

AVID

Association of Visitors to Immigration Detainees

Patrons: Colin Firth, Lord David Ramsbotham, GCB, CBE and John Scampion, CBE

Registered Charity No. 1063784

In Touch

130 (July 2014)

AVID:
Archway Resource Centre
1b Waterloo Road
London
N19 5NJ
enquiries@aviddetention.org.uk
0207 281 0533
Twitter: @AVIDdetention

Parliamentary Inquiry into Detention

The All Party Parliamentary Group on Migration and the APPG on Refugees have launched a cross party inquiry into the use of immigration detention in the UK. The Inquiry will be chaired by Sarah Teather MP (Lib Dem), and the panel comprises:

Sarah Teather MP	Richard Fuller MP
Paul Blomfield MP	Baroness Lister
David Burrowes MP	Baroness Hamwee
Caroline Spelman MP	Lord Ramsbotham
Jon Cruddas MP	Lord Lloyd of Berwick
Julian Huppert MP	

News from AVID

Congratulations to our runners in the British 10k, Saturday 13th July



Our fabulous AVID team! L-R: James McMenamin, Leah Cowan, Alison Fleet, Carolina Albuerne Rodriguez, Ana Gonzalez, Ali Bandegani

A huge thank you to the brave runners who undertook the British 10k race through central London on 13th July to raise important funds for AVID's work. We are very grateful for all of those who took part in what was a very well attended (10,000 runners!) event.

The inquiry is the first of its kind to investigate immigration detention and will have a particular focus on conditions within detention centres, the impact on individual detainees and their families, the wider financial and social consequences, how detention is used in other countries, and the future role of detention within the immigration system. It is a vital opportunity for those with experience of detention (including those in detention, who have experienced detention, and visitors groups) to speak directly to Parliament on the injustices of the detention system and the experiences you have had as visitors to detention around the country. It is a unique chance to do so, so please consider how your visitors group can get involved.

There are various ways to get involved including making a written submission (**deadline: 1st October 2014**), but you may also be interested in holding a local 'hearing' with visitors and detainees to gather evidence. There are also oral hearings in parliament, the first took place on July 17th. Full information is available at <http://detentioninquiry.com/how-to-submit-evidence/>.

There is likely to be much activity ongoing until the Inquiry ends on 1st October, so we will keep you up to date.

If you would like help considering how your group could be involved, or any guidance or advice in collating testimony and evidence for your submissions, please contact Ali in the AVID office as soon as possible. There will also be a guidance pack from the Detention Forum with plenty of useful information on making submissions and local hearings, which we will circulate when available.

We are also fundraising for the 20th anniversary project. You can donate simply and easily by texting AVID20£10 to 70070 to make a £10 donation.

Do you have any items for next month's newsletter? If so please send to avidnews321@gmail.com by August 15th

News from Members

Samphire recruiting: Trustee Opportunity!

Samphire Project, formerly Dover Detainee Visitors group, has an opportunity to join their Committee as a volunteer Treasurer. For full details, please see the Role Description circulated with this newsletter. The role would begin in September when the current Treasurer steps down. This is a great opportunity to get involved with a leading detention NGO.

Detention Update

High Court Ruling on Detained Fast Track 'unlawful'

In a landmark ruling in a case brought by Detention Action, the High Court found that the way the government operates the Detained Fast Track asylum system is unlawful.

This is a huge piece of news and well done to Detention Action. You can read more from DA [here](#). The Daily Mail ran an [unusually positive story](#) about the ruling, and coverage from the Independent is [here](#).

The judge identified 'serious failings' in the DFT, which detains asylum seekers while a decision on their claim is made. Designed as a speedy response to cases deemed to be 'straightforward', the DFT instead – as visitors are aware – is riddled with delays and frequently people are routed into the system inappropriately, such as victims of torture or rape, or those who have been trafficked into the UK. Mr Justice Ouseley highlighted the unjustifiable delay in allocating lawyers and said that this meant the DFT 'as operated carries an unacceptably high risk of unfairness'.

HMIP report: Dover detention centre

HMIP inspected Dover IRC in March 2014 (unannounced inspection) and published the report on the 7th July. Critically, the team found that the detention centre was still being run like a prison and needed to 'separate its identity'. The physical security was described as 'excessive' given the population, and procedural security 'lacked proportionality'. The high stress levels of detainees were also highlighted in the report, which made 98 recommendations. Key findings include:

- reward scheme was inappropriate and its application was punitive;
- immigration processes impacted on detainees' stress levels and their sense of safety and too many did not have an immigration lawyer;
- the management of cases was too slow;
- arrangements to support detainees prior to removal or release were very limited.

You can read the report [in full here](#), or local media coverage from [Kent Online](#) and the [Dover Express](#).

HMIP report: Haslar detention centre

Haslar was inspected by HMIP in February 2014 and the report published in July. This report also highlighted that some security was

'disproportionate' to the population. Rates of self-harm were low, but inspectors found that handcuffs were being used when under escort without an individual risk assessment being carried out. One detainee who had spent 3.5 years in detention was released during the inspection. Insufficient preparation for release was also highlighted, alongside:

- the special accommodation unit was not routinely staffed when used to hold detainees who had been separated or when they were at risk of self-harm;
- increasing numbers of detainees did not have a lawyer to assist with their immigration cases;
- some detainees were held for unreasonably long periods;
- not all detainees were prepared for what came after leaving the centre, and some were only told the day before that they were being moved to another centre;
- the Home Office continued to prevent detainees from working if they did not comply with immigration processes.

You can access the [full report here](#).

IMB report: Harmondsworth detention centre "failing the vulnerable"

In a press release relating to the publication of their 2013 annual report on Harmondsworth, the IMB state that the centre is "still failing the vulnerable". The IMB highlight the lack of a proper therapeutic environment for vulnerable people including those with mental health needs, and the use of segregation to manage such vulnerabilities- which they raised last year. The IMB were promised that things would change, yet apparently the centre has not had the resources to follow through on these recommendations. The IMB also report the detention of a 15 year old boy for 4 months. You can read the full report [here](#).

Brian Dalrymple Inquest: 'neglect' a contributing factor to his death

The jury at the inquest into the death of Brian Dalrymple at Harmondsworth IRC in 2011 has concluded that he died of natural causes '*contributed to by neglect*'. A [press release by](#)

AVID Association of Visitors to Immigration Detainees | In Touch 130
www.aviddetention.org.uk

[the charity INQUEST](#) which works on death in custody issues and support families, reports from the inquest. It notes that the jury '*detailed a catalogue of errors in his care and stated that the medical record keeping at Harmondsworth Immigration Detention centre was 'shambolic'*

Deborah Coles from INQUEST said: "*This is a shocking death of a mentally and physically ill man who died in his cell as a result of corporate neglect and indifference. The catalogue of failings is not unique to this case but expose the plight of those held in immigration detention and the systemic neglect of detainees' mental and physical ill health as evidenced by the high numbers of deaths, suicide attempts and self harm*"

European Court of Justice ruling: Illegal for Germany to hold 'deportees' in prison

With thanks to Bekah Sparrow

<http://www.dw.de/eu-court-to-germany-get-deportees-out-of-prisons/a-17792247>

<http://www.euractiv.com/sections/justice-home-affairs/germanys-deportees-cannot-be-held-prisons-ecj-rules-303587>

STATISTICS

Number of charter flights to remove people from the UK, April 2013 to March 2014

With thanks to No Deportations

A Freedom of Information request by 'No Deportations' asked for information on the number of Charter Flights to remove people from the UK. The response is as follows:

How many Charter Flights were there? 47

What were the destination countries?
Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nigeria, Ghana, Jordan, Suriname, Kosovo and Albania.

How many returnees were:

Males: 2,290

Females: 173

Children: 0

What was the total cost? The total cost was £12,664,191.98. It should be noted however that 50% of these costs are covered by the European Union.

News, Publications, Reports

Home Office Accessing NHS Records to Track Immigrants

An article in the Guardian newspaper reports that the Home Office has been given access to the NHS records of more than 6,900 people since 2010 as part of its efforts to track down what the Guardian describes as “illegal immigrants”.

Medical records are protected by data protection laws, but new statistics show the Home Office has made use of a little-noticed exemption in the rules to access patients' non-clinical records, without any need for a court order. The exemption allows officials to see where people have made use of the health service and when, but not the details of the clinical conditions or medical attention they received. Police forces and the National Crime Agency have also accessed these records, the figures show, in pursuit of perpetrators of serious crimes such as murder and rape. Patients' groups said the use of NHS records by immigration and law enforcement officials could deter people from seeking treatment for themselves or their families, and so pose a public health risk. You can read more [here](#).

UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women: UK report

Rashida Manjoo, the UN Special Rapporteur on VAW has finished her mission to the UK. The mission made the headlines last month when she was denied access to Yarl's Wood detention centre by the UK government. She has called for urgent action to address the ‘accountability deficit’ and the adverse impacts of changes in funding and services. She reports that *‘a common consensus in all the locations I visited is that the justice system as a whole is not equipped or responsive to addressing the specific needs of women and girl survivors of violence. Another important obstacle to women’s access to the justice system, are the changes and cuts to legal*

aid following the adoption of the "Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act" of 2012’. You can read more [here](#).

Immigration Statistics “not fit for purpose”

Migrants Rights Network has published a blog on the Westminster Hall Debate on the Public Administration Select Committee’s report on migration statistics. As we all know, the migration statistics as relate to detention are problematic as they don’t present a real picture, completely ignoring the high numbers of immigration detainees held in prisons. It is interesting then that MPs described the migration statistics as ‘blunt instruments’ not fit for purpose. Read more from [MRN here](#).

UNHCR report ‘Beyond Detention’

UNHCR has produced a new global strategy (Beyond Detention) which aims to help countries move away from detaining migrants. The new strategy calls for an end to the detention of children, and also for alternatives to detention to be both available in law and implemented. It also calls for the conditions of detention when unavoidable to fully meet international human rights standards.

UNHCR Director of International Protection said “Seeking asylum is lawful and the exercise of a fundamental human right. The detention of asylum-seekers as a routine response should be avoided - these are people who need protection. We are ready to work with governments on this, particularly to end the practice of detaining asylum-seeking children”. UNHCR has identified a number of countries to work with initially to look at detention practices and strengthen alternatives to detention, including the UK.

The strategy is a five year initiative running June 2014 to June 2019. The main thrust of implementation will focus on the development of national action plans. You can read the full strategy and find out more [here](#).

Mark Harper's former cleaner detained in Yarls Wood

Isabella Acevedo was snatched by immigration officials from her own daughter's wedding and now faces deportation, while Mark Harper, who resigned when it emerged he employed her for less than £10 an hour, is back in government. She tells her story to the Guardian, you can read it [here](#).

ICIUKBI (Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration) publishes 3 new reports

The Home Secretary laid three reports on the topic of asylum before Parliament on the 15th July. These were three reports produced by the **Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration, John Vine**. You can access the reports and a media release for each report using the links below:

- [An Inspection of Asylum Support](#)
- [An Inspection of the Non-Suspensive Appeals Process](#)
- [An Unannounced Inspection of the Cardiff Asylum Team](#)

Medical Justice Annual Report

Medical Justice has produced their annual report for 2014 which you can access [here](#).

Law and Policy

Unlawful Detention of Torture Survivor

R (AA) Sudan v. SSHD

As many visitors already know, the procedures in place to protect torture survivors from detention are systemically flawed. A recent legal ruling confirms this. The case relates to a Sudanese national – visited by a member of the Sudanese Visitors Group – who claimed asylum on arrival in Britain in 2003, and when his claim and appeal were rejected he went off the radar. In 2011 when he was detained, various assessments were carried out which found 260 scars. The Home Office did not respond to these medical assessments until June 18th 2014, the day before the hearing. The man was detained throughout this time. The reasoning the Home Office gave for

failing to heed medical evidence was 'lack of resources'. Mr Justice Dingham said the claimant's detention has now become unlawful; the defendant [Theresa May] has incurred liabilities to the claimant; and the claimant must now be released". Toufique Hossain, director of public law at Duncan Lewis, said

"It is chilling to hear what the Home Secretary says as part of her defence in this case. She says that she has insufficient resources to monitor and review the administrative detention of foreign nationals even when those detainees have clear evidence of being victims of torture.

"Our client has over 260 scars including burning, cutting and branding. How many torture victims is the state detaining unlawfully because it lacks resources to monitor detention? How many torture victims are detained under immigration powers either in prisons or detention centres?"

You can read the coverage by [politics.co.uk here](#).

Residence Test struck down as discriminatory and unlawful

The residence test, introduced by the Government as a test for eligibility for legal aid, has been found in the High Court to be discriminatory and unlawful. Three senior judges declared that the draft regulations (currently before Parliament) cannot be enacted through secondary legislation. You can [read more here](#) and access [Guardian coverage here](#).

ILPA information service update for July

ILPA has published their information service update for July, including:

1. BAIL: New restrictions on the right to bail for those detained under immigration powers, there are two material changes: The Act provides that a person cannot be released on bail by the Tribunal where their removal is set to take place within 14 days, unless the Home Secretary consents. The Act provides that the Tribunal must refuse any bail application made within 28 days of a previous application for bail, absent proof of a 'material change of circumstances'. The changes have not yet come into force and full details of how they will work in practice are awaited; this

will depend on rules published by the Tribunal Procedure Committee. See the ILPA information sheet: [Immigration Act - Bail](#)

2. Loss of Appeal Rights: [Immigration Act - Appeals](#)

3. Housing: [Immigration Act - Housing](#)

4. Healthcare: [Immigration Act - Healthcare](#)

Parliamentary Monitoring

Deportation to Somalia

[HL Deb, 23 June 2014, c115W](#)

Lord Roberts of Llandudno asked whether enforced removals to Mogadishu will continue, pending the decision on an official decision on a country guidance case and an official statement by the SSHD. The reply from Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Home Office, Lord Taylor of Holbeach (Con) was that 'there are no existing court judgments that have found that all removals to Somalia are unsafe or should be suspended'. He also pointed out that an existing country guidance judgment in November 2011 recognised that many, but not all, Somalis returning after a 'significant time abroad' would be at risk on return. He also stated that '*the determination also recognized that the country situation was improving and each case needed to be considered on its individual merits*'. The country guidance is still awaited, but Lord Taylor noted that the High Court has previously ruled that automatic stays on removal simply because a country guidance case is pending are 'not necessary', so '*we will only enforce the return of Somali nationals who we, and the courts, are satisfied are not at risk on return and who do not elect to leave voluntarily*'

Legal advice at Verne Prison

[HL Deb, 24 June 2014, c154W](#)

Lord Roberts of Llandudno asked what steps are being taken to make legal aid funded advice available to those in the Verne. The **Minister of State, Ministry of Justice (Lord Faulks, Con)** replied that advice on immigration matters within the scope of legal aid can be given by any provider that holds an Immigration and Asylum contract with the Legal Aid Agency. Four

providers are apparently interested in the provision of surgeries at the Verne and "*Communications will be issued shortly regarding when these services are likely to commence*".

(note: legal aid advice surgeries have since commenced at the Verne).

'Deportation' of transgender asylum seekers
[HL Deb, 26 June 2014, c175W](#)

Baroness Royall of Blaisdon asked how many people seeing asylum in the UK on the basis of 'trans-related issues' have been refused asylum and deported to their country of origin in the last 5 years. The response from **Lord Taylor of Holbeach** was that this information is not collated centrally and could only be obtained through searching individual case files - which would exceed the cost limit.

Immigration: Removals

[HL Deb, 26 June 2014, c131WS](#)

Written Ministerial Statement (text in full): "A removal decision under section 47 of the Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006 (the 2006 Act) may be made in relation to any person whose leave is statutorily extended leave by virtue of either:

- *section 3C of the Immigration Act 1971 (the 1971 Act) – where the migrant has made an in-time application and a decision on the application is pending or an appeal against refusal has not yet been exhausted; or*
- *section 3D of the 1971 Act – where leave has been revoked or curtailed with immediate effect and any appeal against that decision has not yet been exhausted.*

The previous Government stated that migrants who had received a removal decision under section 47 of the 2006 Act could not be subject to reporting conditions or detention while they had continuing leave pending the outcome of an appeal (House of Commons Official Report 29th March 2006, Col 908). In fact, Schedule 2 of the 1971 Act allows their detention, and in circumstances where leave has been abused this may be appropriate.

Curtailment with immediate effect is used where the migrant has failed to comply with the conditions of their leave, or their character, conduct or associations make it undesirable to allow them to remain in the UK – for example, where there is reliable evidence that they have facilitated or entered into a sham marriage or civil partnership to gain an immigration advantage. Sham marriage is known to be a significant and increasing threat to UK immigration control.

To allow robust and proportionate enforcement action against individuals who abuse the immigration system, we are changing policy in regard of persons who have statutorily extended leave under Section 3D of the 1971 Act. Migrants whose leave has been revoked or curtailed with immediate effect will be liable to be detained or to report to the Home Office (depending on the individual circumstances of the case) pending their removal from the UK.

The Home Office will continue not to detain persons whose leave is extended by virtue of section 3C of the 1971 Act. In these cases, migrants have sought to regularise their stay before their leave expired and should not be subject to enforcement action before their application is finally determined. Similarly, a person whose leave is curtailed for reasons outside their control (for example, the college at which they were studying has closed down) would normally be left with some leave remaining, in order to let them find alternative provision. A removal decision would not be made with the curtailment decision and they would be unaffected by this policy change”.

New restraint system for detainees under escort

[HL Deb, 26 June 2014, c132WS](#)

Written Ministerial Statement (text in full): “I am today announcing that I have formally approved a new restraint system for safely managing people being escorted during immigration removals. This fulfils a commitment by this Government to provide training for escort staff that reflects the environment they work in, both in-country and overseas. The bespoke training is tailored to the experience and behaviour of detainees and staff in immigration

removals and provides practical tools to de-escalate situations and minimise the use of restraint.

The new system has been assessed by the Independent Advisory Panel for Non Compliance Management, chaired by Stephen Shaw. The panel was established to provide support to the National Offender Management Service in the design of the new training package, to provide independent advice on the quality and safety of the new package, in particular on the use of restraint techniques.

The report by the Independent Advisory Panel for Non Compliance Management is welcomed by the Government. The report recognises the balance to be struck between treating detainees with respect and minimising the need for restraint, with our responsibility to enforce immigration law, which sometimes requires the use of physical intervention. After careful consideration of the panel’s comprehensive assessment of the quality and safety of the new system, the Government has accepted all of its recommendations.

The new training for overseas and in-country escort staff will begin implementation on 28 July 2014. I am placing a copy of the full report of the Independent Advisory Panel for Non Compliance Management and the Government’s response to the report in the Library of the House. A redacted version of the Manual for Escorting Safely and supporting guidance will be published in due course”.

Transgender immigration detainees

[HL Deb, 2 July 2014, c264W](#)

Baroness Gould of Potternewton asked what assessment has been made of the incidence of abuse experienced by transgender individuals placed in mixed sex detention centres. **Lord Taylor of Holbeach** replied that men and women only mix at two IRCs, Yarl’s Wood and Dungavel. “*Transsexual people may be held at any IRC*”. They are managed in accordance with DSO 11/2012, which requires a care management plan to be produced by the centre, outlining how the detainee will be managed safely and decently, and that they “put in place measures to manage the risk of transphobic harassment and

transphobic hate crime". He added that "assessment of the incidence of physical, sexual and emotional abuse experienced by transgender individuals placed in IRCs is not possible as the information is not centrally recorded and can only be provided at disproportionate cost".

Detention: disclosure of tender information/contracts

[HL Deb, 3 July 2014, c279W](#)

Lord Roberts asked what consideration was given to (1) the death of detainee Christine Case, and (2) allegations of sexual assault, at Yarl's Wood Immigration Removal Centre in permitting Serco to retender to run that facility; and whether the tender documents submitted by all applicants who entered bids to run (1) Harmondsworth, and (2) Colnbrook, Immigration Removal Centres will be disclosed. The reply from **Lord Taylor of Holbeach** was that "*it has not been possible to answer this question within the usual ten day deadline. I will write to the Noble Lord, Lord Roberts of Llandudno, before the summer recess and will place a copy of that letter in the House library*".

Deportation and Return to Somalia

[HC Deb, 8 July 2014, c196W](#)

Hilary Benn asked how many failed asylum seekers have (a) been deported and (b) voluntarily returned to Somalia in each of the last 12 months; and if a statement will be made. Karen Bradley replied with the following table which details the number of asylum seekers deported and voluntarily returned in each of the last 12 months:

	Enforced removals	Vol departures
April 2013	0	0
May 2013	0	0
June 2013	0	0
July 2013	0	1
August 2013	0	1
September	0	0

2013		
October 2013	0	2
November 2013	1	0
December 2013	1	1
January 2014	1	0
February 2014	0	0
March 2014	2	0
Total	5	5

Voluntary Returns and Removals

[HC Deb, 8 July 2014, c198W](#)

Mr Hollobone asked "how many illegal immigrants have been sent back from the UK to their country of origin in each calendar year since May 2010" **Karen Bradley** provided the following table, noting that the information provided "is a subset of the total number of persons removed or departed voluntarily from the UK as others may be removed or depart voluntarily to a country that is different to their country of origin".

	Total enforced removals	Total non-asylum refused entry at port and subsequently departed	Total vol departures
Jan to April 2010	4,098	2,857	7,718
May to Dec 2010	8,691	5,139	14,049
Total 2010	12,789	7,996	21,767

2011	12,997	6,250	20,622
2012 ³	13,096	5,760	22,272
2013 ³	11,577	6,252	28,130

Staffing at Yarl's Wood

[HL Deb, 9 July 2014, c61W](#)

Lord Roberts of Llandudno asked two questions about Yarl's Wood. He asked whether an assessment had been made by the Government on the appropriateness of the current number of female officers employed by Yarl's Wood and also whether steps are being taken to ensure that women in the detention centre who are on suicide watch are only supervised by female officers. The response from **Lord Taylor of Holbeach** was that "*The Home Office and its service providers comply with all relevant employment legislation. The service provider for Yarl's Wood immigration removal centre (IRC), Serco, is required under their contract to employ sufficient female officers to enable appropriate searching and security arrangements for female detainees. Yarl's Wood IRC has 52% male detainee custody officers (DCOs) and 48% female DCOs. A new recruitment drive is underway, with a review of how flexible and family friendly hours might be enhanced to attract more women recruits as well as devising recruitment campaigns that target female audiences*".

In terms of ACDT, the system used for monitoring detainees at risk of self harm, the response was that "*ACDT requires centre managers to appoint trained assessors and named case managers to provide individualised care to detainees based on their particular needs*".

Repatriation of foreign national prisoners

[HC Deb, 10 July 2014, c379W](#)

Sadiq Khan: To ask the Secretary of State for Justice how many foreign nationals of each nationality were deported from jails in London to complete their sentences in their home countries in (a) 2010, (b) 2011, (c) 2012, (d) 2013 and (e) 2014 to date. Jeremy Wright responded with the

following table:

Year	Number of prisoners transferred
2010	47
2011	43
2012	41
2013	43
2014 to date	16

He added that '*the prisoner transfer process is just one mechanism for removing Foreign National Offenders. The number of FNOs deported under the Early Removal Scheme (ERS) has increased under this Government. In 2013, we removed nearly 2,000 FNOs under ERS and under the Tariff Expired Removal Scheme (TERS), which we introduced in May 2012, we have removed over 240 FNOs to date. Whereas this Government has begun to reduce the foreign national population in prison since 2010, between 1997 and 2010, the number of foreign nationals in our prisons more than doubled*'.

Incidents in the detention 'estate'

[HC Deb, 14 July 2014, c499W](#)

Andy Sawford asked how many times the Gold Suite has been opened at each immigration removal centre in England and Wales in the last year; and what the nature was of each incident that caused it to be opened. **Karen Bradley** replied that "*the Home Office command suite structure for the management of serious incidents is based on the model operated by the Prison Service. Silver Command Suites are opened in the establishment where the incident occurred*".

A Gold Command Suite is opened in Prison Service headquarters for incidents where the Home Office requests mutual assistance from the Prison Service and is attended by a Home Office senior manager.

Any other serious incident, which does not require mutual assistance but requires ongoing management, is dealt with by opening a Gold Command Suite at Detention Operations headquarters".

She also presented the following table, detailing the number of Silver Suites opened in IRCS for Jan 2013 – March 2014 as follows:

IRC	Number of incidents	Date	Incident
Morton Hall	1	7 April 2013	Concerted indiscipline
Haslar	1	22 July 2013	Barricade
Dungavel	1	10 March 2013	Escape
Campsfield	2	20 August 2013	Incident at height
		18 October 2013	Fire
Dover	2	18 October 2013	Incident at height
		9 August 2013	Barricade
Brook House	2	15 May 2013	Tool loss
		9 September 2013	External protest
Yarl's Wood	2	5 March 2014	Bomb threat
		30 March 2014	Death in detention
Harmondsworth	6	30 April 2012	Concerted indiscipline, passive
		1 January 2013	External protest
		18 July 2013	Concerted indiscipline, passive
		6 August 2013	Concerted indiscipline, passive
		22 November 2013	External protest
		29 November 2013	External protest
Colnbrook	0		
Tinsley	0		

Detention Centres: Incidents

[HC Deb, 14 July 2014: C493W](#)

Andy Sawford asked how many (a) red incidents and (b) amber incidents have occurred at each IRC in each of the last four years. **Karen Bradley**

replied that incidents in the detention estate are reported in accordance with Detention Services Order (DSO) 12/2008. Incidents are classified according to their seriousness as red, amber or green. Examples of the types of red or amber incidents are given in the DSO. Red incidents are generally those relating to serious disturbances and/or fires within a centre. Amber incidents may be those involving threats to the centre, external demonstrations, or co-ordinated food or fluid refusal.

Incidents in immigration removal centres for the period 1 July 2013 to 9 March 2014 by status:

IRC	Red	Amber	Total
H/worth	0	145	145
C/brook	4	109	113
Y Wood	1	109	110
Brook	2	59	61
Dover	1	39	40
M Hall	6	29	35
Tinsley	0	17	17
C/field	1	14	15
Dungavel	0	3	3
Haslar	0	2	2
TOTAL	15	528	541

Escapes from detention and during escorts

[HC Deb, 14 July 2014, c509W](#)

Andy Sawford asked how many detainees have (a) escaped from detention, (b) escaped while being escorted and (c) attempted to escape each IRC in the last four years; and how many such people are still at large. **Karen Bradley** provided the following table, adding that '*information on attempted escapes is not held centrally and could be provided only by examination of individual records at disproportionate cost*'.

11 of those individuals recorded as escaped 2010-11 to 2013-14 have not been located. The police are informed immediately when a detainee has escaped and the individual's details are recorded on the Police National Computer should the individual be apprehended at a later date.

Financial Year	Absconded (no)
2010-11	
Absconded from centre	5

Absconded from escorts	3
Total	8
2011-12	
Absconded from centre	3
Absconded from escorts	3
Total	6
2012-13	
Absconded from centre	4
Absconded from escorts	1
Total	5
2013-14	
Absconded from centre	0
Absconded from escorts	0
Total	0

Andy Sawford then asked how many times an escaped person has been categorised as a high harm person and the senior management team believe there is a high risk of reputational damage to the Home Office as set out in the Home Office Guidance on Escaped Detainees at immigration removal centres in the last four years. **Karen Bradley**: “The Home Office does not routinely categorise immigration detainees against a scale of harm. They are instead subject to individual risk assessment linked to their suitability for placement in an immigration removal centre (IRC) which is based on a number of different factors. Where an escape or attempted escape from an IRC takes place, Criminal and Financial Investigation (CFI) immigration specialist teams will assist in the investigation where the individual is assessed to be a “high harm” person, or where the senior management team believe there is a high risk of reputational damage to the Home Office.

In the last four years the CFI team has conducted two investigations relating to escapes of individuals from escort who were assessed to fit the investigation criteria. There have not been any cases of escapes from an IRC which have warranted the involvement of the CFI.

Yarl's Wood IRC

[HC Deb, 14 July 2014, c514W](#)

Sarah Teather asked (1) what assessment she has made of the appropriateness of the current number of female officers in Yarl's Wood Immigration Removal Centre, (2) what steps she is taking to ensure that women in Yarl's Wood Immigration Removal Centre on suicide watch

are only supervised by female officers and (3) if she will take steps to ensure that women detained in Yarl's Wood Immigration Removal Centre can obtain feminine hygiene products without contact with male guards. **Karen Bradley**: gave the same answer as to Lord Roberts, above, with the addition that “feminine hygiene items are freely available to residents. Access to these is not monitored by staff”.

Campsfield House IRC

[HC Deb, 22 July 2014, c1101W](#)

Andrew Smith asked what reason fire sprinklers were not installed at Campsfield house, Oxfordshire prior to the fire in those premises in October 2013. **Karen Bradley** replied that ‘Campsfield house was fully compliant with fire safety requirements at the time of the fire in October 2013. Other older centres, including Campsfield (which is a former HMPS facility) and all the prison sites utilised as immigration removal centres, have had comprehensive fire strategies that do not involve automated fire suppression systems. Sprinklers are one of several options available for fire prevention’.

Andrew Smith then asked who met the costs of damage caused by the fire in October 2013 at Campsfield House, Oxfordshire. The reply from **Karen Bradley** was that the cost of the reinstatement of Campsfield House was met fully by the operator, MITIE, and their insurers.

Internet access in detention

[HC Deb, 22 July 2014, c1102W](#)

Sarah Teather asked which websites detainees in each immigration detention centre are blocked from accessing. **Karen Bradley** replied that “the details of individual blocked websites are not held centrally and could be obtained only by examination of information held at each immigration removal centre (IRC) at disproportionate cost.

Internet access is not standardised across all IRCs, although a review of access is being undertaken to address this.

Suppliers operating IRCs on behalf of the Home Office use specialised software which screens out prohibited categories of sites or sites whose

addresses contain prohibited key words rather than blocking individual website addresses. Prohibited categories are based on safety and security concerns, for example potential terrorist or pornographic sites".

Harmondsworth IRC

[HL Deb, 22 July 2014, c188W](#)

Baroness Stern asked Her Majesty's Government what plans they have to respond to the Independent Monitoring Board's Annual Report 2013 on Harmondsworth Immigration Removal Centre and, in particular, it's finding in respect of the provision of appropriate accommodation for those with mental health or behavioural problems. She also asked whether they have initiated changes at Harmondsworth Immigration Removal Centre to ensure that detainees claiming to be under 18 are assessed by social services in the community rather than in the centre. **Lord Taylor of Holbeach** replied that "*an action plan to address the recommendations in the report will be agreed by 11 August. Plans to make changes to the configuration of the healthcare unit to address the provision of appropriate accommodation for those with mental health or behavioural problems are under discussion with the new healthcare provider at Harmondsworth. This is in advance of the transfer of healthcare commissioning to NHS England on 1 September. Individuals who claim to be under the age of 18 following their detention are managed in accordance with Detention Services Order 14/2012 for the care and management of age dispute cases. This sets out the policy and procedures to follow in individual cases where there is a lack of physical or definitive documentary evidence to prove the person is under the age of 18. This also details the circumstances in which release by case owners is appropriate*".

Returns under Dublin II

[HC Deb, 14 July 2014, c497W](#)

Mr Hollobone asked how many asylum seekers have been returned from the UK to the last safe country they left under the Dublin II Regulation in each calendar year since May 2010. **Karen Bradley:** "The Dublin Regulation is helpful in ensuring that asylum seekers who are the responsibility of another participating member

state can be transferred from the UK to that member state. The information requested is shown in the following table. To note, the data provided is for the entirety of 2010, rather than from May 2010 onwards".

Year	People Transferred
2010	1162
2011	954
2012	756
2013	757

Events

Right to Remain: Annual Conference 6th September

Right to Remain (formerly NCADC) are holding their annual conference on Saturday 6 September, from 12 - 5pm, at Praxis Community Projects in Bethnal Green, London.

They we will be discussing the major challenges facing us in the year ahead - the new Immigration Act, barriers to justice, and the aggressive border controls that are now intruding into all aspects of our lives. You can find more information on their [conference webpage](#). They anticipate a packed out conference and therefore booking is essential. If you are able to join them on this exciting day, please email lisa@righttoremain.org.uk to reserve.

AVID, July 2014