

HIA REF: []

NAME: [NHB 137]

DATE: [26 January 2015.]

THE INQUIRY INTO HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONAL ABUSE 1922 TO 1995

Witness Statement of [NHB 137]

I, [NHB 137] will say as follows: -

1. I am a qualified social worker and am currently employed by the Health and Social Care Board as a Social Care Commissioning Lead.
2. I hold a BA Hons Degree; a Diploma in Social Studies, Masters of Social Worker Degree and a Post Qualifying Award in Social Work, I hold the Professional Certificate of Qualification in Social work f (CQSW). I have been in practice in statutory social services for over 25 years.
3. During the period from 1990-2006 I was employed as a social worker and later team manager in the legacy Craigavon and Banbridge Community Health and Social Services Trust (CBHSST), primarily based in Brownlow Social Services. It was during this period I was the supervising social worker for two young people placed in Nazareth Lodge, Belfast. One of these was [NL 164] date of birth 8th September 1981
4. [NL 164] had been subject of a Fit Person Order under the Children and Young Persons Act 1969 (CYPA) 1969 which transferred to a Care Order under the Children Order (NI) 1995.

5. **NL 164** had a number of placement breakdowns prior to being placed in Nazareth Lodge and his placement there was the most significant placement in terms of duration only ceasing when he moved to aftercare services.
6. **NL 164** was a tall articulate and intelligent young man with a sharp sense of humour , with striking blond hair .
7. During the period I became the supervising social worker for **NL 164** Visits were undertaken to **NL 164** and Nazareth Lodge in line with the relevant requirements at that time.
8. My first impressions of Nazareth lodge was a large imposing Victorian red brick building accessed via a driveway from the Ravenhill Road Belfast. The Unit **NL 164** was resident in was located to the side of the main building and St Joseph's Children's home was on the same site. There were extensive grounds surrounding the building.
9. In the relevant period, in which I visiting the facility , I had never noted any children playing outside, which was surprising I thought, given the number of children's units on the site .
10. The Unit **NL 164** was placed in was by the side of the main building and was accessed by ringing the bell and entry facilitated by staff. On entry to the unit there was a staircase to the right which facilitated access to the main building. On the landing of this staircase there was a pool table and games, although at no time did I ever note any young people using these.
11. The model of operation in the unit was with one member of staff identified as the keyworker for the child/young person. This was consistent with models in other residential units. Unlike the current requirements for staff working in residential services the staff were generally unqualified and in the time I visited **NL 164** all his keyworkers were predominately young females .All of the keyworker staff I had involvement with had outlined that they had sought employment in residential care as it allowed them to develop experience in working with young people and to assist in their aspirations to apply for professional training. This would have been the norm at the time in respect of the pathway into professional Social work Training.

12. In relation to **NL 164**, I have had an opportunity to review files relating to **NL 164** placement retained by the current Southern Health and Social Care Trust, and in particular files relating to the period 1994-95 when a number of matters arose in the placement. In all residential placements there will be reports in relation to the interactions among young people living in a group environment. These reports will record various issues arising among young people in a day to day setting, however for the purposes of this statement the incidents referred relate to matters in relation to the management and procedural duties of the unit
13. There were a number of allegations made by **NL 164** in relation to the care provided during this period and these are outlined as follows.
14. **12 May 1994.** I had interviewed **NL 164** in relation to a fight he had with another resident **[REDACTED]** in which he had received a black eye. In the course of this discussion **NL 164** stated that he had received bruises having been "poked" by **SR 18**. I discussed this with **NL 164** and checked the unit log book to see if this incident was recorded. At this stage **NL 164** had indicated he did not wish to make a complaint. The matter of reports from unit staff in relation to this incident was also progressed. All documentation pertaining to this particular incident are provided by way of **exhibit 1**.
15. **24 May 1994.** **NL 164** was spoken to on 24th May again in relation to this matter and asked if he wished to progress a complaint. He indicated he did not wish to do. The staff reports were also reviewed in relation to this incident which indicated **NL 164** had grabbed **SR 18** head of the unit in which he was resident, please refer to **exhibit 1**. The log book and incidents reports reviewed as indicated from the file noted the report as provided by **SR 18** and was signed by another staff member present indicating **NL 164** had grabbed **SR 18**. No record of bruises on **NL 164** or other corroborating evidence to confirm allegation was available. **NL 164** was informed of the staff report.
16. This incident had concerned **NL 164** switching off lights in his room and I had recounted a previous contact with Miss Marion Reynolds from the Social Services Inspectorate in relation to **NL 164** bedroom lights. This had

concerned a previous report that **NL 164** had made to the Inspector about staff switching off his light from outside his bedroom and without his permission. I recall this as I was asked where the light switch for his room was and only subsequently became aware it was located outside the door. Following this, **NL 164** was provided with a bedside light which he could use and had control over for his room. This stands out in my memory and I still can recall the external light switch and its location.

17. **2 June 1994.** Telephone call received from **NL 164** advising that he had been a victim of inappropriate sexual behaviour from another resident. Following this phone call I made contact with unit staff to ensure appropriate safeguarding arrangements were in place. The RUC care unit was also informed of the allegation in line with the joint protocol arrangements in place at that time for the investigations of such allegations.
18. **6 June 1994** – A Strategy meeting was convened and attended by Social Services staff, Nazareth Lodge staff and RUC in respect of these allegations, see **exhibit 2**. **NL 164** was spoken to that afternoon and he agreed to make a formal complaint under the procedures which were explained to him.
19. **9 June 1994** – A formal joint protocol interview was convened in conjunction with the RUC, see **exhibit 3**. On the basis of the outcome this interview, the social worker of the other young person who was subject of the allegation was informed of the outcome as were Nazareth Lodge staff. The North and West Belfast Trust (NWBHSST) responsible for the other young person had already been advised of the allegations given that they related to a child in their care.
20. I was advised at this time that the North and West Trust assessment of the incident related to adolescent behaviours, see **exhibit 4**. Nazareth Lodge indicated that, they felt this response was unsatisfactory and the matter was to be referred within Nazareth Lodge Management structures to raise formally with North and West Trust.
21. My understanding of the outcome of this was that the other young person was subsequently removed from the Unit but there was clear evidence of

actions taken by Nazareth staff to "safeguard" NL 164 including immediately moving him to another adjacent unit to ensure no contact with the alleged perpetrator.

22. **21 June 1994** – A Referral was made to Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) for NL 164 by me. The focus of this referral was to assess and support NL 164 and to acknowledge he did not always engage with social services and hopefully this would provide him an alternative opportunity to raise any matters of concern which he may have had. No concerns were raised by NL 164 to CAMHS and NL 164 subsequently withdrew from this service.
23. **8 September 1994** – I received a telephone call from a member of staff of Nazareth Lodge, named NL 171. The nature of this telephone call was to outline an incident which NL 164 stated occurred on holiday in Donegal when he had been assaulted by other young people and that SR 18 was aware of this assault. NL 164 indicated to me that he wished to make a complaint to the staff member and that he wished for this staff member to agree to contact me on his behalf. I subsequently met NL 164 in relation to this. I refer to documents exhibited herewith at exhibit 5
24. **13 September 1994** – Telephone call from NL 170 NL 164 keyworker, Nazareth Lodge, advising she had compiled reports relating to incidents where NL 164 had been locked in the kitchen by SR 18. She advised she was told not to share this report with social services by senior staff in Nazareth. She indicated she would share this report with me. See contact sheet, exhibit 6 I agreed to come to the unit the next day and to meet with both her and NL 164. I advised senior staff in my organisation of the nature of this call and the action that I was taking
25. **14 September 1994** – Spoke with NL 164 in relation to allegations made both in relation to incidents concerning alleged assault in Donegal and incident re the kitchen. NL 164 indicated that there was nothing to this and did not wish to make any complaint, see contact sheet, exhibit 7.

26. **14 September 1994** – I spoke with **NL 170** who did not wish to speak to me in relation to any complaints, see contact sheet, **exhibit 8**.
27. **NL 170** was also asked about the reports which she indicated had been compiled in relation to the incident. However, no such reports were forthcoming. I assured her that any complaint she made would be investigated as detailed in the contact sheet referred to at **exhibit 8**, however at this time, no complaints were made. The outcome of these series of contacts with both **NL 164** and **NL 170** was outlined in correspondence to my then manager, **[REDACTED]** Assistant Principal Social Worker, see **exhibit 9**.
28. **6 October 1994**. I made a request to the Residential Staff in Nazareth Lodge **SR 18** to see **NL 164** file as I wished to satisfy myself if there was any other evidence of any incidents or reports within the unit which had not been shared, see **exhibit 10** At this time I also spoke to **SR 18** and indicated I was also requesting copies of all untoward incidents from Christmas 1993 held within the unit. I indicated that would wish to speak to her and **SR 2** in relation to any complaints regarding **NL 164** As no complaints were actually made or any evidence of any other reports held within the unit files, no further action could be taken
29. In respect of the discussion with **NL 164** on 14 September 1994, I had a recollection of asking about the role of **NL 165** within Nazareth Lodge. **NL 165** as a young person had been placed in Nazareth Lodge by Port down Social Services and I was the social worker for his half siblings resident in Craigavon. I was aware that at this time **NL 165** was no longer in care. The extent of the time he was present t in my view would have been in excess of what I would have expected of an ex resident and it was this that raised my concern. **NL 165** role in the unit also seemed to me to be akin to that of a senior staff role. When asked, **NL 164** would not comment any further other than to say that he was **SR 18** "pet". I recall having a conversation with **NL 165** social worker from Portadown about the level of presence he had in the unit. Her response was that **NL 165** had left care and the authority of the care order in respect of him had lapsed.

30. I was aware of matters relating to concerns in relation to another member of **NL 165** family relating to risks posed to children and I wished to assure myself that other social work staff involved with this part of the family were aware that **NL 165** was frequently at a children's facility and to be assured his brother was not present. I can recall that the social worker for **NL 165** was clear that senior staff in Nazareth were aware of these concerns.
31. 5 June 1995 – A Contact card from **NL 164** requesting someone visit him received by CBHSCT after initially being forwarded to South & East Belfast Health and Social Services Trust by error, see **exhibit 11**. . I spoke to **NL 164** on his own in relation to this where he informed me that the card had been sent in temper after being reprimanded for slamming doors and going to other residents' rooms. Details of this are also recorded in subsequent correspondence between myself and **NL 222** Assistant Principle Social Worker (APSW), see **exhibit 12**.
32. On 13 December 1995 I visited **NL 164** at Nazareth Lodge, see **exhibit 13**. I had been made aware by **NL 222** APSW that allegations had been made to the Social Services Inspectorate (SSI) in relation to **SR 18** **SR 18** and I was to check with **NL 164** if there were any issues for him at this time, pending a decision whether there should be a formal strategy for investigation.
33. My understanding was that the short report referred to in exhibit 13 was subsequently shared with the Trust convening the investigation. The report detailed in exhibit 13 indicates **NL 164** was preoccupied with other issues in his life at this time, particularly contact with his family and while time was spent with him no concerns with regard to his treatment in Nazareth Lodge were indicted to me by **NL 164**
34. I received hard copies of documentation in relation to the allegations made to the SSI in and around 27 February 1996 and was asked to speak with **NL 164** as a matter of urgency, see **exhibit 14**. A report in relation to where such allegations related to **NL 164** was required immediately.

35. I arranged to see **NL 164** the next day being the 28th February 1996 and spoke with on his own .Initially I had asked him open questions but with little response. I then asked him again directly about the allegations. He was aware that staff members and residents Nazareth Lodge in the unit had spoken with the SSI and other social workers about **SR 18**
36. He then spoke further in relation to the incidents as follows all of which are outlined in my letter to Alan Chard Principal social Worker, Down and Lisburn Trust dated 1st March 1996, see **exhibit 15:-**
37. **NL 164** advised that **NL 165** who was not a resident or staff member frequently drove the unit minibus and that **SR 18** was often not in the bus when driven by **NL 165**
38. **NL 164** when asked about food being retrieved from bins and stated he was aware of this happening. He was aware that it was **SR 18** who retrieved the food but indicated he was not forced to eat this food.
39. He did recount an incident where he had been put out of the bus and having to walk back to the accommodation at which he was staying .He indicated this accommodation was 10-12 miles away from where he was put off the minibus. He stated in the report that he got a lift from a stranger whom he did not know back to the accommodation. he advised when asked to get out of the minibus he refused and his hair was pulled by another resident and **SR 18**
SR 18
40. Following the outline of incidents I had asked **NL 164** why he had never felt able to speak about these incidents or any other incidents in Nazareth concerning life there, he indicated that every time he went to make a complaint, **SR 18** was nice to him and he felt guilty about complaining.
41. At the time of the interview on the 28th February 1996, he informed me **SR 18**
SR 18 was no longer in Nazareth Lodge and he did not know why
42. Following the submission of this report to Alan Chard, I met **SR 18** by chance and she was told she was aware of the content of the investigation

reports which had been complied and that she was being moved to England by the Order. She was pleasant and said she knew I had to do my job and report what I was told. She wished me well.

- 43 In or around 1996, **NL 164** care order was revoked as he no longer wished to engage with Social Services and he therefore moved from Nazareth Lodge and was provided accommodation by Barnardos Aftercare Services in the Belfast area which is where he wished to reside. Social Services continued to provide financial support.
44. I had maintained contact with **NL 164** for a period of time but lost contact when he went to England
45. Given the request to provide a statement in relation to my knowledge of Nazareth Lodge and given that such related to **NL 164** I had located him and advised him I was completing this statement.
46. **NL 164** has subsequently contacted the HSCB to discuss the matter. He has indicated he has not yet decided whether he wishes to take any further steps in relation to this.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed **NHB 137**

Dated 26 Jan 15

INTERVIEW - INCIDENT .. Report ..

NL 164

12th May 1994

RE: Complaint from **NL 164** given to me verbally in Nazareth Lodge.

While interviewing **NL 164** today about his behaviour in the Unit and in particular about a black eye which was reportedly received in a fight between **NL 164** and another young resident **NL 164** alleged that **SR 18** had poked him and left bruises.

NL 227 RSW and Key Worker to **NL 164** stated that she had spoken to **NL 164** about this and had advised him of his rights and asked for the Doctor to see **NL 164**. **NL 227** advised me that the Doctor was in the Unit at the time of her discussion with **NL 164**. **NL 164** stated he did not want to speak to the Doctor nor did he inform **NL 227** of his intention to make a formal complaint.

I checked the Log Book and noted that there was a note that this incident involving **NL 164**, **NL 221** RSW and **SR 18** was to be written up.

I asked for a copy of this as soon as possible.

After listening to the complaint **NL 164** remarked that he was better than staff and that if **NL 227** touched him he would make allegations of sexual assault against her or other staff.

NL 164 did not comprehend the seriousness of this and thought it was funny.

On the morning of 13th May 1994 I contacted Nazareth and spoke to **SR 18** and asked again that the report be forwarded. I also advised them that a formal interview with **NL 164** would be arranged. **SR 18** to provide report early next week.

NHB 137

Social Worker

After speaking to NL 164 the substance of the allegations was outlined to Nazareth staff and to SR 18 Head of unit. Given the seriousness of such the issue of protection for NL 164 and other residents was discussed. The unit have undertaken to provide supervision of NL 164 and when [redacted] and NL 164 are present in the unit there is one to one supervision. The boys are not allowed to associate together at any time.

The outcome of the meeting was also conveyed to Irene Gartland, SSW, Antrim Road Social Services and in particular concern that [redacted] seems to be involved in grooming behaviours which are indicative of sexual offending.

Antrim Road state they are presently trying to place [redacted] in alternative accommodation and are trying for a place in St Patricks Training School.

On 13th June 1994 Nazareth Lodge telephoned Brownlow Social Services to state that NL 218 APSW, Antrim Road Social Services had spoken to them about [redacted] behaviour.

Nazareth staff state he has informed them he perceives [redacted] behaviour as little more than normal adolescent behaviour.

Nazareth Lodge state they are unhappy with this response and have referred the matter to their Management Committee.

NHB 137

13 June 94

CRAIGAVON/BANBRIDGE COMMUNITY
HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES TRUST

CONTACT SHEET

CLIENTS NAMES		NL 164		ADDRESS			
DATE	CONTACT	CODES	PURPOSE	CONTENT	OUTCOME/ACTION	SIGNATURE	
3 Sept 94	NL 171 RSH Hagworth	S C T L I O P		NL 164 relating to NL 171 that he wanted to make a complaint. The substance of this was that while on holiday			
		S C T L I O P		NL 165 + NL 166 previous residents of Hagworth Lodge had beaten him up after he seemed had pulled the hair of James King:			
		S C T L I O P		NL 164 also stating that SR 18 of this		NHB 137	
		S C T L I O P		App arranged to interview NL 164.			

CODES: S Initiated by Social worker
C Initiated by Contact
T Contact by Telephone
L Contact by Letter

I Interview in Contacts home/office
O Interview in Social Services office
P Other interview or contact (specify)

Indicate nature
of contact by



NOTE: In child abuse cases
all contacts including
attempted contacts
should be recorded

file SR 2

On afternoon, while I was in town with NL 164 and NL 168, NL 168 informed me that NL 164 had been "beaten up" by NL 165 and NL 166 two ex-residents, while the children were on holiday in Dargal. NL 164, at this point, told NL 168 to be quiet saying that it didn't matter. I asked NL 164 if what NL 168 had said was true. NL 164 replied that it was. He then proceeded to describe the incident to me. NL 164 alleged that this incident occurred following a previous incident between himself and NL 168 earlier that evening. This particular incident had been recorded in NL 164's log book as occurring on the 12th of July. He had apparently trailed NL 168 around the room by the hair. In NL 164's opinion this behaviour had been the reason as to why he was later assaulted. NL 164 alleged that [redacted] tripped him causing him to fall to the ground while NL 166 hit him across the head. According to NL 164, SR 18 was present throughout the assault. He said that SR had turned the lights out and that he could hear her laughing throughout. He also said that he was able to see her standing at the door.

I asked NL 164 why he did not pursue this incident at the time, NL 164 said that he felt that he would not be believed. He also added that he was unhappy about the outcome of a previous complaint that he had made regarding SR 18. NL 164 had retracted this complaint after speaking with his social worker. He said that he did not follow up the complaint because no one would believe him, "there was two against one". I asked NL 164 what he meant by this, NL 164 said that it was both NL 221 and SR 18.

I then asked **NL 164** if he would record the incident for me as I felt that I had a duty to follow up the matter. I also asked **NL 164** if he wished to make a formal complaint regarding the allegation. **NL 164** replied Yes.

I later spoke with **NL 168** about **NL 164** allegation asking her what **NL 164** had told her. **NL 168** gave the same account as **NL 164** had given. She added that, on the same night that **NL 164** had assaulted her, (12th July) **NL 166** came up to the bedroom and told **NL 168** and **NL 170** that she had given **NL 164** two black eyes because of his previous actions towards **NL 168**. **NL 168** told me that **NL 164** did not have any marks on his eyes when she saw him on the following day, therefore, she thought that **NL 166** had been joking. According to **NL 168** it was not until **NL 164** told her about the incident that she realised this had been on the same night.

I asked **NL 168** to record what **NL 164** had told her, and, what **NL 166** allegedly said. **NL 168** declined to give a written account. She said that she did not want to be involved as she was afraid that it would be angry with her. I told **NL 168** that this was fine, adding that I would have to record what she had told me. **NL 168** accepted this.

I contacted **NHB 137** **NL 164** social worker, to inform him that **NL 164** wished to make a formal complaint.

NL 171

CRAIGAVON/BANBRIDGE COMMUNITY
HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES TRUST

CONTACT SHEET

CLIENTS NAMES

NL 164

ADDRESS

DATE	CONTACT	CODES	PURPOSE	CONTENT	OUTCOME/ACTION	SIGNATURE
13 Sept 94	NL 170 Keyworker Margaret Lodge	S C T L I O P		NL 170 ring to home to say she had completed reports in regard to incidents whereby NL 164 had been locked in the kitchen.		
		S C T L I O P		by Sister. She was advised not to share this information with Social		
		S C T L I O P		Services. - NL 170 has a copy of her report which she would give to me this pm when I visit the unit.		NHB 137
		S C T L I O P				

CODES: S Initiated by Social worker
C Initiated by Contact
T Contact by Telephone
L Contact by Letter

I Interview in Contacts home/office
O Interview in Social Services office
P Other interview or contact (specify)

Indicate nature
of contact by



NOTE: In child abuse cases
all contacts including
attempted contacts
should be recorded

CRAIGAVON/BANBRIDGE COMMUNITY
HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES TRUST

CONTACT SHEET

CLIENTS NAMES

NL 164

ADDRESS

Nogorath

Trimprint Ltd., Armagh

DATE	CONTACT	CODES	PURPOSE	CONTENT	OUTCOME/ACTION	SIGNATURE
14 9 94	NL 164 as Nogorath	S C T L I O P		NL 164 came in from School. When asked how he was getting on he stated he was enjoying School.		
		S C T L I O P		When asked if anything was concerning him or if anything was happening or had happened to upset him he said nothing had happened.		
		S C T L I O P		When asked about the incident where he was alleged to have been locked in and the incident is NL 164 saying there was	NL 165	
		S C T L I O P		nothing to this and clear not want to make a complaint		NHB 137

CODES: S Initiated by Social worker
C Initiated by Contact
T Contact by Telephone
L Contact by Letter

I Interview in Contacts home/office
O Interview in Social Services office
P Other interview or contact (specify)

Indicate nature
of contact by



NOTE: In child abuse cases
all contacts including
attempted contacts
should be recorded

CRAIGAVON/BANBRIDGE COMMUNITY
HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES TRUST

CONTACT SHEET

CLIENTS NAMES

ADDRESS

Trimprint Ltd., Armagh

DATE	CONTACT	C O D E S	PURPOSE	CONTENT	OUTCOME/ACTION	SIGNATURE
14 9 94	NL 170 [REDACTED] Rsw	S C T L I O P		Spoke to NL 170 re her concerns for NL 164 Karen now not able or willing to speak about these other that it seems		
		S C T L I O P		NL 164 is being picked up When asked for report NL 164 declined to forward this to me		
		S C T L I O P		She was advised any concerns would be investigated if raised		NHB 137
		S C T L I O P				

CODES: S Initiated by Social worker
C Initiated by Contact
T Contact by Telephone
L Contact by Letter

I Interview in Contacts home/office
O Interview in Social Services office
P Other interview or contact (specify)

Indicate nature
of contact by



NOTE: In child abuse cases
all contacts including
attempted contacts
should be recorded

Report for **SR 2**

I was doing an overnight shift with **NL 171** on Monday 5 September when **NL 171** asked me had I known that **NL 164** said he was attacked on holiday in Donegal by two ex-residents **NL 165** and **NL 166**. I said that at the time of the holiday I had heard this. I did not go into any detail with **NL 171**. The following day, Tuesday September 6th, another resident **NL 167** told me of an incident when **SR 18** allegedly locked **NL 164** in the electric cupboard in the kitchen. He described the incident as though he had been present and said that when **NL 164** was let out of the cupboard after 5 minutes he looked as though he was about to cry. I did not question **NL 167** at this stage as another resident was present.

Following this, however, I chose to speak to **NL 169** as I was concerned about what I had heard. I spoke informally to **NL 169** as I simply wanted advice on what to do. I mentioned 3 incidents and following this **NL 169** advised me to speak to **SR 2**.

The three incidents I spoke of were as follows.

On 26/07/94, after the residents had returned from Donegal **NL 168** told me of a conversation she had with **SR 18**. I recorded the conversation at the time. **NL 168** said that during the second week of the holiday **SR 18** had asked her if she drank alcohol. **NL 168** said she did not. **SR 18** then said that **NL 168** was not a good liar and then apparently asked if **NL 168** knew her limit. **NL 168** replied that she did. **NL 168** then told me that **SR** gave her permission to go to an over 18s disco, said that she

2.

(

could drink alcohol but could not come home
~~drink.~~ **NL 168** then added that Sr. had given her money
 to go to the disco.

I later showed **NL 168** what I had recorded and she
 asked me to rip it out of the book or change what I
 had written to make it sound 'better.' I asked her if
 what I had written was incorrect and she said no
 but that she was frightened Sr. would be angry that
 she had told me. I explained to **NL 168** that I
 would not remove or alter what I had written and
 that I was now concerned **NL 168** would abuse
 the freedom she had been given. It was after this
 incident that **NL 168** absconded overnight from the
 unit to return to Doregal to stay with friends. I
 did not necessarily connect the incidents although I
 remained concerned about them. I had no opportunity
 to talk with **SR 18** due to the fact that both
 Sr. and I took holidays in July and August.

The second incident I mentioned to **NL 169** and
SR 2 concerned **NL 164** being locked in a
 cupboard. I said, however, that I had not spoken to
NL 164 but had only heard this from another resident.
 Following my discussion with **SR 2** I asked **NL 164**
 if this was true. He said he had not been locked in
 a cupboard but that he had been locked in the kitchen.
 He said that the incident occurred approximately two
 weeks ago. He explained that he and **SR 18** had
 been arguing and that everyone was preparing to watch
 a video. It was around 9pm. **NL 164** said that Sr.
 had locked one kitchen door after **NL 164** had snubbed
 it. He said **SR 18** had then gone around to
 the other door and locked it. **NL 164** said he remained

3

locked in the kitchen while the residents watched a video. I asked him ~~was~~ he certain both doors were locked and he said they had been. Apparently after the video **SR 18** then went upstairs with the other children. According to **NL 164** this was around 11pm. **NL 164** then climbed out a kitchen window as he said he needed to go to the bathroom. However, the front door was locked so he then rang the bell both for our unit and for the independent unit. **NL 164** said that **SR 18** appeared with some other

residents and stopped the independent staff member opening the door. **NL 164** thinks it was [REDACTED]. He claims Sr. then told him to go back through the kitchen window. **NL 164** said that he heard the kitchen door being unlocked with the key and that he then unsnibbed the door and left the kitchen. He went on to bed. **NL 164** admitted that he had been arguing with Sr. and that he had snibbed the kitchen door. He said, however, that it had later been locked as he had tried to open the door to go out to the bathroom.

I asked **NL 167** where he had heard that **NL 164** had been locked in a cupboard. He said he thought a staff member had told him and I explained that, according to **NL 164** this had never happened.

The final incident I mentioned concerned an event in Donegal during July. I had known that **NL 164** had trailed another resident around the room one evening following their visit to a junior disco. **NL 168** had described this to me as she was the person involved. I recorded this in **NL 164** day book. However, later that evening **NL 166** then told **NL 168** and myself that she had hit **NL 164** because of his

4.

behaviour. She said she had hit **NL 164** on the face. **NL 166** later explained that she and **NL 165** had both hit **NL 164** because of the way he had treated **NL 168**. **NL 166** said the lights in the room were turned off before they hit **NL 164**. I asked **NL 164** the following day if anything had happened to him. He said that after everyone had gone to bed he was downstairs with Sr, **NL 166** and **NL 165**. He said that **SR 18** had given permission to **NL 166** and **NL 165** to hit **NL 164** but not to hurt him too much. **NL 164** added that Sr then turned the lights out and that he could see her outline at the door and hear her laughing as **NL 165** and **NL 166** hit him. He thinks he was hit with a shoe. He said he was pushed to the floor before being hit, that he was not hit hard but that he was frightened. I asked **NL 164** what he wanted to do and he said that no one would believe him against **SR 18** and that there was no point complaining as he would only end up having to drop the complaint. **NL 164** also said that he had dropped a previous complaint because people did not believe him. The rest of the week in Doragal **NL 164** asked me to take him home and he said repeatedly he was afraid of **NL 165** and **NL 166**. I remained very concerned about this incident and felt that if **NL 164** did not wish to make a complaint then there was little I could do. However, when **NL 171** explained he had told her about it I decided to speak to **NL 169**.

NL 170

KMCS\AM

16th September 1994

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Mr [NL 225] APSW
Child and Family Care Unit
[REDACTED]

Dear [NL 225]

RE: [NL 164] - Presently placed in Nazareth Lodge, Belfast

I have received reports from Nazareth outlining incidents in regard to [NL 164]. I enclose copies of these. These incidents I was informed were the substance of complaints made against [NL 164] by other residents.

On contacting the Unit on 13th September 1994 by telephone I was informed by the Residential Social Worker [NL 170] that [NL 164] wished to make complaints against [SR 18] and also against [NL 165] and another resident [NL 166]

The incident in regard to [SR 18] involved her allegedly locking [NL 164] in the kitchen.

[NL 170] Residential Social Worker also stated it was alleged by [NL 164] that [NL 165] had beaten him up while on holiday and that [SR 18] was aware of this and nothing was done.

The Residential Social Worker [NL 170] involved in making this report also stated she wished to speak to me in private in regard to her concerns in relation to [NL 164]. She also stated that she was advised not to share the information in regard to the issues [NL 164] was raising re: the kitchen and [NL 165] incident with Social Services.

I subsequently spoke to both [NL 170] and [NL 164] on 14th September 1994 in Nazareth Lodge in regard to the incidents. Ms [NL 170] stated she did not wish to disclose any information to myself. [NL 164] was interviewed and stated he had no complaints to make even though the issues of the kitchen and [NL 165] were raised with him.

I find it concerning that the complaints against [NL 164] appear to be those which can be dealt with within the Unit and by the appropriate Social Workers involved, and that the complaints

procedure appears to be demeaned by the type of issues raised.

What is also of concern is the statement that information is being withheld from the responsible Social Worker and this information is being withheld on the instruction of Senior Residential Staff.

In regard to pursuing the allegations no-one has been prepared to substantiate any of the reports in regard to incidents reported by **NL 164**

NL 164 has also been interviewed and has stated he wishes not to make any complaints.

Yours sincerely

.....
NHB 137

Social Worker

Enc



Our Ref:

Your Ref:

27th September, 1994

TO:- NHB 137
Social Worker

FROM:- NL 225
Child & Family Care Manager

Re:- NL 164 Nazareth Lodge, Belfast

I refer to your recent correspondence in relation to complaints regarding NL 164

I agree with you that the Complaints Procedure should only be used when criteria are met, and not as an additional tool for young people to use against one and other. The danger, as you have pointed out, is that the procedure meant to protect the interests of young people is brought into disrepute.

Regarding the matter in hand: Is SR 18 aware of all the "formal complaints"?

Is she aware of NL 170 behaviour in this matter?

Is SR 2 the Head of Home, aware of what is going on regarding the implementation of the complaints procedure?

I would ask you to discuss the matter directly with SR 18 and SR 2 and satisfy yourself regarding the incidents mentioned in your correspondence.

I would ask you to report back to me on the matter.

/ma

NL 225

CRAIGAVON/BANBRIDGE COMMUNITY
HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES TRUST

CONTACT SHEET

CLIENTS NAMES

NL 164

ADDRESS

Tramprint Ltd., Armagh

DATE	CONTACT	CODES	PURPOSE	CONTENT	OUTCOME/ACTION	SIGNATURE
6 Oct 94	Residential staff - SR 18	S C T L I O P		Asked Staff to get me see NL 164 file. Only one report not forwarded and sent from NL 170 -		
		S C T L I O P		Delivered SR 18 I was requesting a copy of all unresolved incidents from times too cross ref with reports received -		
		S C T L I O P		Also that I would be contacting SR 18 about interviewing her + SR 2 in regard to complaints in regard to NL 164 -		NHB 137
		S C T L I O P				

CODES: S Initiated by Social worker
C Initiated by Contact
T Contact by Telephone
L Contact by Letter

I Interview in Contacts home/office
O Interview in Social Services office
P Other interview or contact (specify)

Indicate nature
of contact by



NOTE: In child abuse cases
all contacts including
attempted contacts
should be recorded



Our Ref:

Your Ref:

STRATEGY REPORT RE:

NL 164
C/O NAZARETH LODGE
BELFAST.

ALLEGATION IN RESPECT OF **SR 18**

Following the recent inspection of the above facility a 3rd party allegation was made against **SR 18** in respect of her conduct against **NL 164** (Please see attached Report).

Three other children were named: one from South and East Belfast; two from North and West Belfast. These allegations were less serious in nature.

Craigavon/Banbridge received correspondence from J. A. Chaddock, Inspector of Social Services Inspectorate, on the 12th December. Contact was made with Nazareth on the 13th December, to ascertain the procedure for dealing with the Complaint. Nazareth informed that contact be made with **NL 224** P.S.W. from North and West Belfast, who would be co-ordinating a strategy response.

NL 224 informed that the management committee chaired by Pat Kinder would be seeking to establish an inquiry team with an independent person from Down Trust (Lisburn) to take the inquiry forward.

The following strategy has now been agreed:

1. **NL 164** was spoken to in a general way by **NHB 137** Social Worker, on the 13th December, 1995. **NL 164** appeared happy and content with his placement (see attached Report from **NHB 137** S.W.) It was agreed at this stage, not to directly interview **NL 164** in respect of this 3rd party Complaint, allegedly 1 year old, until a joint strategy had been agreed between North and West, South and East Belfast, in conjunction with Nazareth Lodge.
2. **SR 18** has subsequently taken Annual Leave from Nazareth. Pat Kinder is to confirm in writing, the strategy for taking forward the allegations made in respect of **SR 18** and this is to be disseminated between interested parties (i.e. Trust). It is unlikely that this team will be identified before the New Year.

The inquiry team will then meet with the involved Trust to discuss and identify the investigating officers.

NL 222

APSW

NAME: NL 164

ADDRESS: C/O Nazareth Lodge

DATE: 13.12.95

CONTACT: NL 164 at Unit, later also contact with new Key Worker NL 226
NL 164 seen on his own for part of the interview.

CODE: SP

PURPOSE: Visit to NL 164 also first visit after allegations made to Inspector, This was an arranged visit prior to allegations

CONTENT: NL 164 in very good form but very flighty and silly. NL 164 agenda to talk about being a pop star - he wants to moved to Manchester and have singing lessons and Social Services to pay for this.

NL 164 did not make any reference to the statement to the Inspector. Indeed did not want to spend anytime in interview preferring to mess around. NL 164 did not avail of opportunity to speak to me although this option was available to him. He instead continued to discuss his aspirations as a pop star. NL 164 was asked to focus on any issue or concern that he might have. The only thing he raised was that he wants to be transferred from St Gabriels. He was reminded that he had contacted me to withdraw his transfer form recently as he stated he was happy to remain in St Gabriels. At no point did NL 164 make reference to SR 18 nor to NL 170 nor did he use the opportunity to discuss either individual.



COMMUNITY HSS TRUST

Our Ref: **RP/KMcS**

Your Ref:

1 March 1996

Mr Alan Chard
Principal Social Worker
Down and Lisburn Trust
Lisburn Health Centre
Linenhall Street
Lisburn
BT28 1LU



Dear Mr Chaid

RE: NL 164 - Fit Person Order - NL 164
NL 164 is presently placed in Nazareth Lodge

I spoke to **NL 164** on Wednesday 28 February 1996 after a request made on Tuesday 27 February by **NL 222**, APSW, **NL 222** Health and Social Services Trust.

NL 222 outlined that **NL 164** had been mentioned by another child as having been the subject of a number of untoward incidents within Nazareth Lodge.

Given the circumstances and the time constraints I have only managed to speak to **NL 164** on the one occasion in regard to these alleged incidents. When spoken to he was initially asked to describe life in the Unit and to feel free to discuss anything which caused him distress or concern. He stated that he liked the Unit and had no complaints. When pressed further about his relationship with **SR 18** he replied that he got on alright with her but at times they have had arguments.

Given that **NL 164** was not forthcoming about any incident, he was asked in a more direct manner about the allegations raised by **NL 168** although he was not informed of the source of these allegations.

NL 164 did state that **NL 165** who had previously been a resident in the Unit did go on holiday with the Unit and that he had driven the Unit minibus and that children from the Unit had been on this bus. **NL 165** was not always accompanied by **SR 18** while driving this vehicle. **NL 164** can also recall **NL 165** having taken alcohol while on holiday and on one occasion when he visited the Unit.