   15					
sort 94:10         76:24 88:10         staffing 21:19         18:10 11:20         123:21 131:9         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:22         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25         131:10 187:25		_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
sorts 113:16         110:1 115:10,13         staffing 21:19         187:2 191:5         staying 114:10         staying 114		_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
131:19.23					
sough 17:13         169:2 192:22 spoken 62:22 spoke		15	<u> </u>		
19:17 79:22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	i o
144:12   145:4,10   109:22   147:6   120:22   147:6   14	<u> </u>				
200:17 202:22 sound 108:4 spur 70:10 squalid 38:8 stages 136:3 stages					
sound 108:4 sounds 104:9,10 108:3 128:12 141:16         spur 70:10 squalid 38:8 Stacie 111:9,19 117:3 199:13         stages 136:3 stake 6:25 17:14 stamd 111:1,5 123:18         192:18 195:1,5 stament 1:6 13:22 23:12         steer 130:17,17 step 21:24           167:25 192:13 203:11         38:14 40:20 41:12 42:16 59ace 135:5 178:13         23:14 244 26:15 47:17 50:7 75:1 47:17 50:7 75:1 78:23 82:7 85:9 52:18,19,22,23 6:4 86:9 91:24 96:8 86:9 91:24 96:8 105:21 110:23 101:17 110:2 158:22 198:23,24 101:17 110:2 158:22 198:23,24 102:25 143:44 speaking 103:12 182:9 185:24 190:13         86:9 91:24 96:8 86:9 91:24 96:8 86:9 91:24 96:8 86:9 91:24 96:8 86:9 91:24 96:8 86:9 91:24 96:8 105:21 110:23 177:2,15 118:12 177:2,15 118:12 178:21 179:25 118:12 179:25 124:24         86:9 91:24 96:8 86:9 91:24 96:8 86:14 39:1 190:20 156:14-20 157:2 156:14-20 157:2 156:14-20 157:2 156:14-20 157:2 156:14-20 157:2 156:14-20 157:2 156:14-20 157:2 166:3,8,10,14 168:24 169:2,10 168:24 169:2,10 169:24 184:13 177:22 120:18 117:22 120:18 118:20 184:13 117:22 120:18 119:61 420:2 100:12 110:2 100:12 110:2 100:12 110:2 100:12 110:2 100:12 110	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
sounds 104:9,10 108:3 128:12 117:3 199:13 141:16         squalid 38:8 Stacie 111:9,19 141:16         stake 6:25 17:14 stamp 119:3 statement 1:6 117:3 199:13 stand 111:1,5 123:14 24:4 26:15 23:14 24:4 26:15 30:24 47:8 49:7 23:14 24:4 26:15 30:24 47:8 49:7 23:14 24:4 26:15 30:24 47:8 49:7 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:9 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:9 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:9 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:9 49:3 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:9 49:3 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:9 49:3 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:9 49:3 49:9 49:3 49:9 41:10:10 49:11 49:14 52:10 49:14 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:14 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:14 49:9 49:14 49:9 51:11 52:3 49:14 49:9 49:14 49:9 49:14 49:14 49:9 41 49:14 49:9 41 49:14 49:14 49:14 49:14 49:14 4					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
108:3 128:12   117:3 199:13   117:3 199:13   117:3 199:13   117:3 199:13   132:18   132:2 23:12   26:3 32:9 33:21   24:4 26:15   23:14 24:4 26:15   23:14 24:16   23:14 24:16   23:14 24:16   23:14 24:16   23:14 24:16   23:18   23:14 24:16   23:18   23:18   23:18   23:12 23:12   26:3 32:9 33:21   17:22 18:15   13:22 23:12   26:3 32:9 33:21   17:22 18:15   13:22 23:12   26:3 32:9 33:21   17:22 18:4:10   26:3 32:10   26:3 32:10   26:3 32:10   26:3 32:10   26:3 32:10   26:3 32:10   26:3 32:10   26:3 32:10   26:3 3		_	O		· ·
141:16 source 11:19 117:6         117:3 199:13 staff 15:21 21:17         stand 111:1,5         13:22 23:12 30:24 47:8 49:7         Stephen 21:10 26:3 32:9 33:21         Stephen 21:10 26:3 32:9 33:21         17:22 184:10 30:24 47:8 49:7         Stephen 21:10 26:3 32:9 33:21         26:3 32:9 33:21         17:22 184:10 30:24 47:8 49:7         30:24 47:8 49:7         49:12 54:4 56:5         58:18 541:56:5 58:18 30:25 44:6,11,13 78:4 79:17 82:2         17:22 184:10 30:24 47:8 49:7         30:24 47:8 49:7         49:12 55:4,711,17         49:12 55:4,711,17         49:12 55:4,711,17         49:12 55:4,711,17         49:12 55:4,711,17         49:12 55:4,711,17         49:12 55:4,471,17         49:12 55:4,711,17         49:12 55:4 49:3         40:22 55:4 49:3         40:22 55:4 49:3         40:22 55:4 49:3         40:21 5:4,711,17         40:21 55:4,71,11,71         40:21 55:4,71,11,71         40:21 55:4,71,17         40:2	· ·	<u> </u>			
source 11:19 117:6         staff 15:21 21:17         123:18         30:24 47:8 49:7         26:3 32:9 33:21           167:25 192:13         23:14 24:4 26:15         23:16 20:23         30:11         38:14 40:20         49:9 51:11 52:3         49:9 51:11 52:3         177:22 184:10           space 135:5         47:17 50:7 75:1         42:12 5:4,7,11,17         78:23 82:7 85:9         55:18,19,22,23 6:4         59:10:54 97:3         51:8,19,22,23 6:4         59:10:57         91:12 95:4 97:3         stereotypes 49:23         stereotypes 40:21		· ·	_		
167:25 192:13   23:14 24:4 26:15   38:14 40:20   2:20 3:16;20,23   54:1 56:5 58:18   54:15 68:5 58:18   54:15 68:5 58:18   38:14 40:20   3:25 44,6,11,13   78:23 82:7 85:9   5:18,19,22,23 6:4   108:7 110:5   132:10   stereotypes 49:23   stereotypes 49:23   stereotypes 49:23   101:17 110:2   105:21 110:23   117:2,15 118:12   158:22 198:23,24   speaking 103:12   146:25 154:25   155:13,19,20   156:14,20 157:2   speaks 9:17 85:15   96:7 164:10   159:14,20 157:2   159:17,19,24   160:13,25 161:1   159:17,19,24   160:13,25 161:1   169:17 170:12,3   148:10   160:13,25 161:1   169:17 170:12,3   170:20 168:13,16 164:6   8:14 39:1 131:25   168:24 169:2,10   170:14 170:2   175:22   203:21   175:22   177:22 181:1,5,8   specificity 6:24 spectifiedly 29:4   117:16   specificity 6:24 spectume 8:6 pecificity 6:24 spectuate 68:10 special 34:15   175:22   175:22   181:13,25 182:2   175:22   182:10 184:13   183:14,58   183:21 188:20 189:5,15   183:14 166:7   191:64,22   191:64,22   182:10 184:13   183:14 166:7   191:64,22   191:64,24   191:64,24   191:64,24   191:64,24   191:64,24   191:64,24   191:64,24   191:64,24   191:64,24   191:64,24   191:64,24   191:			· ·		
203:11					
sown 42:10         41:12 42:16         3:25 4:4,6,11,13         78:4 79:17 82:2         132:10           space 135:5         47:17 50:7 75:1         4:21 5:4,7,11,17         78:23 82:7 85:9         4:18,19,22,23 6:4         9:11 295:4 97:3         stereotypes 49:23           spawned 103:16         speak 99:21         105:21 110:23         117:2,15 118:12         8:4         129:7,8,14,16,24         42:21         stereotyping 29:8           speaking 103:12         146:25 154:25         167:9,19         156:61,12 157:19         155:6,12 157:19         52:16 69:17         73:25 77:21           191:3         156:14,20 157:2         standing 57:25         173:2,14 177:1         119:16 120:7,7,8           191:3         156:14,20 157:2         5tanton 154:15,16         189:20 190:19         180:2,12,3,35         185:2 172:5         185:2 172:5         185:2 172:5         185:2 172:5         185:2 172:5         185:2 172:5         185:2 172:5         185:2 172:2         stifling 130:5,8         stigma 70:9         stifling 130:5,8         stigma 70:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 70:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 70:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 13:9         stigma 13:9			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
space 135:5         47:17 50:7 75:1 78:23 82:7 85:9 spawned 103:16         42:1 5:4,7,11,17 513,17,20 108:7 110:5 110:5 110:23         108:7 110:5 125:22 128:15,18 108:7 110:5 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:15,18 122:7 125:22 128:11,17:10         4:21 5:4,7,11,17 513,17,20 125:22 128:15,18 122:12 128:12 128:12 128:13 128:22 128:11 125:143:13 128:22 128:21 128:21 128:22 128:23 128:11 128:22 128:23 128:23 128:23 128:23 128:23			· · ·		_
178:13					132:10
spawned 103:16 speak 99:21         86:9 91:24 96:8 105:21 110:23         6:7,11 7:13,17,20         125:22 128:15,18 129:7,8,14,16,24         42:21 Steve 25:11 52:16           101:17 110:2 158:22 198:23,24 speaking 103:12 192:3 speaking 103:12 191:3         120:2,5 143:4,4 60:6 155:19 160:4,12 167:19 155:6,12 157:19 160:4,12 167:29 181:28 325         155:6,14,20 157:2 167:9,19 160:4,12 167:29 173:2,14 177:1 19:16 120:7,7,8 185:5 186:6 127:23 133:9,25         8:12 83:25 173:2,14 177:1 19:16 120:7,7,8 185:5 186:6 127:23 133:9,25         155:13,19,20 156:14,20 157:2 79:5 158:18 159:6,11 159:17,19,24 160:13,25 161:1 159:17,19,24 160:13,25 161:1 159:17,19,24 162:17,20,23,25 163:13 131:25 164:6,9,12,20 168:19 171:23 specific 4:4 7:8 8:14 39:1 131:25 164:6,9,12,20 165:7 166:3 164:6,9,12,20 165:7 166:3 169:17 170:1,2,4 171:2 177:20 168:13,16 164:6 169:17 170:1,2,4 171:2 172:22 10:18 specificity 6:24 s	_ <u> </u>				
speak 99:21         105:21 110:23         8:4         129:7,8,14,16,24         Steve 25:11 52:16           101:17 110:2         117:2,15 118:12         standards 54:8         154:2,18,19         52:16 69:17           158:22 198:23,24         120:2,5 143:4,4         60:6 155:19         155:6,12 157:19         73:25 77:21           speaking 103:12         146:25 154:25         155:13,19,20         167:9,19         160:4,12 162:22         81:12 83:25           191:3         156:14,20 157:2         79:5         79:5         185:5 186:6         127:23 133:9,25           special 29:2,11         159:17,19,24         190:16 199:4         205:13         204:21,22,23,24         stifle 130:6           specialist 90:20         161:3,8,10,14         160:13,25 161:1         106:13,25 161:1         205:3         205:13         204:21,22,23,24         stifle 130:6           158:15 194:20         165:7 166:3         164:6,9,12,20         63:5 106:1,14         156:18         156:12,20         158:18 139:2         107:13,13 109:11           17:16         169:17 170:1,2,4         117:12 172:2         145:13 180:1,23         190:23         states 2:8 26:19         107:13,13 109:11           specifically 29:4         168:24 169:2,10         169:17 170:1,2,4         117:12 172:2         168:14 47:8         1167:5,6			/ / /		
101:17 110:2   117:2,15 118:12   158:22 198:23,24   120:2,5 143:4,4   146:25 154:25   146:25 154:25   155:13,19,20   155:13,19,20   155:14,71 158:15   155:14,20 157:2   155:14,17 158:15   155:14,17 158:15   157:4,17 158:15   159:17,19,24   160:13,25 161:1   159:17,19,24   168:19 171:23   162:17,20,23,25   168:19 171:23   162:17,20,23,25   168:13,16 164:6   168:24 169:2,10   168:15 194:20   203:21   167:20 168:13,16 164:6   171:16   169:17 170:1,2,4   171:16   169:17 170:1,2,4   171:16   169:17 170:1,2,4   171:12 172:22   182:10 184:13   180:1,2,3   188:20 189:25   182:2 182:11   183:21 183:25   182:2 175:22   182:10 184:13   182:10 184:13   182:10 184:13   182:10 184:13   182:11 183:15   183:11 183:15   194:20   183:11 183:25   183:20 189:5,15   183:11 101:5   192:11 193:8,13   12:21 21:2 26:24   142:12 36:216   163:17,25 10:13   183:20 199:7   182:17,18,19   18	spawned 103:16	86:9 91:24 96:8		125:22 128:15,18	
158:22 198:23,24         120:2,5 143:4,4         60:6 155:19         155:6,12 157:19         73:25 77:21           speaking 103:12         146:25 154:25         155:13,19,20         standing 57:25         173:2,14 177:1         119:16 120:7,7,8           191:3         156:14,20 157:2         79:5         185:5 186:6         127:23 133:9,25           speaks 9:17 85:15         157:4,7 158:15         Stanton 154:15,16         189:20 190:19         158:2 172:5           96:7 164:10         158:18 159:6,11         159:17,19,24         190:16 199:4         204:21,22,32,4         stifle 130:6           special 29:2,11         159:17,19,24         160:13,25 161:1         190:16 199:4         204:21,22,32,4         stifle 130:6           specific 4:4 7:8         163:13,16 164:6         stark 24:8 29:24         205:3         statements 46:22         stigmatises 202:22           8:14 39:1 131:25         164:6,9,12,20         165:7 166:3         125:6 126:22         110:3 118:5         stigmatises 79:11           17:16         169:17 170:1,2,4         159:17 170:1,2,4         170:12,14 171:2         172:2 10:18         stares 2:8 26:19         107:13,13 109:11         153:22,22           spectficity 6:24         170:12,14 171:2         120:18         stating 62:14         stops 124:21         stops 124:21           <	<b>speak</b> 99:21	105:21 110:23	8:4	129:7,8,14,16,24	Steve 25:11 52:16
speaking 103:12         146:25 154:25         167:9,19         160:4,12 162:22         81:12 83:25           191:3         156:14,20 157:2         79:5         173:2,14 177:1         185:5 186:6         127:23 133:9,25           speaks 9:17 85:15         157:4,17 158:15         158:18 159:6,11         159:17,19,24         159:17,19,24         190:16 199:4         204:21,22,324         stifle 130:6           special 29:2,11         159:17,19,24         190:16 199:4         205:3         205:1,2,34,5         stifling 130:5,8           specialist 90:20         161:3,8,10,14         162:17,20,23,25         stark 24:8 29:24         starteng 129:2         statements 46:22         stigmatise 202:22           8:14 39:1 131:25         164:6,9,12,20         63:5 106:1,14         156:18         stood 123:22         stood 123:22         stop 53:8 101:10           specifically 29:4         17:16         169:17 170:1,2,4         117:22 120:18         started 54:7 83:3         190:23         stopped 114:13         stopped 114:13           specificity 6:24         170:12,14 171:2         121:5 143:13         states 6:13         states 6:13         stops 124:21           speculate 68:10         175:22         175:22 181:1,5,8         starting 5:8 6:3         r19:28:16         startis 10:19         statistic 149:14         story 137:23 140:8 </td <td>101:17 110:2</td> <td>117:2,15 118:12</td> <td>standards 54:8</td> <td>154:2,18,19</td> <td>52:16 69:17</td>	101:17 110:2	117:2,15 118:12	standards 54:8	154:2,18,19	52:16 69:17
182:9 185:24     155:13,19,20     standing 57:25     173:2,14 177:1     119:16 120:7,7,8       191:3     156:14,20 157:2     79:5     185:5 186:6     127:23 133:9,25       speaks 9:17 85:15     157:4,17 158:15     158:18 159:6,11     158:18 159:6,11     159:17,19,24     190:16 199:4     204:21,22,23,24     stifle 130:6       special 29:2,11     160:13,25 161:1     190:16 199:4     205:1,2,3,4,5     stifle 130:6     stifle 130:6       specialist 90:20     161:3,8,10,14     staring 129:2     stark 24:8 29:24     stifle 130:6     stifle 130:6       8:14 39:1 131:25     164:69,12,20     63:5 106:1,14     156:18     start 1:23 62:16     156:18       specific 4:4 7:8     165:7 166:3     125:6 126:22     states 2:8 26:19     stood 123:22       175:19 4:20     165:7 166:3     125:6 126:22     states 2:8 26:19     107:13,13 109:11       17:10 5:10 4:10     169:17 170:1,2,4     117:22 120:18     states 6:13     states 6:13       specificity 6:24     170:12,14 171:2     163:1 167:5,6     84:14 90:10     162:17,82       speculate 68:10     173:3 174:9,24     181:13,25 182:2     163:17     91:3 159:9     182:17,18,19       speculate 13:11     181:13,25 182:2     163:17     149:4     202:10       175:22 181:1,5,8     188:20 189:5,15     163:17 <td>*</td> <td>120:2,5 143:4,4</td> <td>60:6 155:19</td> <td>155:6,12 157:19</td> <td>73:25 77:21</td>	*	120:2,5 143:4,4	60:6 155:19	155:6,12 157:19	73:25 77:21
191:3         156:14,20 157:2         79:5         185:5 186:6         127:23 133:9,25           speaks 9:17 85:15         96:7 164:10         158:18 159:6,11         158:18 159:6,11         158:18 159:6,11         158:18 159:6,11         159:17,19,24         190:16 199:4         204:21,22,23,24         stifle 130:6         stifle 130:6         stifle 130:5,8         stifle 130:6         stifle 130:6         stifling 130:5,8		146:25 154:25	167:9,19	160:4,12 162:22	81:12 83:25
speaks 9:17 85:15         157:4,17 158:15         Stanton 154:15,16         189:20 190:19         158:2 172:5           96:7 164:10         158:18 159:6,11         159:17,19,24         159:17,19,24         190:16 199:4         204:21,22,33,4,5         stifle 130:6         stifle 130:6         stifling 130:5,8         <	182:9 185:24	155:13,19,20	standing 57:25	173:2,14 177:1	119:16 120:7,7,8
96:7 164:10         158:18 159:6,11         154:18,19 176:16         191:4 197:20         stifle 130:6         stifle	191:3	156:14,20 157:2	79:5	185:5 186:6	127:23 133:9,25
special 29:2,11         159:17,19,24         190:16 199:4         204:21,22,23,24         stifling 130:5,8           specialist 90:20         161:3,8,10,14         staring 129:2         statements 46:22         stigma 70:9           specific 4:4 7:8         163:13,16 164:6         start 1:23 62:16         123:11 137:16         stood 123:22           8:14 39:1 131:25         164:6,9,12,20         63:5 106:1,14         156:18         states 2:8 26:19         107:13,13 109:11           17:16         169:17 170:1,2,4         170:12,14 171:2         170:12,14 171:2         170:22 120:18         states' 6:13         states' 6:13         stoped 114:13           specificity 6:24         170:12,14 171:2         168:4         starting 5:8 6:3         stating 62:14         stoped 114:13           speculate 68:10         173:3 174:9,24         168:4         starting 5:8 6:3         statistic 149:14         stories 88:19           speculated 21:22         182:10 184:13         188:20 189:5,15         starts 110:19         status 71:8 85:5         strain 169:22           spent 82:12 83:11         188:20 189:5,15         state 5:17,25 10:13         statutory 4:3         straing 19:22           spinc 38:13 101:5         192:11 193:8,13         12:21 21:2 26:24         35:12,17 44:12         stranger 175:23	<b>speaks</b> 9:17 85:15	,			158:2 172:5
148:10       160:13,25 161:1       205:3       205:1,2,3,4,5       stigma 70:9         specialist 90:20       161:3,8,10,14       162:17,20,23,25       staring 129:2       statements 46:22       stigma 70:9         specific 4:4 7:8       163:13,16 164:6       stark 24:8 29:24       110:3 118:5       stigmatise 202:22         8:14 39:1 131:25       164:6,9,12,20       63:5 106:1,14       156:18       stood 123:22         158:15 194:20       165:7 166:3       125:6 126:22       states 2:8 26:19       107:13,13 109:11         203:21       167:20 168:13,16       145:13 180:1,2,3       stated 54:7 83:3       190:23       stoppa 162:18         specifically 29:4       169:17 170:1,2,4       170:12,14 171:2       121:5 143:13       states' 6:13       stopped 114:13         specificity 6:24       170:12,14 171:2       163:1 167:5,6       84:14 90:10       stories 88:19         speculate 68:10       173:3 174:9,24       168:4       starting 5:8 6:3       statistic 149:14       storm 37:14         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       182:10 184:13       188:20 189:5,15       starts 110:19       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         spic 38:13 1	96:7 164:10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	154:18,19 176:16		<b>stifle</b> 130:6
specialist 90:20         161:3,8,10,14         staring 129:2         statements 46:22         stigmatise 202:22           specific 4:4 7:8         163:13,16 164:6         stark 24:8 29:24         start 1:23 62:16         123:11 137:16         stood 123:22           8:14 39:1 131:25         164:6,9,12,20         63:5 106:1,14         156:18         states 2:8 26:19         107:13,13 109:11           158:15 194:20         165:7 166:3         125:6 126:22         states 2:8 26:19         107:13,13 109:11           203:21         167:20 168:13,16         125:6 126:22         states 2:8 26:19         107:13,13 109:11           specifically 29:4         168:24 169:2,10         started 54:7 83:3         190:23         states' 6:13         stopgap 162:18           specificity 6:24         170:12,14 171:2         121:5 143:13         stating 62:14         stopgap 162:18         stopgap 162:18           speculate 68:10         173:3 174:9,24         168:4         91:13 159:9         stories 88:19           speculated 21:22         182:10 184:13         181:13,25 182:2         163:17         statistic 149:14         storm 37:14           spent 82:12 83:11         188:20 189:5,15         starts 110:19         status 71:8 85:5         strain 169:22           spic 38:13 101:5         191:6,14,22         state 5:17,25 10:13	<b>special</b> 29:2,11	159:17,19,24	190:16 199:4	204:21,22,23,24	<b>stifling</b> 130:5,8
168:19 171:23       162:17,20,23,25       stark 24:8 29:24       110:3 118:5       stigmatises 79:11         specific 4:4 7:8       163:13,16 164:6       start 1:23 62:16       123:11 137:16       stood 123:22         8:14 39:1 131:25       164:6,9,12,20       63:5 106:1,14       156:18       states 2:8 26:19       107:13,13 109:11         203:21       167:20 168:13,16       125:6 126:22       states 2:8 26:19       107:13,13 109:11         specifically 29:4       168:24 169:2,10       145:13 180:1,2,3       started 54:7 83:3       190:23       stopgap 162:18         specificity 6:24       170:12,14 171:2       121:5 143:13       states 2:8 26:19       stopgap 162:18         speculate 68:10       173:3 174:9,24       168:4       168:4       stating 62:14       stories 88:19         speculate 68:10       175:22 181:1,5,8       181:13,25 182:2       163:17       statistic 149:14       stories 88:19         175:22       182:10 184:13       183:20 189:5,15       starts 110:19       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         spent 82:12 83:11       185:20 189:5,15       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strain 169:22       strange 99:7         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       strange 775:23 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>205:1,2,3,4,5</td> <td></td>				205:1,2,3,4,5	
specific 4:4 7:8       163:13,16 164:6       start 1:23 62:16       123:11 137:16       stood 123:22         8:14 39:1 131:25       164:6,9,12,20       63:5 106:1,14       156:18       stop 53:8 101:10         158:15 194:20       165:7 166:3       125:6 126:22       states 2:8 26:19       107:13,13 109:11         203:21       167:20 168:13,16       145:13 180:1,2,3       84:10 173:14       153:22,22         specifically 29:4       168:24 169:2,10       started 54:7 83:3       190:23       stopgap 162:18         177:12       170:12,14 171:2       121:5 143:13       states' 6:13       stopped 114:13         speculate 68:10       173:3 174:9,24       168:4       84:14 90:10       stories 88:19         speculated 21:22       175:22 181:1,5,8       starting 5:8 6:3       statistic 149:14       storm 37:14         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       163:17       status 71:8 85:5       status 71:8 85:5         spice 38:13 101:5       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       35:12,17 44:12       strange 99:7         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       stranger 175:23	specialist 90:20	161:3,8,10,14	staring 129:2	statements 46:22	stigmatise 202:22
8:14 39:1 131:25       164:6,9,12,20       63:5 106:1,14       156:18       stop 53:8 101:10         158:15 194:20       165:7 166:3       125:6 126:22       states 2:8 26:19       107:13,13 109:11         203:21       167:20 168:13,16       145:13 180:1,2,3       84:10 173:14       153:22,22         specifically 29:4       168:24 169:2,10       started 54:7 83:3       190:23       stopgap 162:18         specificity 6:24       170:12,14 171:2       121:5 143:13       stating 62:14       stops 124:21         speculate 68:10       173:3 174:9,24       168:4       91:13 159:9       stories 88:19         speculated 21:22       175:22 181:1,5,8       starting 5:8 6:3       statistic 149:14       storm 37:14         spend 134:15       182:10 184:13       7:19 28:16       statistics 36:2       202:10         175:22       182:10 184:13       starts 110:19       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strain 169:22         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       stranger 175:23	168:19 171:23	162:17,20,23,25	stark 24:8 29:24	110:3 118:5	stigmatises 79:11
158:15 194:20       165:7 166:3       125:6 126:22       states 2:8 26:19       107:13,13 109:11         203:21       167:20 168:13,16       145:13 180:1,2,3       84:10 173:14       153:22,22         specifically 29:4       168:24 169:2,10       169:17 170:1,2,4       170:12,14 171:2       170:12,14 171:2       170:12,14 171:2       states' 6:13       stoppap 162:18         spectrum 8:6       170:12,14 171:2       163:1 167:5,6       84:14 90:10       stopped 114:13         speculate 68:10       173:3 174:9,24       168:4       91:13 159:9       stories 88:19         speculated 21:22       175:22 181:1,5,8       181:13,25 182:2       163:17       statistic 149:14       storm 37:14         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       163:17       149:4       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         spice 38:13 101:5       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       strange 99:7	specific 4:4 7:8	163:13,16 164:6	start 1:23 62:16	123:11 137:16	stood 123:22
203:21       167:20 168:13,16       145:13 180:1,2,3       84:10 173:14       153:22,22         specifically 29:4       168:24 169:2,10       168:24 169:2,10       190:23       stopgap 162:18         117:16       169:17 170:1,2,4       170:12,14 171:2       170:12,14 171:2       121:5 143:13       stating 62:14       stopped 114:13         spectrum 8:6       171:12 172:22       163:1 167:5,6       84:14 90:10       stories 88:19         speculate 68:10       175:22 181:1,5,8       starting 5:8 6:3       statistic 149:14       storm 37:14         spend 134:15       181:13,25 182:2       7:19 28:16       statistics 36:2       202:10         175:22       182:10 184:13       163:17       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strange 99:7         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       stranger 175:23	8:14 39:1 131:25	164:6,9,12,20	63:5 106:1,14	156:18	<b>stop</b> 53:8 101:10
specifically 29:4       168:24 169:2,10       started 54:7 83:3       190:23       stopgap 162:18         117:16       169:17 170:1,2,4       117:22 120:18       states' 6:13       stopped 114:13         specificity 6:24       170:12,14 171:2       121:5 143:13       stating 62:14       stops 124:21         speculate 68:10       173:3 174:9,24       168:4       91:13 159:9       stories 88:19         speculated 21:22       175:22 181:1,5,8       starting 5:8 6:3       statistic 149:14       storm 37:14         spend 134:15       181:13,25 182:2       7:19 28:16       statistics 36:2       202:10         175:22       182:10 184:13       163:17       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strain 169:22         85:14 166:7       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       35:12,17 44:12       stranger 175:23	158:15 194:20	165:7 166:3	125:6 126:22	states 2:8 26:19	107:13,13 109:11
117:16       169:17 170:1,2,4       117:22 120:18       states' 6:13       stopped 114:13         specificity 6:24       170:12,14 171:2       121:5 143:13       stating 62:14       stops 124:21         speculate 68:10       173:3 174:9,24       168:4       91:13 159:9       stories 88:19         speculated 21:22       175:22 181:1,5,8       starting 5:8 6:3       statistic 149:14       storm 37:14         spend 134:15       181:13,25 182:2       7:19 28:16       statistics 36:2       202:10         175:22       182:10 184:13       163:17       status 71:8 85:5       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strange 99:7         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       stranger 175:23	203:21	167:20 168:13,16	145:13 180:1,2,3	84:10 173:14	153:22,22
specificity       6:24       170:12,14 171:2       121:5 143:13       stating       62:14       stops       124:21         spectrum       8:6       171:12 172:22       163:1 167:5,6       84:14 90:10       stories       88:19         speculate       173:3 174:9,24       168:4       91:13 159:9       182:17,18,19         speculated       21:22       181:13,25 182:2       7:19 28:16       statistic       149:14       storm       37:14         spent       82:12       83:11       188:20 189:5,15       starts       110:19       status       71:8 85:5       strain       169:22         85:14       166:7       191:6,14,22       state       5:17,25 10:13       statutory       4:3       strange       99:7         spice       38:13       101:5       192:11       193:8,13       12:21       21:22       26:24       35:12,17       44:12       stranger       175:23				190:23	101
spectrum 8:6       171:12 172:22       163:1 167:5,6       84:14 90:10       stories 88:19         speculate 68:10       173:3 174:9,24       168:4       91:13 159:9       182:17,18,19         speculated 21:22       175:22 181:1,5,8       starting 5:8 6:3       statistic 149:14       storm 37:14         spend 134:15       181:13,25 182:2       163:17       149:4       story 137:23 140:8         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       starts 110:19       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         85:14 166:7       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strange 99:7         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       stranger 175:23	117:16		117:22 120:18	states' 6:13	<b>stopped</b> 114:13
speculate 68:10       173:3 174:9,24       168:4       91:13 159:9       182:17,18,19         speculated 21:22       175:22 181:1,5,8       starting 5:8 6:3       statistic 149:14       storm 37:14         spend 134:15       181:13,25 182:2       7:19 28:16       statistics 36:2       202:10         175:22       182:10 184:13       163:17       status 71:8 85:5       story 137:23 140:8         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       starts 110:19       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         85:14 166:7       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strange 99:7         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       stranger 175:23		170:12,14 171:2	121:5 143:13	stating 62:14	stops 124:21
speculated 21:22       175:22 181:1,5,8       starting 5:8 6:3       statistic 149:14       storm 37:14         spend 134:15       181:13,25 182:2       7:19 28:16       149:4       202:10         175:22       182:10 184:13       163:17       149:4       story 137:23 140:8         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       starts 110:19       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         85:14 166:7       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strange 99:7         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       stranger 175:23	spectrum 8:6	171:12 172:22	163:1 167:5,6	84:14 90:10	stories 88:19
spend 134:15       181:13,25 182:2       7:19 28:16       statistics 36:2       202:10         175:22       182:10 184:13       163:17       149:4       story 137:23 140:8         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       starts 110:19       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         85:14 166:7       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strange 99:7         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       stranger 175:23	speculate 68:10	173:3 174:9,24	168:4	91:13 159:9	182:17,18,19
175:22       182:10 184:13       163:17       149:4       story 137:23 140:8         spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       starts 110:19       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         85:14 166:7       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strange 99:7         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       stranger 175:23	speculated 21:22	175:22 181:1,5,8		statistic 149:14	storm 37:14
spent 82:12 83:11       188:20 189:5,15       starts 110:19       status 71:8 85:5       strain 169:22         85:14 166:7       191:6,14,22       state 5:17,25 10:13       statutory 4:3       strange 99:7         spice 38:13 101:5       192:11 193:8,13       12:21 21:2 26:24       35:12,17 44:12       strange 175:23	spend 134:15	181:13,25 182:2	7:19 28:16	statistics 36:2	202:10
85:14 166:7	175:22	182:10 184:13	163:17	149:4	story 137:23 140:8
spice 38:13 101:5   192:11 193:8,13   12:21 21:2 26:24   35:12,17 44:12   stranger 175:23	spent 82:12 83:11	188:20 189:5,15	starts 110:19	status 71:8 85:5	strain 169:22
1 7	85:14 166:7	191:6,14,22	state 5:17,25 10:13	statutory 4:3	strange 99:7
101·10 116·24 25   193·15 194·5   33·9 34·13 35·9   97·22   strangers 156·9	spice 38:13 101:5	192:11 193:8,13	12:21 21:2 26:24	35:12,17 44:12	stranger 175:23
101.10 110.24,25   175.15 174.5   55.7 54.15 55.7   77.22   strangers 150.7	101:10 116:24,25	193:15 194:5	33:9 34:13 35:9	97:22	strangers 156:9
					_
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ı

				Page 242
strangulation	80:16 81:17	10:17,20,25	suited 97:1	symptoms 37:4
58:20	84:23 92:3 95:10	12:19 13:5,9	suits 4:17	70:19 83:7
Strasbourg 28:10	100:13 105:13	15:24 18:3 19:13	sults 4.17 sullenly 129:1	104:18 105:2
strategy 163:3	192:6	27:12 28:25	summaries 17:20	191:10,21
strengthen 33:25	subjective 66:19	29:17 31:16 37:1	summarise 136:1	Syred 19:6 40:19
stress 11:19 31:3,8	submission 55:12	44:19 55:19,21	summarises 98:12	40:23 111:6
31:11,12 39:3	111:10 116:22	55:22 56:2,12,13	supervision	154:20,22 155:6
83:8 98:3 169:19	117:12,22 122:4	56:15,18,20	105:21	155:14 156:1,16
176:2 182:1	124:5 133:21	57:18 58:24 64:7	supplying 116:24	156:22 157:3,4,9
203:14	184:1 196:23	64:13 68:2 70:22	116:25 117:8	157:21 158:12
stressed 111:13	submissions 1:11	75:2,10 94:3	support 9:4,6 82:7	159:2 160:24
stresses 201:16	6:16 13:24 14:4	95:13 101:5,21	134:18 159:2,10	161:23 162:12
stressful 30:25	14:24 30:10	104:13,17 106:13	159:22 169:8,9	163:4 164:8,11
72:23 73:4	46:24,25 48:23	118:17 137:8	169:18 170:2	164:19,24 165:16
168:10 175:7	55:11 70:11	187:7 195:24	171:7,24 198:16	165:23 166:1
stretched 183:11	93:18 95:5 107:9	201:15	supported 6:14	167:1,12,16,23
strict 25:23 44:16	142:4 154:7	suffers 16:14	57:8 128:9	168:18 169:7,14
strike 71:13	177:4,5 185:11	70:15 95:20	supporting 8:13	169:18 170:20
striking 156:14	185:14 192:23	158:12	8:18	171:11 172:2,6,8
strip 62:8 78:13	204:10,12,14	sufficient 58:24	supportive 158:20	172:19,23 173:8
stripes 152:15	submit 1:15 3:7	132:11 170:6	171:12	173:11,14,21
strong 6:19 8:11	147:3 184:18	sufficiently 6:18	supposed 116:12	174:10,12,18
33:16	submitted 173:2	8:11	125:17 180:11	175:21 176:12
strongly 38:21	180:13 192:23	suggest 3:4 64:16	supposedly 125:14	186:12,13 188:25
52:5	subsection 177:9	88:21 105:24	183:3	199:6
structurally 33:14	177:13	124:21 160:17	suppressed 101:15	<b>Syred's</b> 159:7
structured 85:16	subsequent 177:17	174:12 176:18	160:11	160:12,14 168:4
struggled 104:8	subsequently	suggested 1:8	sure 6:8 8:3 62:1	170:7 171:25
struggling 78:7	86:16 106:21	123:16 190:9	107:19 142:21	174:15,23
110:25 111:2	substance 181:21	suggestion 189:18	sure' 4:10 5:16,21	<b>Syria</b> 149:10
198:16	193:24	suggestions 47:1	surprising 131:18	system 16:17 20:8
stuff 118:20 121:5	substantial 51:23	160:10 162:21	137:9 179:9	22:1,18 43:14
121:8 123:21	82:17,19	suggests 150:18	Surrey 171:21	49:13,14,15,17
125:15 130:14	substantiate 7:4	164:19 174:10	surrounds 141:14	50:7,8 52:7 53:1
137:6	success 66:25	<b>suicidal</b> 30:2 75:2	suspected 136:9	53:11,16,18 68:9
stunning 90:18	<b>succumb</b> 152:19	80:20 89:22 91:3	suspended 48:7	69:13,22 71:22
sub-questions 13:2	<b>Sudan</b> 149:10	91:4 187:7 195:4	<b>suspicion</b> 4:23 8:9	72:2,9 80:3,4
subculture 40:17	suffer 9:24 11:17	suicidality 37:5	suspicion' 5:24	88:7 93:19,20,24
<b>subdued</b> 139:13	11:18 12:18 39:2	55:4 59:18 65:16	sustained 110:15	94:8 97:25
<b>subject</b> 27:18,25	92:4 96:11	65:19 66:3 79:1	124:4 126:20	109:14 123:23
28:13 56:24	100:14 104:22	<b>suicide</b> 46:2 61:6	139:24	124:17 127:12
57:10 63:14,20	165:11 201:15	64:20 65:3,10,12	swearing 182:6,9	132:8,17,25
63:23 69:21,23	suffered 83:19	65:14 66:24	swift 53:20	134:8 138:1
70:8 74:23 81:9	88:20 98:10,22	70:24 75:1 98:1	switched 41:12	142:5,7,13,15,18
84:19,22 97:16	104:6 105:16	132:6,21 136:18	sworn 161:23	154:9 184:1,17
165:21 178:24	136:15 165:12	137:19 143:6	sympathetic 189:1	196:3 197:6
179:7	169:4 178:5	147:12	<b>symptom</b> 94:8,8	199:19 201:19
subjected 54:14	181:13 196:10	suitable 92:24	symptomatic	system's 25:9
62:7 75:4 77:20	suffering 10:9,15	194:8	99:19	26:18

				Page 243
			1	
systemic 14:8 22:2	talked 30:24 85:5	tends 9:19	151:23 152:16	78:22 128:3
34:17 35:8 36:21	110:24 117:7	tension 104:1	172:13 190:25	139:14
39:14 53:20	119:6 127:1	156:10	198:1	threatening 128:2
54:23 74:21	134:21 148:16,16	<b>Tenth</b> 12:24	things 51:5 52:5	164:16 169:16
81:20 83:17 88:4	talking 117:3	term 165:9 183:4	62:21 86:6	threats 60:15
121:19 188:12	119:2 129:9	terms 1:10,23 2:1	109:11,15,24,24	67:21 163:24
190:10 194:5	131:3 152:24	2:8,13 4:15,18	113:13 119:3,5	three 13:2 31:15
196:9 199:11	180:2	7:1 11:9 14:5	121:2 123:12	52:10 60:4 62:24
systemically 33:4	talks 128:11 191:3	27:1,2 28:3 44:6	125:17 126:12	74:2 76:22 79:14
systems 6:11 13:25	target 103:7	46:10 61:15	127:1 131:20	80:11 83:11
27:4 32:3 35:4	<b>Tascor</b> 105:19	99:17 115:13,18	132:5 137:2	86:14 89:9,12
36:18 37:16	106:19,22	138:21 140:12	140:16,16 141:12	104:19 137:3
74:20 80:23	task 4:14 15:15	151:4,5 152:6,8	141:18,20 144:10	138:8 144:16
110:22 123:5	16:12 33:11 47:5	180:25 204:7	146:14,17 147:2	179:16
141:23 142:1,3	tasked 27:2 85:18	terribly 145:13	147:4 152:22	three-day 58:12
142:22 143:5,7	152:5	terrifying 31:21	153:2 178:7	three-man 38:10
153:15 190:14	tasks 15:4	106:14 192:8	179:6	threshold 2:21
	<b>tasted</b> 98:15	terror 106:16	think 14:23 24:15	28:17 58:25
T	taunted 61:6	terrorisation 66:5	24:16 88:1,16	64:14 140:3
table 60:8 64:23	team 20:14 54:3	terrorise 66:2	111:10 112:24,25	141:22
tablets 79:20	82:7 91:4 93:11	test 15:13 30:12	113:20 118:16	thrive 41:11
tailored 168:21	99:11,18 157:10	191:25	119:21 125:21	throat 104:8
take 6:2 11:6,23	157:12,20,23,25	testimonies 94:15	126:10,12,14	throughput 132:4
14:20 21:24	158:4,13,20	testimony 17:19	127:2,3,9 130:22	throwing 98:13
48:22 52:18	159:2,24 160:5	33:1	135:13,14,14	thrust 177:23
79:19 85:24	160:10 161:10	testosterone-filled	141:5 145:16	thumbnail 177:3
94:21 95:17	162:15 168:11	188:18	146:2,4,6,7,9,21	Tick 133:13
115:4 120:12	199:14	thank 1:3,5 13:20	151:17 178:17	ticked 133:15
131:5 139:11	team's 99:11	14:15 15:2 30:17	179:18 180:3	tie 134:2
142:1 143:13	teams 109:3	30:17 48:21,24	183:5 204:8	tied 186:11
151:25 161:21	technique 60:24	49:3,6 53:21,22	thinking 190:24	ties 142:13
165:3 173:8	73:18	54:3 81:24,25	192:9	time 17:9 37:13
174:25 176:18	techniques 57:24	82:3,6 94:19,20	third 1:18 8:3,25	44:12,17 55:11
194:19 198:9	69:3 78:18 192:1	95:1,3,6 107:14	11:16 12:10	61:24 63:6,24
taken 5:7 21:24	tell 63:4 89:21	107:15,16,20	13:10 73:23	77:12,14 80:13
22:22 23:1 25:19	134:7 137:25	108:1,1,4 154:13	155:17 163:11	80:14 82:23 83:4
31:1,4 34:2,18	140:17 145:11,14	154:14,14,16,17	179:13 194:7	89:4 90:4,15
52:23,24 58:17	145:15 170:8	176:15,16,21,25	<b>Thomas's</b> 66:23	96:10,20 97:16
59:5 64:16 65:5	telling 63:24 66:13	177:2 179:22	thorough 174:22	98:13,24 99:9
66:9 70:11 74:6	111:14 130:14	180:4 185:1,3	thought 78:8	100:7 103:23
74:8 76:12 78:11	147:9 151:8,9,14	204:11,15	102:11 103:4	104:13,20 106:4
81:5 93:12	151:15	Thanks 179:23	105:10 119:3	107:3,17 111:14
109:23 119:24	tells 117:12 133:3	theme 87:4	126:16 130:16	112:12,22 114:11
138:10 152:14	137:18,25 138:16	themes 23:25	176:6 182:21	119:1,18 122:3
175:24 194:23	151:11	therapeutic	184:12 187:13	128:14 134:15
198:14	ten 57:2 90:17	153:11	thoughtless 140:4	136:16,25 137:7
takes 44:23 45:13	ten-week 56:10	therapy 92:16	thoughts 65:2	137:14,22 139:24
116:2 122:23	tenacity 100:2	thing 123:17 148:9	171:17	140:14 147:21
152:13 154:11	tender 196:20	148:19 150:5	threat 58:21 67:10	151:3,10 153:23
talk 119:19 121:22	170.20	110.17 100.0	0110000000107.10	101.0,10 100.20
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 244
154111550	151 1 4 102 15	1.55.12.201.10	101 15 01 100 4	1
154:11 155:2	171:1,4 182:17	157:13 201:19	191:17,21 192:4	tribunal 76:8
163:15 166:6	186:1,2 191:6,24	toxicity 113:5,5,6	203:14	108:23
170:6 173:25	198:19,22,24	113:8	trauma-based	trick 139:10
175:16,18,22	199:7	toying 128:2	92:16	tricky 149:9
179:5 185:2	tolerate 26:6	track 48:6	traumatic 16:8	tried 79:18 86:6
187:1,10,13	tomorrow 204:13	trade 184:14	195:22	89:12,21 97:20
196:15 197:14	Tomsett 74:11	trafficking 153:14	traumatisation	101:18 111:5
202:6 204:8,9	118:21 119:12	train 146:25	201:17	169:20 186:4
time-served	tone 125:4	trained 167:1	traumatised 74:17	189:19 198:23
163:10 173:24	tool 186:24	187:15 188:11,14	traumatising	trigger 41:19 46:3
times 31:4 39:22	tools 38:24 40:11	192:20 196:7	74:25	97:22
76:23 79:14	top 116:22 119:12	202:10	traveller 79:10	triggered 65:14
110:9 129:6	139:12 140:1	trainees 165:1,4	treat 55:7 56:22	87:1 94:16
140:7 168:13	202:21	training 41:22	86:2 88:11	trope 43:11
170:25 178:21	topic 40:23	50:16,18 125:8 141:23 155:18	162:18 182:5 treated 28:5 41:15	trouble 62:25 121:3
timetable 107:20	topics 46:21 torment 63:24	141:23 155:18	92:6 99:2 102:18	trousers 63:1
timing 144:18 150:15			103:10 106:15	trousers 63:1 true 98:21 117:12
Timms 132:10	tormenting 64:1 tortuous 66:16	160:2 161:7,11 163:2,9,11,12,16	115:11,17 170:15	119:12 182:25
Tinkering 94:3	torture 2:5 10:6,7	164:2,5,7,10,14	182:23 186:2	trust 91:19 130:1,2
Tinsley 70:18	10:18,20,21 13:3	164:18,20,25	199:6	157:20
158:10	25:25 39:4 44:11	165:17 166:8,11	treating 147:15	truth 72:2 122:8
tired 198:15	55:4,14,17,20,23	166:12,25 168:17	treatment 2:2,6,9	try 15:1 108:8
tirelessly 171:19	56:2,4,9,24 57:3	169:9,18 181:10	9:16,17,21 10:6,8	110:15 134:15
tissue 187:21	57:9,20 58:2,16	187:8,10 190:18	10:12,21,22,25	trying 49:10 119:3
today 154:20	58:25 59:7,9,11	190:21 191:1,13	11:5 12:1,4,6,8	127:9 131:6
185:10,16 187:25	60:1 64:18 65:7	191:16,17,24	12:16,23,25 13:4	172:7 187:20
204:13	65:12 66:7,19	192:12,12,15,19	13:8,11 17:24	191:4
toilet 73:1 85:1	70:8,14,20 71:21	193:24 194:5,12	22:25 27:14 28:1	Tuesday 1:1
122:4 138:13,14	72:10 98:7,8	203:11	29:10,15,18 37:4	Tulley 19:6,18
139:22 180:18	101:24 102:4,8	transcripts 17:18	54:10,12,14	20:4 40:19 60:11
toilets 38:10	102:19 103:2,6	145:9	55:18 56:25 57:1	74:5 79:20 93:15
told 18:15 62:20	103:22 104:17	transfer 97:12	57:2 58:6 64:19	112:7 123:6
65:8 67:20 83:25	153:14 165:12	160:16,20	65:6,11 66:21	172:15 180:9
88:20 89:23 90:4	177:20 192:3	transferred 73:19	67:24 69:8 72:12	182:11,15,17
97:6 113:14	194:13	translators 180:15	75:20,21,22,24	198:23 199:7
120:19 121:18	tortured 56:3 69:9	translocation	80:17,18 81:18	Tulley's 110:19
125:22 126:2,23	torturous 66:17	77:22	85:9 86:8,21	119:9 121:22
130:17 131:9	total 24:23 82:12	transparency	88:3,12,13,15	123:14 182:20
133:16 135:8	96:10 97:23	150:2	90:20 91:15,17	turn 70:11 72:13
136:17 137:11,12	148:4	transparent 203:3	92:3,19 96:6	85:22 91:23
137:22 138:2	totality 66:20	transpired 79:4	97:5,18 98:1,4,11	126:25 139:1
140:7 144:14	touch 127:7	transported 71:10	99:21 102:25	181:20
145:20,20,21,21	touched 190:18	transporting	114:22 115:5	turned 89:22
147:11,13,18,20	192:22	106:16	141:19 171:23	94:13 129:11
148:13 150:14	toxic 19:10 31:11	trauma 25:25 36:8	177:20 195:5	162:12 182:21
151:2 152:20	50:4,13,15 53:9	44:11 75:3,10	trespasses 68:13	turning 32:3 58:14
160:24 163:12	53:13 74:22	102:4,18 104:18	trial 175:16	118:25 119:1
164:6 170:21	84:13 119:25	105:2 169:3,4	177:12	turnover 181:8
	<u> </u>	I .	I .	I .

				Page 245
turns 136:6 139:17	unhoamable 22.20	20.24 46.12 15	199:15	98:23 99:19
<b>TV</b> 74:16	unbearable 32:20 unbelievable	39:24 46:13,15 48:14 52:9,14,19	199:15 <b>unique</b> 108:11	98:23 99:19 114:6
tweaking 21:17	87:11	98:4 102:15	109:5 112:1	UOF 61:15 62:12
51:18 202:2	unbroadcast 17:16	111:12 134:16	113:5 192:15	
	116:8	138:6 144:5	194:4	update 126:2,3
tweaks 53:4,7 twice 73:16 95:21				upheld 125:11
	uncaring 156:19 188:21	151:3 153:15,20	Unit 10:4 54:8	uploaded 97:24
two 3:8 14:17 15:4		188:1,8 190:22	60:6 175:25	upset 88:24
51:4 62:24 65:14	uncertain 178:23	191:7	United 183:5,23	urban 183:14
66:13 72:14 75:4	uncertainty 73:7	understandable	unjust 49:13,15	urged 45:7
84:23 86:22	151:21 166:18	161:8	unjustifiable	urgency 68:23
89:17 97:6 105:4	178:9 183:15,25	understandably	140:1	urgent 45:5,15
109:17 111:5	unchecked 16:23	172:14	unlawful 24:6	69:13 107:9
118:3 123:12	42:12 193:23	understanding	28:19,22 34:14	urgently 23:2
125:16 133:1,12	unclean 38:8	14:18 96:15	39:17 48:7 49:20	45:19 46:5 69:20
134:1 137:2	unclear 193:9	153:19 165:19	60:4 61:12 63:19	use 5:15 6:11
138:7 139:1	uncompassionate	201:13	67:7 73:13 74:2	18:16,17 23:18
157:3,18 163:21	131:19	understands 85:15	74:9 75:4 78:3	23:23 24:6 25:22
174:7,12 181:5	unconstrained	187:5	79:1,25 81:3,11	30:2 31:6 32:18
184:9 186:3	152:16	understood 38:3	82:20 92:11,13	37:7,9 38:18
188:19 193:1,1,2	uncovered 17:16	153:21	105:17 139:25	39:11,23 40:7
197:15	17:23 43:21	undertake 43:24	195:11 202:14	41:6 49:22 50:17
two-day 165:17	under-resourced	165:16 176:4	unlawfully 31:14	60:11,20 61:15
two-year 52:11	178:6 180:8	undertaken 35:15	61:3 97:14	63:15 67:10,17
tying 74:15	184:22	72:18,19 96:19	103:22 129:12	69:1 73:13,14
type 1:16 9:15	undercover 4:1	undertaking 163:7	unled 111:3	74:1,3 77:18,20
31:10 159:14	7:18 22:17 42:17	undeserving 32:20	134:14	78:17 79:2 81:11
160:21	113:17 121:3	undiagnosed	unnecessary 78:22	84:22 92:5
types 188:21	underlying 18:11	136:9	79:2 160:15	106:10,12,23
	28:14 46:16	undocumented	unplanned 105:23	107:1 114:12,19
U	195:20 197:5	200:19	140:4	132:1 133:5,7,8
ubiquitous 41:4	undermine 125:21	undoubtedly	unpleasant 200:19	133:10,11,21
UK 55:23 57:22	undermines 29:8	59:24	unprovoked 105:5	138:20 139:3,25
64:10 76:4 79:4	126:10	undressed 78:20	unreasonably	140:1 143:3
82:18 114:10	undermining	uneasy 181:7	73:14	156:13 160:15,20
136:10 175:16	151:12	unequivocal	unrebutted 6:20	161:4 173:3
199:25 200:3,16	underpin 28:2	159:13	8:12,23	177:17,24 180:15
ultimately 49:10	underscored 18:11	unequivocally	unreconstructed	182:4,10
124:25 190:12	underscores 197:1	43:5 96:25	111:3	useless 86:11
200:9 202:8	underscoring	unforgivable	unreleased 136:22	uses 49:20
unable 8:7 11:25	40:25	87:17	unsettled 180:7	Usually 197:15
21:18 76:8 91:23	Understaff 182:1	unfortunate	unsuitable 106:7	utter 21:7 88:23
180:18 187:5	understaffed	130:18	196:12 203:14	
193:15	134:13 178:6	unguarded 122:3	unsuited 50:1	<u>V</u>
unacceptable	180:22 181:2	unguided 111:4	100:23	v 6:8 11:3 27:17
39:20 159:15	184:22 196:15	134:14	unsurprisingly	55:1,8,23,24 57:8
unacceptably	197:8	unidentified 99:2	147:18 193:4	57:22 58:13
202:8	understaffing	Uniform 4:6	untrained 196:9	64:10
unauthorised	197:12	uniforms 93:23	untrue 19:15	validity 43:22
60:24	understand 28:2	uninterested	unwell 84:10 97:8	value 93:14 102:19
unavailable 97:5				155:15 162:10
		•		

values 33:22 93:23 158:7,23 162:4 162:13 van 71:10         78:19 viewing 58:20 views 50:5 160:8 views 50:5 160:8 views 50:5 160:8 views 50:5 160:8 vigilance 11:21 vigilance 11:22 vigila 10:13 vicimis 52:24 vigila 10:13 vic					Page 246
1587.73 162:4   viewing 58:20   views 50:5 160:8   views 50:5 160:2   views 50:5 160:5		1			1
162:13   views 50:5 160:8   vigilance 11:21   views 50:5 160:8   vigilant 169:15   violation 8:10 11:7   violence 15:22   violation 8:11   violence 15:22   violation 8:11   violence 15:22   violation 8:10 11:7   violence 15:23   violation 8:10 11:7   violence 15:23   violation 8:10 11:7   violenti 8:9 59:12   162:8 193:17   violenti 8:05:04   virtual 21:5   virtual 21:5   virtual 21:5   virtual 21:5   virtual 31:11   victims 98:7   violenti 8:0 viole 95:8   voile 4:4   victim 10:13 11:1   11:5 13:12 64:10   viole 18:10   viole 95:8   voile 90:18   viole 20:23   viole 25:3   voile 90:18   voile 4:4   viving 127:21;23   victimised 57:11   victims 98:7   violenti 8:20   viole 18:20   viole 18:13:11   victims 98:7   violenti 8:20   viole 18:20   viole 18:13:11   victims 98:7   violenti 8:20   viole 18:20   viole 18:13:11   victims 98:7   viole 18:13:11   victims 98:7   viole 22:23   viole 29:23   viole 20:21   violenti 8:11:1   victims 98:7   violent			•		
van 71:10         vigilance 11:21 vigilant 169:15         4:21 (19:10 80:23)         50:25 51:10,20         83:11 86:22         19:11 81:17 80:23         19:11 81:17 81:20         83:11 86:22         19:11 81:17 81:20         28:23 voilation 8:10 11:7         81:22 87:8,16         warned 42:12 washed 42:12 washed 42:2         weigh 140:18,20         wei		<u> </u>			
Vanessa 125:7,19         vigilant 169:15 violation 8:10 11:7         72:10 80:23         51:25         193:1         weigh 140:18,20         weigh 160:18,60         weigh 180:18,60         weicomes 15:22         weicomes 15:22         weicomes 15:57         weicomes 15:57         weicomes 15:57         weicomes 15:57         weicomes 15:57         weicomes 15:50         weicomes 15:57         weicomes 15:50         weicomes 15:50         weicomes 15:50         weicomes 15:50         weicomes 15:22					1
126:18 137:18   violation 8:10 11:7   28:23   yazinde 4:1120   yazinde 4:1120   yazinde 4:1120   yazinde 4:1120   yazinde 4:1120   yazinde 4:120   yazinde 4			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
variable 4:11,20         28:23         93:21 100:13         washed 42:2 wash't 12:25         weight 18:6 170:4 welcome 15:15           varied 203:6,8         violence 15:22         19:11 31:17 41:6         113:21 219:11,21         113:21 219:11,21         133:18,18 133:14         welcome 15:57         welfare 21:3,21,22         34:19 38:7         wested 99:17         132:18,18 133:14         16:025         wasted 99:17         136:16         wasted 99:17         16:3:16         wasted 99:17         136:16         wasted 99:17         136:18         wasted 99:17         136:18         wasted 99:17<		S			
5:3,11 7:16         violations 3:1         violations 3:1         101:9 106:19         wasn't 122:25         Wecome 145:15           varied 14:5         184:6         57:16 59:20 60:5         12:2 129:11,21         13:18 196:25         13:18 181:33:14         wetcome 145:15         welcome 155:7           VC 34:10         105:5 163:23,24         20:15:5 163:23,24         20:14,18         waste 90:4 163:1         waste 90			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
varied 203:6,8 variety 114:5         violence 15:22 19:11 21:1.7 41:6         112:2 129:11.21 10:15:1.31:1 41:6         132:18,18 133:14 10:25 waste 90:4 163:1 waste 90:4 163:1 waste 90:14 163:1 waste 90:4 163:1 waste 90:14 163:1 waste 90:14 163:1 waste 90:14 163:1 waste 90:14 163:1 waste 90:17 163:16 waste 90:17 17:25 173:1 163:16 waste 90:17 17:25 173:1 163:16 waste 90:17 163:16 waste 90:17 163:16 waste 90:17 17:25 173:1 163:16 waste 90:17 17:25 173:1 163:16 waste 90:17 163:16 waste 90:18 waste 90:17 163:16 waste 90:18 waste 90:17 163:16 waste 90:18 waste 90:17 163:16 waste 90:17 17:17 163:16 waste 90:17 17:17 163:16 waste 90:18 106:10,18,22 waste 105:18 waste 105	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				O
variety 114:5         19:11 31:17 41:6         134:16 153:13         160:25         welfare 21:3,21,22           various 75:21         62:5 67:9 78:3         181:6 191:5,15         4 sate 99:17         33:19 38:7           VC's 34:20         105:5 163:23,24         Wester 13:21 19:25         Wester 16:31:18         waste 99:17         131:25 132:1         waste 99:18         160:25         34:19 38:7         3	*				
184:6         57:16 59:20 60:5         62:5 67:9 78:3         181:6 191:5;15         waste 90:4 163:1         34:19 38:7           VC 34:20         105:5 163:23,24         105:18         105:5 163:23,24         105:5 163:23,24         105:5 163:23,24         105:18         105:5 163:23,24         105:18         105:18         105:18         105:18         105:18         105:18         105:18         105:19         105:19         105:10,18,22         105:11         105:10,18,22         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:11         105:12         105:12         105:12         105:11         105:12         1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	
various 75:21         62:5 67:9 78:3         193:18 196:2         wasted 99:17         131:25 132:1           VC3:4:10         VC3:4:20         wasted 105:3 163:23,24         wasted 199:17         131:25 132:1           verbal 3:12 12:7         189:27:10,21         62:8 193:17         waist 105:18         waist 105:18         watch 60:8 62:15         64:22,24 94:15         79:17 116:11         711:25 174:14         712:25 174:14         713:25 174:14         713:25 174:14         713:25 174:14         713:25 174:14         713:25 174:14         713:25 174:14         713:25 174:14         714:14         714:15         714:15					
VC34:10 VC*s34:20 verbilation 38:9 178:12         105:5 163:23,24 169:13,16 174:5 202:17         202:14,18         163:16 watch 60:8 62:15 64:22,24 94:15 97:17 116:11         134:3 146:4 148:15 156:11           verball 3:12 12:7 73:15 75:8 161:23 163:24 verbally 96:9 Verita 124:22 131:2 188:17 200:1         violent 18:9 59:12 165:14 visibility 160:6 visible 131:11 115: 13:12 188:17 200:1         waite 105:18 106:10,18,22 wait 46:4 102:11 10:13,13 124:18 139:4,4 waited 120:15 visibility 160:6 visible 131:11 115: 13:12 64:10 71:21 72:10 victim 10:13 11:1 115: 13:12 64:10 71:21 72:10 victim 20:13 victimised 57:11 volume 108:20 violume 108:20 volume 108:20 volume 108:20 volume 108:20 volume 108:20 volume 108:20 volume 108:20 113: 113: 12: 12: 21 123: 138: 17 173:4 187:19         200:1 visibilities volume 108:20 volume 108:20 volume 108:20 volume 108:20 volume 108:20 volume 108:20 volume 108:20 volume 108:22 23: 137 13: 23 39:9 42:9 43: 22 53: 11 61: 168:11,24 113: 148: 162: 3 171: 23 192: 3 172: 21 175: 9 173: 24 194: 24 173: 3 141: 19, 19 177: 25 178: 24 177: 25 178: 24 177: 25 178: 25 178: 20: 12. 178: 24 179: 24 179: 24 179: 24: 148: 15 15: 11 186: 10 0: 11 12: 29 12: 20: 174: 12 12: 23 122: 20 12: 23 18: 13 12: 12 13: 13 14: 19, 19 13: 13 14: 19, 19 13: 13 14: 19, 19 13: 13 14: 19, 19 14: 15 12: 12 122: 13: 13: 13         163: 16 watched 87: 18 106: 10, 18, 22 watched 87: 18 100: 11 10: 11, 11 watches 109: 17, 17 watches			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
VC's 34:20 ventilation 38:9 178:12 verbal 3:12 12:7 verbal 3:12 12:7 18:9 27:10,21 163:22 65:17 73:15 75:8 161:23 163:24 verbally 96:9 verbally 96:9 virtually 178:3 visa 165:10 202:15 visibility 160:6 visible 131:11 11:15 13:12 64:10 71:12 124:18 13:12 12:10 visit 37:22 94:14 victim 10:13 11:1 victims 98:7 110:11,12 124:18 124:18 153:14,14 video 136:7 138:12 129:3 volume 108:20 vulnerabilities 124:18 153:14,14 video 136:7 138:12 138:17 39:14 video 136:7 138:12 138:17 173:4 187:19 vilnerabilities 138:17 173:4 187:19 vilnerabilities 138:17 173:4 187:19 vilnerabilities 138:17 173:4 187:19 vilnerabilities 138:17 173:4 188:18 133:14:19,19 19:13 11:12,15 12:22 172:20 174:15 188:23 194:23 12:25 188:3 201:16,622 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2					
ventilation 38:9 178:12         181:21 193:25 202:17         W waist 105:18 106:10.18,22 106:10.13,12 12:7         64:22,24 94:15 97:17 116:11 136:6         157:6 163:19 97:17 116:11 136:6         157:6 163:19 167:5,15 171:12 136:6         171:25 174:14 watched 87:18 101:11 101:13 132:22 202:20 203:7         watched 87:18 101:11 101:13 132:23 202:20 203:7         101:11 watches 109:17,17         199:18 watching 84:10 way 9:22 13:14 watching 84:10 way 9:22 13:14 watching 84:10 115:19 175:8         157:6 163:19 167:5,15 171:12 watched 87:18 101:11 101:13 132:23 136:6         watched 87:18 101:11 watches 109:17,17         199:18 watching 84:10 way 9:22 13:14 way 9:23 13:14 way 12:17 vent hing 14-71 watching 84:10 way 9:22 13:14 way 9:22 13:14 way 9:22 13:14 way 12:17 went 17:10:11 110:11:11 110:11:11 180:16         17:10:11 180:16         17:10:11 180:16         17:10:11 180:16         17:10:11 180:16         17:10:11 180:16         18:10:10 watching 84:10 way 9:22 13:14 way 12:11 110:			202:14,18		
178:12		· ·			
verbal 3:12 12:7 18:9 27:10,21         violent 18:9 59:12 162:8 193:17         106:10,18,22 wait 46:4 102:11 110:13,13 124:18         136:6 watched 87:18 watched 87:18         171:25 174:14         180:16 190:13         191:19 19:197:11         180:16 190:13         191:19 18 197:11         180:16 190:13         191:19 18 197:11         180:16 190:13         191:19 18 197:11         180:16 190:13         191:19 18 197:11         180:16 190:13         191:19 18 197:11         180:16 190:13         191:19 18 197:11         180:16 190:13         191:18 197:11         watched 87:18 watches 109:17,17 watches 109:13         191:8 197:11 watches 109:17,17 watches 109:13,132,23         111:15 19:18 19:13         15:19 18 29:18         15:19 18 29:18         15:				,	
18:9 27:10,21   162:8 193:17   violently 65:24   139:14, 73:15 75:8   165:14   virtual 21:5   virtually 178:3   virtually 178:3   visa 165:10 202:15   131:2 188:17   visibile 131:11   visible 131:11   159:12   visibly 156:20   visits 119:4   visits 119:4   visits 119:4   visits 119:4   visits 119:4   visits 121:2   victim sed 57:11   victims 98:7   10:11,12 124:18   138:17 138:18 138:17 138:17 138:18 138:17 138:17 138:18 138:17 138:18 138:17 138:18 138:17 138:18 138:17 138:18 138:17 138:18 138:17 138:18 138:18 138:16   202:6   wanted 79:17   watching 84:10   watching 84:10   watching 84:10   watching 84:10   ulbic 138:18 16:22 28:22 85:3   112:9   02:22 85:3   112:9   02:22 85:3   112:9   02:22 85:3   112:9   02:22 85:3   112:9   02:23 89:19   111:10 115:4   17:15 82:25   90:1 104:13   17:15 82:25   17:18 198:25   90:1 104:13   17:18 20:16   122:22   17:18 198:25   108:12 110:11   10:11:4   10:11:4   10:11:14					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
63:22 65:17 73:15 75:8 161:23 163:24 verbally 96:9 Verita 124:22 131:2 188:17 200:1 Verne 86:24 139:18 visibly 156:20 visible 131:11 11:5 13:12 64:10 71:21 72:10 101:24 103:21 102:4 103:21 101:24 103:21 101:17, 200:13 victimised 57:11 victims 98:7 110:11,12 124:18 124:18 153:14,14 video 136:7 138:12 138:17 101:18 13:12:4:18 124:18 153:14,14 video 136:7 138:12 138:17 139:18 viable 48:40 visibly 156:20 visibly 160:6 visibly 156:20 visibly 156:20 visibly 156:20 visibly 160:6 visibly 156:20 visibly 160:6 visible 131:11 11:19,19 129:69:825 00:110:11 watches 109:17,17 watching 84:10 185:16 way 9:22 13:14 176:9 183:20,24 Wendy 144:17,19 went 17:15 82:25 valls 93:24 walls 93:24 walls 93:24 walls 93:24 walls 93:24 valls 93:24 valls 93:24 valls 15:2; 125:8 valls 99:16 11:10:111 watches 109:17,17 watching 84:10 185:16 02:22 07:21 176:9 183:20,24 Wendy 144:17,19 vent 17:15 82:25 valls 93:19 128:5 valls 197:11 176:9 183:20,24 Wendy 144:17,19 vent 17:15 8:22 valls 93:24 valls 93:25 177:25 108:25 177:22 173:0 110:11,12 124:18 139:1,4 vaited 120:15 vatches 109:17,17 valching 84:10 115:11:10:15:4 115:12:9 129:6 98:25 111:10:115:4 115:12:9 129:6 98:25 111:10:115:4 115:12:9 127:4 129:5,9,15 valls 93:24 valls 93:24 valls 93:24 valls 93:24 valls 93:24 valls 93:24 valls 93:25 178:20 19:4: valle 12:1 177:2 109:16 176:9 183:10 185:16 185:16 19:16:9 17:10 185:16 19:18:10:11 191:8 19:11 190:13 11:11:11 11:11 11:11 11:11 11:11 1					
73:15 75:8 161:23 163:24 verbally 96:9 virtual 21:5 visa 165:10 202:15 visa 165:10 202:15 visible 131:11 159:12 visible 131:11 159:12 visible 131:11 11:5 13:12 64:10 71:21 72:10 vividly 127:21,23 voice 95:8 104:17 200:13 victimised 57:11 victims 98:7 104:17 200:13 victims 98:7 110:11,12 124:18 124:18 153:14,14 video 136:7 138:12 138:17 view 2:24 24:24 42:9 43:22 53:11 61:12 51:22 vimerabilities 138:17 173:4 16:16 68:11,24 42:9 43:22 53:11 61:16 68:11,24 42:9 43:22 53:11 61:12 51:22 188:23 194:23 120:16 122:22 viewed 50:20  28:20 29:25 33:6  139:4,4 watted 120:15 watching 84:10 185:16 way 9:22 13:14 way 9:22 13:14 23:3 36:13 51:24 62:20,22 71:13 verbally 84:10 185:16 way 9:22 13:14 view 22:22 85:3 112:9 Waldock 111:7 92:6 98:25 voil 10:11;5 voil 86:12 125:3 voil 90:18 voil 86:12 125:3 voil 80:12 11:15 138:14 visibly 156:20 vial 62:0, 22 71:13 vietimised 57:11 vietims 98:7 voil 86:12 125:3 voil 80:11:17 11:0 115:4 115:10 115:4 117:8,20 126:19 127:4 129:5,9,15 130:24 132:2 130:24 132:2 130:24 132:2 140:15 14:17 vietims 98:7 146:20 14:17,19 verballok:11:7 185:16 vay 33: 36:13 51:24 verbally 16:20 visids 71:24 visibly 156:20 vial 62:20,22 71:13 vietimised 57:10 viii 10:13 11:1 11:5 13:12 64:10 voil 11:5:4 117:8,20 126:19 127:4 129:5,9,15 vietimised 57:11 vietimised	18:9 27:10,21	162:8 193:17		watched 87:18	180:16 190:13
Table   Tabl	63:22 65:17	violently 65:24	-	101:11	191:8 197:11
verbally 96:9         virtually 178:3         waiting 91:21         185:16         151:19 175:8           Verita 124:22         visibility 160:6         visibility 17:19         visibility 17:10         visibility 17:10         visibility 160:2         visibility 160:2	73:15 75:8	165:14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	watches 109:17,17	202:20 203:7
Verita 124:22         visa 165:10 202:15         visable 13:12         145:22         way 9:22 13:14         176:9 183:20,24         Wendy 144:17,19           200:1         visible 131:11         112:9         Waldock 111:7         92:6 98:25         90:1 104:13         90:1 104:13           139:18         visibly 156:20         visibly 15	161:23 163:24	virtual 21:5		watching 84:10	wellbeing 31:23
131:2 188:17   200:1   Visibility 160:6   Visible 131:11   159:12   Maldock 111:7   92:6 98:25   90:1 104:13   139:18   Visibly 156:20   Visible 44:4   Victim 10:13 11:1   119:1,5   Maldock 111:7   102:17 108:23   111:10 115:4   Visits 119:4   Vitrolic 18:10   Vividly 127:21,23   Voice 95:8   Voitimsed 57:11   Victims 98:7   Volume 108:20   Volum	verbally 96:9	virtually 178:3	S	185:16	151:19 175:8
200:1         visible 131:11         112:9         62:20,22 71:13         went 17:15 82:25           Verne 86:24         139:18         visibly 156:20         visibly 156:20<	Verita 124:22	visa 165:10 202:15	-	way 9:22 13:14	176:9 183:20,24
Verne 86:24         159:12         Waldock 111:7         92:6 98:25         90:1 104:13           viable 44:4         visibly 156:20         wisit 37:22 94:14         wisit 37:22 94:14         wisit 37:22 94:14         wilsit 98:19         111:10 115:4         120:16 122:22         171:25 200:5         Western 51:14         walls 98:19         111:10 115:4         171:8,20 126:19         Western 51:14         whatsoever 53:6         whitst 16:14 18:4         27:23 76:23         whitst 16:14 18:4         whatsoever 53:6         whitst 16:14 18:4         27:23 76:23         86:16 97:21         27:21 76:23         27:21 76:23         27:22 76:23         86:16 97:21         103:6 105:3,17         105:18 106:21         105:18 106:21         105:18 106:21         105:18 106:21         105:18 106:21         105:18 106:21         105:18 106:21         105:18 106:21         105:18 106:21         105:18 106:21         17:14         20:20:6         20:20:6         20:20:6         20:20:6         20:20:6         20:20:6         20:20:6         20:20:6         20:20:6         20:20:6 <td>131:2 188:17</td> <td>visibility 160:6</td> <td></td> <td>23:3 36:13 51:24</td> <td><b>Wendy</b> 144:17,19</td>	131:2 188:17	visibility 160:6		23:3 36:13 51:24	<b>Wendy</b> 144:17,19
139:18	200:1	visible 131:11		62:20,22 71:13	went 17:15 82:25
viable 44:4         visit 37:22 94:14         walking 98:19         111:10 115:4         171:25 200:5           victim 10:13 11:1         visit 37:22 94:14         visits 19:4         visit 37:22 94:14         visits 19:4         visit 37:22 94:14         visit 37:22 94:14         111:10 115:4         171:25 200:5         whatsoever 53:6         whils 16:14 18:4         171:25 200:5         whits 16:14 18:4         171:25 20:15         172:23 76:23         27:23 76:23         103:6 105:3,17         105:11 2:7         12:11 175:9	Verne 86:24	159:12		92:6 98:25	90:1 104:13
victim         10:13         11:1         visits         119:4         vitriolic         18:10         vitriolic         18:10         vividly         128:5         117:8,20         126:19         Western         51:14         whatsoever         53:6         whatsoever         53:6         whils         16:14         18:4         whatsoever         53:6         whatsoever         53:6         whils         16:14         18:4         27:23         76:23         76:23         76:23         76:23         76:23         76:23         76:23         77:21         77:22         77:23         76:23	139:18	<b>visibly</b> 156:20	•	102:17 108:23	120:16 122:22
11:5 13:12 64:10         vitriolic 18:10         wall 57:25 198:25         127:4 129:5,9,15         whatsoever 53:6         whist 16:14 18:4           71:21 72:10         vividly 127:21,23         voice 95:8         wall 57:25 198:25         130:24 132:2         whist 16:14 18:4           101:24 103:21         voice 95:8         void 86:12 125:3         volte 90:18         volte 90:18         108:12 112:5         140:15 142:7         86:16 97:21           102:11,12 124:18         102:11,12 124:18         103:24 132:2         103:6 105:3,17         105:18 106:21           103:11,12 124:18         104:18 153:14,14         volumes 164:10         121:23 122:20         122:21 175:9         103:6 105:3,17           105:18 106:25         138:17 173:4         135:19 192:3         136:1 138:16         145:16 179:24         178:24 195:24         196:9         whipped 70:21         121:2 139:12         196:9         whipped 70:21         121:2 139:12	viable 44:4	visit 37:22 94:14	S	111:10 115:4	171:25 200:5
71:21 72:10         vividly 127:21,23         walls 93:24         130:24 132:2         whilst 16:14 18:4           101:24 103:21         voice 95:8         void 86:12 125:3         yolte 90:18         135:55,5,22         27:23 76:23         86:16 97:21           victims 98:7         volume 108:20         volume 108:20         138:12 112:5         146:20 149:23         103:6 105:3,17           110:11,12 124:18         volumes 164:10         volumes 164:10         121:23 122:20         172:21 175:9         105:18 106:21           138:17 173:4         yolunerabilities         99:16 106:25         136:1 138:16         145:16 179:24         117:14         ways 41:3 88:20         whipped 70:21           view 2:24 24:24         vulnerability 11:9         202:6         warted 79:17         we've 152:17         we've 152:17         wholesale 45:16           42:9 43:22 53:11         39:13 40:10 42:2         158:1 167:14         Webb 83:25 133:9         84:11 89:2           188:23 194:23         12:25 18:13         23:19 25:5,24         23:19 25:5,24         23:19 25:5,24         23:19 25:5,24         23:19 25:5,24         23:19 25:5,24         23:19 25:5,24         23:19 25:5,24         23:19 25:5,24         23:19 25:5,24         23:19 25:5,24	victim 10:13 11:1	<b>visits</b> 119:4		117:8,20 126:19	Western 51:14
101:24 103:21	11:5 13:12 64:10	vitriolic 18:10		127:4 129:5,9,15	whatsoever 53:6
104:17 200:13         void 86:12 125:3         98:14 105:12         140:15 142:7         86:16 97:21           victimised 57:11         volume 108:20         110:11,12 124:18         124:18 153:14,14         volumes 164:10         121:23 122:20         172:21 175:9         105:18 106:21           video 136:7 138:12         138:17 173:4         99:16 106:25         136:1 138:16         145:16 179:24         117:14         ways 41:3 88:20         whipped 70:21           view 2:24 24:24         vulnerability 11:9         202:6         we've 152:17         we've 152:17         wholesale 45:16           42:9 43:22 53:11         39:13 40:10 42:2         45:12 59:17         45:12 59:17         wanted 79:17         89:11 134:22         139:1         wholesale 45:16         wholly 24:11 84:6         84:11 89:2         wide 114:5 120:11         152:7         wide 13:19 14:5         16:16 32:24 49:5         48:4	71:21 72:10	vividly 127:21,23		130:24 132:2	<b>whilst</b> 16:14 18:4
victimised 57:11         volte 90:18         108:12 112:5         146:20 149:23         103:6 105:3,17           victims 98:7         volume 108:20         volumes 164:10         volumes 164:10         121:23 122:20         122:21 175:9         105:18 106:21           124:18 153:14,14         volumerabilities         124:18 153:14,14         voluntarily 200:20         123:8,9 127:7         136:1 138:16         178:24 195:24         ways 41:3 88:20         whipped 70:21           138:17 173:4         135:19 192:3         180:3 181:16         we'll 112:13 139:3         whipped 70:21           187:19         202:6         wanted 79:17         we've 152:17         wholesale 45:16           42:9 43:22 53:11         39:13 40:10 42:2         45:12 59:17         89:11 134:22         we've 152:17         wholesale 45:16           133:3 141:19,19         45:12 59:17         wanting 149:18         133:25 172:5         84:11 89:2           188:23 194:23         12:25 18:13         23:19 25:5,24         Ward 13:19 14:5         16:16 32:24 49:5           201:1,6,22         28:20 29:25 33:6         49:8,18 50:2,14         97:12 109:16         widely 101:8	101:24 103:21	voice 95:8	· ·	135:5,5,22	27:23 76:23
victims 98:7         volume 108:20         113:8 115:19,21         161:9 167:13         105:18 106:21           110:11,12 124:18         124:18 153:14,14         volumes 164:10         121:23 122:20         172:21 175:9         121:2 139:12           video 136:7 138:12         vulnerabilities         138:17 173:4         135:19 192:3         136:1 138:16         ways 41:3 88:20         166:9           187:19         vulnerability 11:9         180:3 181:16         we've 152:17         whipped 70:21           42:9 43:22 53:11         39:13 40:10 42:2         45:12 59:17         89:11 134:22         wanted 79:17         wearing 121:6         139:1         wholesale 45:16           113:3 141:19,19         45:12 59:17         vulnerable 2:22,22         wanting 149:18         Webb 83:25 133:9         84:11 89:2           112:25 18:13         201:1,6,22         12:25 18:13         23:19 25:5,24         Ward 13:19 14:5         16:16 32:24 49:5         48:4         wide-ranging 47:6           viewed 50:20         28:20 29:25 33:6         49:8,18 50:2,14         97:12 109:16         widely 101:8	104:17 200:13	void 86:12 125:3		140:15 142:7	86:16 97:21
110:11,12 124:18       volumes 164:10       121:23 122:20       172:21 175:9       121:2 139:12         video 136:7 138:12       voluntarily 200:20       vulnerabilities       136:1 138:16       172:21 175:9       172:21 175:9       196:9         view 2:24 24:24       vulnerability 11:9       123:8,9 127:7       136:1 138:16       ways 41:3 88:20       whipped 70:21         42:9 43:22 53:11       vulnerability 11:9       202:6       we've 152:17       we've 152:17       wholesale 45:16         41:1 68:11,24       45:12 59:17       89:11 134:22       139:1       Webb 83:25 133:9       wholly 24:11 84:6       84:11 89:2         148:5 162:3       vulnerable 2:22,22       11:12,15 12:22       Wants 62:19       Ward 13:19 14:5       172:21 175:9       We'll 112:13 139:3       whistleblowing       51:11 198:19       203:20         wholesale 45:16       wholly 24:11 84:6       84:11 89:2       84:11 89:2       Webb 83:25 172:5       177:22 184:10       152:7       152:7         188:23 194:23       12:25 18:13       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 25:5,24       23:19 2	victimised 57:11	volte 90:18		146:20 149:23	103:6 105:3,17
124:18 153:14,14       voluntarily 200:20       123:8,9 127:7       178:24 195:24       196:9         138:17 173:4       99:16 106:25       135:19 192:3       187:19       135:19 192:3       ways 41:3 88:20       whipped 70:21         187:19       135:19 192:3       vulnerability 11:9       180:3 181:16       we've 152:17       whistleblowing         113:3 141:19,19       23:17 31:22 39:9       wanted 79:17       wanted 79:17       wearing 121:6       wholesale 45:16         138:13 141:19,19       45:12 59:17       vulnerable 2:22,22       wanting 149:18       Webb 83:25 133:9       84:11 89:2         188:23 194:23       12:25 18:13       Ward 13:19 14:5       17:22 184:10       152:7         188:23 194:23       23:19 25:5,24       28:20 29:25 33:6       49:8,18 50:2,14       97:12 109:16       widely 101:8	victims 98:7	<b>volume</b> 108:20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	161:9 167:13	105:18 106:21
video 136:7 138:12         vulnerabilities         136:1 138:16         ways 41:3 88:20         whipped 70:21           187:19         135:19 192:3         180:3 181:16         we'll 112:13 139:3         whistleblowing           view 2:24 24:24         23:17 31:22 39:9         23:17 31:22 39:9         wanted 79:17         wearing 121:6         wholesale 45:16           61:1 68:11,24         39:13 40:10 42:2         45:12 59:17         Webb 83:25 133:9         wholesale 45:16           138:20         Whipped 70:21         whistleblowing         51:11 198:19           202:6         wanted 79:17         wearing 121:6         wholesale 45:16           139:1         Webb 83:25 133:9         84:11 89:2           188:23 194:23         12:25 18:13         13:19 14:5           201:1,6,22         12:25 18:13         23:19 25:5,24           201:1,6,22         28:20 29:25 33:6         49:8,18 50:2,14           136:1 138:16         ways 41:3 88:20           117:14         wholesale 45:16           139:1         Webb 83:25 133:9           139:1         Webb 83:25 133:9           139:1         152:7           139:1         152:7           139:1         152:7           139:1         152:7           13	110:11,12 124:18	<b>volumes</b> 164:10		172:21 175:9	121:2 139:12
138:17 173:4       99:16 106:25       145:16 179:24       117:14       whistleblowing         187:19       135:19 192:3       202:6       we'll 112:13 139:3       51:11 198:19         202:6       wanted 79:17       we've 152:17       wholesale 45:16         42:9 43:22 53:11       39:13 40:10 42:2       89:11 134:22       139:1       wholesale 45:16         113:3 141:19,19       45:12 59:17       158:1 167:14       Webb 83:25 133:9       84:11 89:2         112:20 174:15       11:12,15 12:22       wanting 149:18       133:25 172:5       wide 114:5 120:11         188:23 194:23       12:25 18:13       Ward 13:19 14:5       186:7 188:2       wide-ranging 47:6         201:1,6,22       23:19 25:5,24       28:20 29:25 33:6       49:8,18 50:2,14       97:12 109:16       widely 101:8	124:18 153:14,14	voluntarily 200:20	-	178:24 195:24	196:9
187:19       135:19 192:3       180:3 181:16       we'll 112:13 139:3       51:11 198:19         view 2:24 24:24       vulnerability 11:9       202:6       we've 152:17       203:20         42:9 43:22 53:11       39:13 40:10 42:2       89:11 134:22       wearing 121:6       wholesale 45:16         113:3 141:19,19       45:12 59:17       89:11 134:22       Webb 83:25 133:9       84:11 89:2         148:5 162:3       vulnerable 2:22,22       wanting 149:18       133:25 172:5       wide 114:5 120:11         188:23 194:23       12:25 18:13       Ward 13:19 14:5       186:7 188:2       wide-ranging 47:6         201:1,6,22       28:20 29:25 33:6       49:8,18 50:2,14       97:12 109:16       widely 101:8	<b>video</b> 136:7 138:12	vulnerabilities		ways 41:3 88:20	whipped 70:21
view 2:24 24:24       vulnerability 11:9       202:6       we've 152:17       wholesale 45:16         42:9 43:22 53:11       39:13 40:10 42:2       89:11 134:22       139:1       wholesale 45:16         113:3 141:19,19       45:12 59:17       wanted 79:17       Webb 83:25 133:9       84:11 89:2         148:5 162:3       vulnerable 2:22,22       wanting 149:18       133:25 172:5       wide 114:5 120:11         172:20 174:15       11:12,15 12:22       wants 62:19       177:22 184:10       152:7         188:23 194:23       23:19 25:5,24       Ward 13:19 14:5       186:7 188:2       wide-ranging 47:6         201:1,6,22       28:20 29:25 33:6       49:8,18 50:2,14       97:12 109:16       widely 101:8	138:17 173:4	99:16 106:25		117:14	whistleblowing
42:9 43:22 53:11       23:17 31:22 39:9       wanted 79:17       wearing 121:6       wholesale 45:16         61:1 68:11,24       39:13 40:10 42:2       45:12 59:17       45:12 59:17       Webb 83:25 133:9       84:11 89:2         148:5 162:3       vulnerable 2:22,22       wanting 149:18       133:25 172:5       wide 114:5 120:11         188:23 194:23       12:25 18:13       Ward 13:19 14:5       186:7 188:2       wide-ranging 47:6         201:1,6,22       28:20 29:25 33:6       49:8,18 50:2,14       97:12 109:16       widely 101:8	187:19	135:19 192:3		we'll 112:13 139:3	S
42:9 43:22 53:11       23:17 31:22 39:9       wanted 79:17       wearing 121:6       wholesale 45:16         61:1 68:11,24       39:13 40:10 42:2       45:12 59:17       45:12 59:17       Webb 83:25 133:9       84:11 89:2         148:5 162:3       vulnerable 2:22,22       11:12,15 12:22       wanting 149:18       133:25 172:5       wide 114:5 120:11         188:23 194:23       12:25 18:13       Ward 13:19 14:5       186:7 188:2       wide-ranging 47:6         201:1,6,22       28:20 29:25 33:6       49:8,18 50:2,14       97:12 109:16       widely 101:8	view 2:24 24:24	vulnerability 11:9		we've 152:17	203:20
61:1 68:11,24       39:13 40:10 42:2       89:11 134:22       139:1       wholly 24:11 84:6         113:3 141:19,19       45:12 59:17       Webb 83:25 133:9       84:11 89:2         148:5 162:3       vulnerable 2:22,22       wanting 149:18       133:25 172:5       wide 114:5 120:11         188:23 194:23       12:25 18:13       Ward 13:19 14:5       186:7 188:2       wide-ranging 47:6         201:1,6,22       23:19 25:5,24       49:8,18 50:2,14       97:12 109:16       widely 101:8	42:9 43:22 53:11			wearing 121:6	wholesale 45:16
113:3 141:19,19       45:12 59:17       158:1 167:14       Webb 83:25 133:9       84:11 89:2         148:5 162:3       vulnerable 2:22,22       wanting 149:18       133:25 172:5       wide 114:5 120:11         188:23 194:23       12:25 18:13       Ward 13:19 14:5       186:7 188:2       wide-ranging 47:6         201:1,6,22       23:19 25:5,24       16:16 32:24 49:5       week 45:3 91:9,9       48:4         viewed 50:20       28:20 29:25 33:6       49:8,18 50:2,14       97:12 109:16       widely 101:8	61:1 68:11,24	39:13 40:10 42:2		<u> </u>	<b>wholly</b> 24:11 84:6
148:5 162:3       vulnerable 2:22,22       wanting 149:18       133:25 172:5       wide 114:5 120:11         172:20 174:15       11:12,15 12:22       wants 62:19       177:22 184:10       152:7         188:23 194:23       12:25 18:13       Ward 13:19 14:5       186:7 188:2       wide-ranging 47:6         201:1,6,22       23:19 25:5,24       16:16 32:24 49:5       week 45:3 91:9,9       48:4         viewed 50:20       28:20 29:25 33:6       49:8,18 50:2,14       97:12 109:16       widely 101:8	-	45:12 59:17		Webb 83:25 133:9	
188:23 194:23		vulnerable 2:22,22	<u> </u>	133:25 172:5	wide 114:5 120:11
188:23 194:23       12:25 18:13       Ward 13:19 14:5       186:7 188:2       wide-ranging 47:6         201:1,6,22       23:19 25:5,24       16:16 32:24 49:5       week 45:3 91:9,9       48:4         viewed 50:20       28:20 29:25 33:6       49:8,18 50:2,14       97:12 109:16       widely 101:8	172:20 174:15	11:12,15 12:22		177:22 184:10	152:7
201:1,6,22	188:23 194:23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		186:7 188:2	wide-ranging 47:6
viewed 50:20 28:20 29:25 33:6 49:8,18 50:2,14 97:12 109:16 widely 101:8	201:1,6,22	23:19 25:5,24		week 45:3 91:9,9	0 0
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			50:17 53:2,9,16		
		I	I	I	I

				Page 247
. 1 47 15	101 5 170 7 0	40.10	X7 144 1 0	100 205 2
wider 47:15	121:5 172:7,9	working 49:19	Yan 144:1,2	108 205:2
115:22 116:4,4	witnesses 26:5	50:5,8 108:5	170:13 182:16	11 76:7 80:7 85:14
widespread 39:17	30:8 33:1 87:13	120:5,9 155:20	188:23 198:21	156:9 175:5
41:4 43:9 113:16	148:12 151:24	161:5 167:5	Yarl's 17:1 42:16	11.26 48:25
113:19	161:1 162:24	168:4 169:1,12	108:15 109:10	11.40 48:24
wife 76:3	184:7	169:22 179:21	112:6 143:21	11.42 49:2
wilful 22:3	woeful 36:3	181:11 188:24	year 83:3 87:19,19	<b>114.17</b> 62:12
William 5:10	woefully 46:10	194:10 198:2	100:21 120:15	<b>12</b> 23:11 76:5 77:7
Williams 52:16	woken 83:21	workplace 182:6	121:15 134:12	89:5 90:7
118:2,6,9 144:17	women 44:15	works 132:2	137:4 170:20	<b>12-hour</b> 197:24
144:19 158:2	111:8,9	world 121:4 146:9	years 22:21 24:1	198:6
<b>willing</b> 16:7 20:9	<b>won</b> 76:1	worried 128:21	49:10 52:10	<b>1234</b> 106:20
46:16 165:2	wonder 94:17,21	worse 151:10	85:14 87:10 92:2	<b>13</b> 68:11 80:9
willingness 126:11	<b>Wood</b> 17:1 42:16	160:10	108:15,17 112:6	125:11 133:11
Wilson 127:6	108:15 109:10	worsen 78:25	112:7,9 120:23	144:21 204:22
<b>Wilson's</b> 127:18	112:6 143:21	worsening 104:6	123:17,18 125:16	<b>131</b> 83:2
<b>window'</b> 31:7	word 9:18 42:13	worst 40:1 51:18	127:13 134:4	<b>133</b> 58:3
windows 32:18	113:6 114:15,19	90:25 170:10	136:19 137:2	<b>14</b> 49:8 72:15
Windrush 144:19	115:3 119:20,21	worth 88:16	138:7 143:21	100:24
144:22	119:21 177:17	114:19	144:16,16,17	<b>142</b> 55:9
wing 39:18 62:3,4	199:10	<b>would-be</b> 32:13	167:5 172:7	<b>15</b> 72:16
62:7,13 65:15,18	words 5:21 7:21	<b>wouldn't</b> 10:19	173:22 193:2	<b>15-minute</b> 176:18
66:9 74:8 77:23	9:20,21 32:15	169:21	years' 202:6	<b>150</b> 44:14
78:11 97:16	49:21 73:8	wrist 98:3 139:15	yesterday 110:1,3	<b>151</b> 78:4
134:11 163:18	106:13 159:8	wrists 79:7	125:21 135:7	<b>1527</b> 56:3 58:14
170:22 175:12	179:17 186:24	write 86:5 122:19	144:11,12 196:20	<b>1527's</b> 58:14
186:13 188:24	187:1,3 188:21	129:23 133:18,19	201:25	<b>1538</b> 73:14,16 74:4
195:1,2,6,9 198:7	199:1	<b>writing</b> 137:19	<b>young</b> 54:18	74:11
wings 174:3	wore 194:1	written 17:19 30:9		<b>154</b> 205:3
wiser 183:8	work 19:21 20:6	46:24 55:11	Z	<b>162</b> 64:11
wish 8:20 13:16	37:22 49:12 54:4	63:11 93:18	<b>Z</b> aynab 112:24	<b>17</b> 80:10 112:6
16:13 98:16	71:16 82:9 93:25	142:4 154:7		177 205:4
165:10	108:2,3 109:7	177:5 185:11	0	<b>18</b> 68:21
wished 187:12	111:14 132:3,9	wrong 38:22 50:21	1	<b>185</b> 205:5
wishes 16:9	132:24 144:16	82:25 130:4		<b>19</b> 80:8
witness 19:4 23:12	146:14,24 150:10	140:13,23 144:8	1 2:8 4:3 72:15	<b>190</b> 79:16
30:24 33:24 47:8	153:11 155:12	144:9	83:2 95:19 115:8	
49:9 79:16 91:12	158:17,19 161:25	wrongdoer 70:2	177:9 204:21	2
110:5 112:23,25	168:23 169:10	wrongdoing 20:10	<b>1.05</b> 107:22	<b>2</b> 2:13 4:6 27:1
118:4 122:1,8	181:25 196:4,23	70:2 120:6	1.114 5:13	71:8 72:21 96:22
125:22 128:15,18	197:12,16,21	wrongly 54:20	10-year 167:23	115:9 144:11
129:8,14,15	198:5 201:18	wrongs 68:1	10,000 197:4	177:8,13
137:16 143:25	worked 96:13	wrote 77:1 90:10	<b>10.00</b> 1:2 204:13	<b>2.00</b> 107:19,21,25
154:2 160:22	109:3,4,4 132:15	90:18 128:10	204:17	<b>20</b> 55:15 87:10
173:1,14 186:6	132:16 170:22		10.49 30:14	94:24 112:6
190:19 191:11	171:19 184:16	X	10.57 30:16	123:17,18 143:21
201:24,24	195:2 198:7	<b>X</b> 204:20	<b>100</b> 39:20 163:20	<b>2000</b> 57:9
witnessed 31:15	workforce 159:14	xenophobic 29:7	103 57:12	<b>2003</b> 42:16
31:18 74:14,24	174:2		<b>104</b> 57:13	<b>2004</b> 17:1
<u> </u>		Y	<b>105</b> 57:15	<b>2005</b> 3:19 5:1
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 248
16:25 32:9,16	25:12 29:22,24	141:9,16,22	58:16 59:4 60:5	<b>72-hour</b> 94:10
42:12 177:8	147:8,11,12	141.9,10,22	61:5 63:9 65:22	135:3
<b>2006</b> 3:19	<b>2021</b> 23:16 77:10	143:7 177:19	65:24 66:22	133.3
<b>2000</b> 3.19 <b>2007</b> 83:8	<b>2021</b> 23.10 77.10 <b>2022</b> 1:1 17:9	185:12	67:18 69:5 74:14	8
<b>2007</b> 83.8 <b>2009</b> 173:11,15	63:17 185:12	<b>3.30</b> 176:22	<b>4.33</b> 204:16	<b>8</b> 47:24 76:3,11
174:6	<b>21</b> 55:20 64:17	<b>3.45</b> 176:19,21	<b>40</b> 10:5 39:15,19	106:5
<b>2010</b> 34:14	66:23 70:23	<b>3.46</b> 176:24	61:19 62:1 63:10	
<b>2010</b> 34.14 <b>2011</b> 83:11	71:19 87:2	<b>30</b> 76:5 120:19	68:14,17,19 69:1	9
<b>2011</b> 65.11 <b>2012</b> 55:2 83:12	21st 65:8	144:23	69:14 73:22	<b>90</b> 173:16
185:8 200:16	<b>218t</b> 63:8 <b>22</b> 54:9 63:18	<b>309</b> 52:3	74:10 77:22 78:2	<b>93</b> 18:17
				<b>95</b> 44:3 205:1
<b>2013</b> 55:24	90:17	<b>31</b> 97:3 133:12	84:23 191:12	979 55:2
<b>2014</b> 17:1 20:15	<b>2249</b> 55:9	310 52:3	193:7 200:22	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
33:1 50:25 51:4	<b>23</b> 185:12	<b>34</b> 30:4 45:16,22	201:11	
53:15 55:9 106:8	<b>24</b> 45:21 60:5,7	46:6,10,13 48:8	<b>400</b> 100:8	
<b>2014/2015</b> 117:14	64:18,20 65:7	68:8 69:12 72:17	403 57:9	
<b>2015</b> 17:1 26:4	24(1) 4:25	81:10 87:6,9	<b>42</b> 10:5 68:17	
42:17 95:23	<b>24/7</b> 171:17	88:5 96:10 104:4	<b>442</b> 100:10	
120:13 157:16	<b>25</b> 55:24 58:16	143:1 183:18	<b>457</b> 90:22	
199:13	60:5,10 65:12	194:16,25 197:7	<b>45th</b> 83:1	
<b>2016</b> 17:2 26:3	186:19 198:21	<b>35</b> 21:25 23:20	<b>47</b> 90:25	
28:6 70:18,24	<b>25,000</b> 134:12	30:4 35:11,13,15	<b>48</b> 68:7	
87:2 120:13,14	<b>26</b> 186:8	45:16,21,22 46:3	<b>49</b> 204:23	
<b>2017</b> 17:5 19:8	<b>27</b> 72:16 77:10	46:7,10,13 48:8	5	
20:22 22:2,16	80:1,8	68:8 69:12 71:12		
23:8 24:1 29:15	<b>28</b> 63:17 74:11	71:16 72:17 80:3	5 1:1 4:23 28:2	
29:24 32:7 36:13	79:5 80:8 183:7	80:10,12 81:11	79:15 80:8	
48:20 51:4,17,20	<b>29</b> 57:9 113:14	87:6,9 88:1,6	149:15	
53:15 58:16 71:2	121:18	90:5 91:5 97:23	<b>5.00</b> 198:8	
72:15,15,16	3	102:15 103:5	<b>50</b> 58:19 181:3	
73:23 74:11,14		104:5,14,19	<b>50.02</b> 117:10	
89:5,12 96:5	3 1:22,25 2:5,17,21	167:2 194:16,25	<b>503</b> 82:22	
97:3 100:24	3:1,5,13,14,18	196:21 199:23	<b>504</b> 82:14	
102:1 109:7,9	4:13 6:6 8:10	<b>35(1)</b> 35:19 46:1	<b>54</b> 204:24	
117:17,18 127:7	9:16,17 10:1	86:23,25 87:21	<b>558</b> 82:12 192:24	
130:11 137:2	11:8,21 12:5	96:22,24 102:9	<b>57</b> 55:24 79:20	
173:12 174:2,6	17:14 26:19,19	143:2 144:11	6	
179:14 186:19	27:8,9,20,24	<b>35(2)</b> 35:21 45:25	62:13 71:11 73:23	
187:19 195:11	28:17,24 29:3,10	87:20 89:24		
198:21	34:21 36:9 37:2	109:18 133:3	80:8 152:10	
<b>2018</b> 34:3,15 54:9	38:5 54:10,15,25	134:4 137:21	187:19	
55:23 57:22	57:21 58:6,8	143:2 147:2	<b>60</b> 132:6 179:14	
58:13 89:21 90:1	60:13 71:1,5,22	<b>35(3)</b> 36:3 70:18	<b>616</b> 100:10	
90:7,17 111:19	72:8 73:13 74:19	102:8	<b>67</b> 55:24 57:22	
125:7 128:20	75:12 80:8 81:23	<b>35(3)s</b> 35:24	7	
180:6	95:13,25 96:22	<b>35,000</b> 197:4	780:8	
<b>2019</b> 47:24	98:11 101:22	<b>37</b> 72:19	<b>7.45</b> 198:8	
<b>202</b> 55:25	106:6 114:21,21	<b>39</b> 191:6 194:16	7.45 198.8 70(f) 55:2	
<b>2020</b> 17:7 22:23	115:18 129:13		<b>70(1)</b> 55:2 <b>72</b> 153:23 183:7,7	
23:13 24:11	130:8,9,10 134:5	4	183:14	
	134:6 139:21	<b>4</b> 4:19 27:1 28:2	103.14	
	•	<u>'</u>	<u>'</u>	<u>'</u>