



Justice does not stop at  
the prison gate:

Justice and fairness in prisons

Image credit: Andy Aitchison

# Howard League for Penal Reform

## Key points

- A prison's disciplinary system should be the embodiment of justice – fair, discerning and proportionate
- In practice prison discipline is too often procedurally unjust and unduly punitive – driving a pervasive sense of injustice in prisons
- Rule-breaking is managed in prisons in England and Wales through formal disciplinary processes that can condemn prisoners to solitary confinement and additional days of imprisonment
- The use of these formal disciplinary hearings (known as adjudications) has exploded in recent years to a record high of 210,326 in 2019 – an increase of 76 per cent on 2011 figures
- Adjudications have been used unnecessarily as an everyday behaviour management tool – leading to punitive and arbitrary outcomes
- Adjudications, and punishment in the form of additional days of imprisonment, have been applied disproportionately to Black, Asian and minority ethnic prisoners and to children and young adults
- Unjust and unfair disciplinary processes are counter-productive – undermining trust and engagement, and contributing to conflict and overcrowding
- Quarterly figures for the onset of the Coronavirus pandemic show a dramatic drop in the use of additional days, offering an opportunity to reset policy
- Progress is possible. Good order can and should be achieved through procedurally fair processes, and by communication, consent and respect
- Prisons must treat adjudications as a last resort, using them sparingly and only for the most serious of incidents
- The case for abolishing the imposition of additional days of imprisonment is overwhelming – it is time to end this damaging and counterproductive practice, as Scotland did almost twenty years ago to positive effect.

Briefing two

## About this briefing

The first briefing in the Howard League's Justice and Fairness programme, *Justice does not stop at the prison gate: Justice and fairness in prisons* (Howard League 2020), explored how a non-punitive, holistic approach can reduce violence and conflict in prisons, enhance well-being and a sense of justice, and so support rehabilitation and release planning. The briefing called for a focus on rights-based approaches and the embedding of the principles of procedural justice in prisons – voice, neutrality, respect, and trust (Tyler 2008; Jackson et al 2015).

This second briefing in the series adopts that theoretical framework to consider how good order can be achieved in prisons in a just and fair way – without resorting unnecessarily to punitive disciplinary processes. The briefing examines disciplinary systems in prisons and reviews how adjudications and additional days of imprisonment have been used in recent years with damaging results. This analysis is illustrated with anonymised case-studies which are drawn from the Howard League's legal work representing hundreds of children in prison disciplinary processes. The briefing argues that in the face of mounting evidence of their discriminatory and damaging effect, the use of additional days of imprisonment should be abolished and adjudication processes used sparingly and as a last resort. Instead, good order can and should be achieved through procedurally fair processes, and by communication, consent and respect.

## Formal disciplinary processes – adjudications and additional days

Disciplinary systems are used to enforce prison rules. When a prisoner is accused of breaking a prison rule, this will be investigated and then considered in a formal disciplinary hearing, known as an adjudication. This can be either an internal adjudication, before a prison governor or, for more serious offences, an external adjudication before an independent adjudicator, who is a district judge. If the charge is proved against a prisoner at an internal adjudication, a range of punishments including the removal of privileges, exclusion from work, stoppage of earnings and

confinement in a cell can be imposed. In addition to these punishments, an external adjudicator can also impose up to 42 days of additional imprisonment which are added onto the end of a prison sentence. Prisoners are entitled to legal representation at external adjudications, but for internal adjudications, although prisoners can receive legal advice, they can only be represented if they meet certain criteria determined by the governor.

## An unnecessarily punitive system

Prisons are uniquely coercive environments – prisoners have no autonomy and their lives are reduced to the most basic necessities. The scope for injustice is huge. It is therefore essential that prison disciplinary processes are scrupulously fair and fully embody the principles of justice on which the whole system depends. Disciplinary procedures should resolve conflict and support people to change their behaviours, not least by manifesting fair treatment. The utility of punishment is limited, as most staff and prisoners know, and its use must be sparing, proportionate and predictable.

Although prison policies make reference to the need for disciplinary procedures to be “just and fair” (see Prison Service Instruction (PSI) on Prison Discipline Procedures, PSI 05/2018), the experiences of prisoners and their representatives, inspection reports and statistical data reveal that disciplinary procedures are generally found wanting. They contribute to the sense of injustice that pervades prison life and too often condemn prisoners to solitary confinement and additional days of imprisonment.

The Justice Committee concluded in 2019 that there was ‘an overemphasis on punitive approaches’ in prisons (Justice Committee 2019). This punitive culture is driving an escalation in the use of adjudications and additional days in prisons in England and Wales at the expense of fostering an environment that is fair and just. When a concern about behaviour is identified, and an offence proved, a punitive response, particularly the imposing of additional days, serves only to underline the offence. It undermines the scope for the prisoner to work with officers and any victims, resolve ongoing problems and adjust future behaviours.

## Excessive and escalating use of adjudications

In recent years the use of adjudications to manage behaviour has exploded. Between 2011 and 2019, the total number of adjudications increased by 76 per cent from 119,678 per year in 2011 to a record high of 210,326 in 2019, despite the prison population remaining relatively constant (Ministry of Justice (MoJ) 2020a).

### *Adjudications over-used for everyday behaviour management*

This escalation has in large part resulted from adjudications being used as an everyday management tool when earlier intervention and constructive engagement would have been more effective and appropriate. Prison inspection reports reflect this concern, and note that such overuse undermines disciplinary processes.

For example, inspecting Hewell prison, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) found that many adjudication charges arose as a result of staff failing to address prisoners' lower-level frustrations, which then escalated into offences.

*"In one hearing, a prisoner who had refused to return to his cell and was restrained explained that he had reported to staff that he was being bullied by his cellmate, who had taken clothing, footwear and even his food from him, yet no action had been taken. Investigation during the hearing, for which he was found guilty, was limited. Both staff and prisoners reported a lack of confidence in the adjudication system." (HMIP 2019a, 28)*

### *Punished for self-injury*

According to the Prison Disciplinary Procedures (PSI 05/2018) prisoners should not normally be disciplined for acts of self-injury, or damage committed to enable self-injury – prisoners need support not punishment. In the year to December 2019, levels of self-injury in prisons stood at a record high of 63,328 incidents (MOJ 2020b). However the Howard League has seen a worrying number of adjudications in these circumstances, as illustrated by the two case

studies below - drawn from the charity's legal work with children in prison. This unfairness is compounded where appeals against these adjudications have also been unsuccessful. It is difficult for a prisoner disciplined in this way to have trust that the prison is acting in their best interests.

### *Case studies: disciplinary processes for self-injury*

A highly vulnerable 18-year-old boy, 'David', with very complex mental health needs and a long history of self-injury, was adjudicated for damaging prison property. The damage was done when David broke off part of his cell in order to use it to self-injure. The prison rules state that where property is damaged in order to self-injure no charges should be brought. Despite this, David was charged and found guilty by the Governor, who fined him £48. The decision to charge David was a breach of the prison rules and he successfully appealed against the fine.

A vulnerable 19-year-old, 'Josh', with a history of self-injury, refused to follow an officer's instruction when asked to stop self-injuring. Josh received 21 days' loss of privileges at a governor's adjudication. An appeal and complaint were not upheld by the Ministry of Justice and Prisons and Probation Ombudsman respectively.

### *Chaotic and ineffective adjudications*

The overuse of adjudications places excessive strain on the prison system's already stretched resources, leading to inadequate investigations and inconsistent application of the procedures. The number of adjudications that were dismissed or not proceeded with more than doubled between 2011 and 2018 (MoJ 2019a) and the proportion of all adjudications which were found proved has fallen from 73 per cent in 2011 to 64 per cent in 2019 (MoJ 2020a).

This issue has also been raised in prison inspection reports. For example, HMIP's inspection of Wetherby and Keppel, which hold children, noted the increase in adjudications and minor reports (of misbehaviour) and that 'too many were of poor quality and lacked investigation' (HMIP 2019b, 19).



The chaos arising from this overuse of adjudications frequently results in procedural rights being threatened. For example, a failure to disclose the evidence against a prisoner is a breach of their right to a fair trial under article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (*MA and others v HMPYOI Ashfield* [2013] EWHC 438 (Admin)). However, Howard League solicitors frequently have to fight for essential paperwork to be served in accordance with the rules, and adjudications are commonly dismissed for failures in the investigation, document retention and case preparation by the prison.

#### *Case study: failure to disclose evidence*

A 19-year-old, 'Chris', was adjudicated for resisting a lawful restraint. The incident started when two other young people tried to attack Chris in the visiting room. Despite offering no provocation, the teenager was restrained by three prison officers. As the officers held Chris on the floor, one of his assailants managed to get close enough to swing a punch at Chris. As a result, Chris struggled against the restraint, feeling understandably threatened and vulnerable. Although three prison officers had restrained Chris, the prison had not provided his legal representative, a Howard League solicitor, with any use of force reports – the records which must be made by each officer after the incident. Eventually one use of force report was produced, but the remaining two could not be found (despite the fact that they are required to be kept in the same place). The judge adjourned the adjudication at the solicitor's request and ordered the reports to be served. At the second hearing the reports had still not been served, despite the judge's order, and so, two months after the original hearing, the judge ordered that the adjudication be dismissed.

Similarly, the right to legal representation for an external adjudication is often compromised. In Werrington prison, for example, inspectors noted that adjudications were issued the night before the hearing, with the result that children did not have enough time to take independent legal advice (HMIP 2019c).

#### *Case study: lack of legal representation*

A young person, 'George', with learning difficulties was subject to an adjudication and had 20 additional days' imprisonment imposed on him when unrepresented, despite the Howard League having written to the prison explaining that he required representation. The adjudication had to be appealed, and the Chief Magistrate later set aside the punishment in recognition that the hearing ought to have been adjourned for legal representation to be provided.

Howard League solicitors have found that, even where access to representation is allowed, prisons do not always provide adequate facilities for legal visits. At Aylesbury prison, for example, all legal visits take place in the main visits hall where young people are unable to speak to their lawyers privately and visits are cut unacceptably short to accommodate reduced staffing levels (see Aylesbury inspection report (HMIP 2017) and for similar constraints at Werrington (HMIP 2019c).

#### *Delays and arbitrary outcomes*

The overuse of adjudications can also lead to significant delays and arbitrary outcomes. The disciplinary rules stress the importance of adjudications being dealt with promptly - an internal adjudication, for example, should begin within 72 hours of the alleged incident (PSI 05/218). However, many adjudications are adjourned for excessively long periods. For example, inspecting Garth Prison, HMIP noted a 'significant backlog of overdue adjudications' with 288 outstanding adjudications, including '50 adjudications [that] had been waiting for between seven and 23 weeks to be dealt with' (HMIP 2019e).

Even where an adjudication is dismissed the impact of a lengthy process on a prisoner can be profound. Awaiting an adjudication can involve not just anxiety but long periods of lost privileges. As soon as a prisoner is 'nicked' (formally reported for having broken a rule) he or she will often have privileges removed, frequently by the officer who is making the allegation, without any independent review of the strength of the charge. The sense of injustice triggered by this summary punishment can be

compounded when, as often occurs, lost privileges are not restored when charges are dismissed. The loss of privileges can also adversely affect the outcome of future parole hearings – redoubling the unfairness of an ineffective disciplinary process.

### *Case study: the punitive effect of delay*

Howard League solicitors represented 19-year-old, 'Max', who spent six months on a reduced privileges status while waiting for an adjudication outcome. The adjudication was delayed twice. Max's behaviour during those six months was excellent, but his previously 'enhanced' privileges status was not restored. The reduction in Max's privileges status will adversely affect his upcoming parole review, meaning that he is being punished twice over, even before there is any finding against him in the adjudication process.

## **A thousand years in additional days**

In 2018, over a thousand years of additional imprisonment (380,169 extra days) were imposed as punishment for rule-breaking across prisons in England and Wales (MoJ 2019b).

In the last year there has been some progress, as the annexed table reveals. In 2019 the number of additional days imposed as punishment reduced to 337,395 (MoJ 2020a). However, this figure still represents close to a thousand years of imprisonment and is more than double the number of additional days handed out in 2014 when the Howard League began to investigate this issue (Howard League 2015).

### *Disproportionate*

A key principle in the imposition of any penalty is that it should be a proportionate response to the transgression. Over three quarters of additional days in 2019 were handed out for non-violent offences – such as 'unauthorised transactions' (which might, for example, involve the possession of a mobile phone or alcohol) and offences of disobedience or disrespect (MoJ 2020a). Whilst it is understandable that such behaviours might

be regulated in prisons, in everyday life they would not normally be categorised as criminal, and certainly not dealt with by imposing imprisonment. The removal of liberty – the ultimate sanction in our criminal justice system – for transgressions of this sort raises real questions about the fairness and proportionality of the additional days regime.

### *Inconsistent*

Not all prisoners can be given additional days, which means that two prisoners breaking the same rule can get different punishments depending on their category of sentence. Remand prisoners can only get prospective additional days, which are not served unless they go on to receive a custodial sentence. Those on indeterminate sentences (sentences which are not of a fixed length) cannot get additional days at all. This can mean that those serving longer sentences for more serious offences cannot be given additional days, but those on shorter sentences for less serious offences can. Such inconsistent and arbitrary outcomes undermine the effectiveness of disciplinary procedures, and prisoners' trust in them.

### *Unpredictable*

A lack of clarity around the implementation of adjudications and their interplay with the Incentive and Earned Privileges scheme is leading to inconsistent application of both systems and unfairness to prisoners. For example, HMIP's inspection of Wetherby and Keppel identified confused and inconsistent application of the two systems by staff and punitive outcomes for children, who were subject to lengthy restrictions without clarity as to when they would come to an end (HMIP 2019b).

The Howard League specialist legal team, which has worked with hundreds of children and young people in prison, has repeatedly encountered cases where the adjudication system was used inconsistently and unnecessarily against this group in particular. The impact is especially punitive where the charge is referred for external adjudication, with the greater risk of additional days being given.

### **Case study: Adjudicated for squirting milk**

A teenager, 'Kyle', had been held in isolation for many weeks in relation to his mental health problems when he was 'nicked' for squirting milk at a prison officer through the opening in his cell door. The officer had received the same treatment from several teenagers on the wing that morning, and on this occasion, she lost her temper and 'nicked' Kyle. Kyle was charged with assault and his case was referred to an external adjudicator. The prison officer concerned expressed genuine shock when she discovered that Kyle might be penalised with extra days. Following extensive representations by the Howard League, the case was eventually dismissed on the basis that it was not sufficiently serious to be heard by an external adjudicator. However, by that time Kyle – who was already struggling with his mental health – had endured the stress of waiting for many weeks for the adjudication to take place.

## **Discriminatory**

### *Racial discrimination*

Racial discrimination is entrenched in the system of adjudications and additional days. In 2019 Black, Asian and minority ethnic prisoners accounted for almost a third of all adjudications, while making up just a quarter of the prison population (MoJ 2020a). The Howard League's previous briefings on additional days reveal that, year after year, Black, Asian and minority ethnic prisoners receive a disproportionately high number of additional days. The government's own research shows that the number of awards of additional days given to white prisoners in 2018 was 2.5 times greater than in 2011; for Black, Asian and minority ethnic prisoners, awards of additional days more than tripled over the same period (MoJ 2019a).

### *Disproportionate use of formal disciplinary processes on children and young people*

Children and young people also disproportionately experience adjudications. Between 2011 and 2018 the largest increase in the number of adjudications was for children (15-17 year olds). In comparison with 2011, in 2018 there were on average approximately two more adjudications per person for people

in their twenties, but children were subject, on average, to almost 6 more adjudications per person (MoJ 2019a).

As with adjudications, young people are also grossly overrepresented in the imposition of additional days. In 2019, those aged 18-20 received 14 per cent of additional days despite making up only just over 1 per cent of the prison population (MoJ 2020a).

## **Excessive and unfair processes are counterproductive**

### *Excessive punitiveness neither necessary nor effective*

The overuse of adjudications and additional days is not explained by a need to respond to violent behaviour. Violence offences accounted for only 16 per cent of adjudications found proved, and 15 per cent of punishments involving the imposition of additional days in 2019 (MoJ 2020a). Whilst an excessively punitive response to unauthorised transactions, disrespect and disobedience has plainly failed to address what HMIP has described as the 'major problem' of safety in prisons (HMIP 2019e).

### *Unfairness undermines legitimacy*

The ineffectiveness of disciplinary processes as currently implemented is thoroughly predictable. As explored in the Howard League's first Justice and Fairness briefing - *Justice does not stop at the prison gate: Justice and fairness in prisons* (Howard League 2020) – when prisoners feel that people in positions of authority act in a procedurally just way, they are less likely to break rules, experience mental health problems and be reconvicted on release (HMPPS 2019). Conversely unfair procedures are liable to lack legitimacy in the eyes of prisoners and undermine the co-operation essential to enable prisons to function effectively.

Disciplinary processes in prisons are consistently characterised by a lack of procedural justice. The key tenets of procedurally just interactions – ensuring that the individual's voice is heard, decision-maker neutrality, dignity and respect for rights, and the fostering of trust (Tyler 2008; Jackson et al 2015) – are conspicuously absent from many adjudications. Adjudications can often be humiliating and undignified. In one private

prison, for example, prisoners must attend the hearing with all their property, in anticipation of them receiving confinement in a cell as punishment, as if their guilt is a foregone conclusion. Similarly, Howard League lawyers have observed young prisoners endure undisguised cynicism on the part of external adjudicators, even off-hand remarks about the untruthfulness of young people appearing before them.

## **Progress is possible**

The evidence of the damaging and discriminatory effect of punitive disciplinary processes continues to mount. The analysis lays bare the counter-productive effect of the excessive use of adjudications and the imposition of additional days. However, this approach is not inevitable – there are indications that progress is possible. Between 24 March and 22 June 2020, under Covid-19 restrictions, no external adjudications (for more serious allegations of rule-breaking) were conducted, nor were any additional days of imprisonment imposed. Quarterly figures for April to June 2020 show a 96 per cent drop in the use of additional days on the same period in 2020 (MoJ 2020c).

Could a step away from these formal mechanisms be manageable and effective under normal circumstances? The experience of prisons in Scotland reveals that removing the most punitive aspect of the disciplinary process, the imposition of additional days, can in fact support compliance by encouraging better relationships between prisoners and with prison staff.

### *The Scottish model*

On 8 June 2001, almost twenty years ago, Scottish Justice Minister Jim Wallace announced that the imposition of additional days of imprisonment in Scotland was to be suspended and the power was never reinstated. Order is maintained in Scottish prisons without external adjudications or the imposition of additional days (Prisons and Young Offenders Institutions (Scotland) Rules 2011, Part 11).

The removal of these punitive mechanisms has not resulted in a discernible deterioration in prisoner behaviour. Quite the opposite. Indeed, in December 2017, Colin McConnell, then Chief Executive of the Scottish Prison Service, reflecting on the impact of abolishing additional days in Scottish prisons, observed:

‘Compliance has not at all been affected, control in our prisons remains in balance, and that is important, and of course relationships between those living in custody (and [between] those living in custody and those charged with their care) have not in any way diminished, in fact over the period things have developed significantly.’

This positive effect has continued. Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland’s latest annual report, for example, makes particular reference to prisoners having ‘consistently reported that relationships between them [staff and prisoners] were generally positive and that they felt safe’ (HMIPS 2019, 16). By contrast, the Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales reports for the same inspection period that ‘over half of respondents in adult male prisons stated that they had felt unsafe, and this was as high as 60% in local prisons’, whilst 35% of children said on inspection that they had felt unsafe in their current young offender institution (HMIP 2019e, 23, 55).

### *Good order through communication, consent and respect*

The practical example of Scotland illustrates the value of the theoretical framework set out in the first Justice and Fairness briefing. Good order can be achieved through communication, consent and respect, even in the most challenging of circumstances.

It is time to move away from the excessive use of punitive mechanisms which foment conflict, drive overcrowding and entrench a sense of unfairness.

Prisons must treat adjudications as a last resort, for only the most serious of incidents, rather than as an everyday behaviour management tool. Restraint and consistency are required to instil trust, avoid punitive and arbitrary outcomes and enable those few adjudications that are required to be properly and fairly investigated. The case for abolishing the imposition of additional days of imprisonment is overwhelming – it is time to end this damaging and counterproductive practice.

As discussed in the Howard League’s first Justice and Fairness briefing (Howard League 2020), the default response to an incident should be to take a restorative approach – building a sense of shared purpose in supporting prisoners to desist from problematic behaviour as they prepare for release.



| Establishment               | Number of additional days imposed |        | Population at 28 June 2019 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|
|                             | 2018                              | 2019   |                            |
| <i>Prisons holding men:</i> |                                   |        |                            |
| Altcourse                   | 2,478                             | 1,946  | 1,147                      |
| Ashfield                    | 30                                | 174    | 398                        |
| Bedford                     | 712                               | 1,579  | 347                        |
| Belmarsh                    | 700                               | 731    | 806                        |
| Berwyn                      | 6,217                             | 5,450  | 1,361                      |
| Birmingham                  | 9,516                             | 4,539  | 925                        |
| Brinsford                   | 4,744                             | 5,651  | 554                        |
| Bristol                     | 3,029                             | 1,642  | 463                        |
| Brixton                     | 7,562                             | 5,182  | 737                        |
| Buckley Hall                | 2,193                             | 1,439  | 449                        |
| Bullingdon                  | 2,718                             | 1,097  | 1,055                      |
| Bure                        | 115                               | 293    | 653                        |
| Cardiff                     | 3,435                             | 3,130  | 722                        |
| Channings Wood              | 8,638                             | 5,940  | 690                        |
| Chelmsford                  | 1,535                             | 3,972  | 665                        |
| Coldingley                  | 3,090                             | 4,115  | 421                        |
| Dartmoor                    | 5,303                             | 4,470  | 628                        |
| Deerbolt                    | 8,750                             | 11,440 | 354                        |
| Doncaster                   | 5,346                             | 4,134  | 1,081                      |
| Dovegate                    | 1,049                             | 855    | 1,150                      |
| Durham                      | 2,910                             | 2,566  | 918                        |
| Elmley (Sheppey cluster)    | 2,263                             | 1,712  | 1,159                      |
| Erlestoke                   | 5,621                             | 5,829  | 507                        |
| Exeter                      | 7,187                             | 6,156  | 488                        |
| Featherstone                | 7,942                             | 7,249  | 611                        |
| Ford                        | 1,106                             | 1,162  | 538                        |
| Forest Bank                 | 8,147                             | 8,409  | 1,430                      |
| Frankland                   | 911                               | 767    | 838                        |
| Full Sutton                 | 874                               | 260    | 521                        |
| Garth                       | 1,421                             | 2,061  | 817                        |
| Gartree                     | 0                                 | 0      | 678                        |
| Grendon/Spring Hill         | 223                               | 176    | 538                        |
| Guys Marsh                  | 6,265                             | 3,053  | 387                        |
| Hatfield                    | 142                               | 196    | 374                        |
| Haverigg                    | 1,427                             | 890    | 264                        |
| Hewell                      | 1,834                             | 1,595  | 1,094                      |
| High Down                   | 3,270                             | 5,185  | 1,107                      |
| Highpoint                   | 7,908                             | 7,405  | 1,279                      |
| Hindley                     | 6,185                             | 7,628  | 547                        |
| Hollesley Bay               | 15                                | 21     | 481                        |
| Holme House                 | 8,133                             | 6,287  | 1,199                      |
| Hull                        | 3,608                             | 1,596  | 989                        |
| Humber                      | 8,076                             | 5,703  | 937                        |
| Huntercombe                 | 1,120                             | 1,490  | 464                        |
| Isis                        | 7,932                             | 3,428  | 622                        |
| Isle of Wight               | 723                               | 166    | 1,016                      |
| Kirkham                     | 2,494                             | 5,538  | 644                        |
| Kirklevington Grange        | 84                                | 23     | 279                        |
| Lancaster Farms             | 7,070                             | 9,080  | 551                        |
| Leeds                       | 5,906                             | 4,363  | 1,066                      |
| Leicester                   | 2,289                             | 2,130  | 302                        |

| Establishment                    | Number of additional days imposed |                | Population at 28 June 2019 |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
|                                  | 2018                              | 2019           |                            |
| Lewes                            | 1,451                             | 2,658          | 514                        |
| Leyhill                          | 0                                 | 13             | 511                        |
| Lincoln                          | 1,150                             | 539            | 514                        |
| Lindholme                        | 3,766                             | 2,837          | 938                        |
| Littlehey                        | 682                               | 607            | 1,205                      |
| Liverpool                        | 2,512                             | 2,448          | 670                        |
| Long Lartin                      | 499                               | 509            | 584                        |
| Lowdham Grange                   | 1,391                             | 2,430          | 878                        |
| Maidstone                        | 3                                 | 0              | 585                        |
| Manchester                       | 3,824                             | 2,914          | 918                        |
| Moorland                         | 7,071                             | 1,915          | 954                        |
| Mount (The)                      | 9,162                             | 8,001          | 990                        |
| North Sea Camp                   | 0                                 | 0              | 411                        |
| Northumberland                   | 5,822                             | 5,745          | 1,342                      |
| Norwich                          | 2,429                             | 2,147          | 719                        |
| Nottingham                       | 2,281                             | 2,582          | 787                        |
| Oakwood                          | 10,036                            | 8,160          | 2,080                      |
| Onley                            | 4,418                             | 4,106          | 730                        |
| Parc                             | 5,182                             | 6,197          | 1,631                      |
| Pentonville                      | 11,426                            | 11,660         | 1,065                      |
| Peterborough Male                | 2,876                             | 4,250          | 810                        |
| Portland                         | 4,987                             | 3,469          | 518                        |
| Prescoed (with Usk)              | 78                                | 10             | 519 <sup>1</sup>           |
| Preston                          | 2,729                             | 4,459          | 697                        |
| Ranby                            | 2,638                             | 3,230          | 1,014                      |
| Risley                           | 2,091                             | 3,660          | 1,066                      |
| Rochester                        | 12,440                            | 9,109          | 680                        |
| Rye Hill                         | 595                               | 425            | 660                        |
| Stafford                         | 797                               | 607            | 750                        |
| Standford Hill (Sheppey cluster) | 147                               | 583            | 459                        |
| Stocken                          | 4,102                             | 4,330          | 864                        |
| Stoke Heath                      | 3,035                             | 2,750          | 755                        |
| Sudbury                          | 291                               | 245            | 579                        |
| Swaleside (Sheppey Cluster)      | 6,460                             | 4,223          | 1,064                      |
| Swansea                          | 2,308                             | 929            | 419                        |
| Thameside                        | 1,782                             | 2,079          | 1,200                      |
| Thorn Cross                      | 60                                | 35             | 384                        |
| Usk (with Prescoed)              | 6                                 | 146            | 519 <sup>1</sup>           |
| Verne (The) <sup>2</sup>         | 0                                 | 0              | 480                        |
| Wakefield                        | 1,411                             | 1,140          | 723                        |
| Wandsworth                       | 9,721                             | 9,856          | 1,496                      |
| Warren Hill                      | 0                                 | 0              | 240                        |
| Wayland                          | 5,025                             | 3,174          | 931                        |
| Wealstun                         | 4,058                             | 2,811          | 804                        |
| Whatton                          | 215                               | 525            | 836                        |
| Whitemoor                        | 196                               | 555            | 451                        |
| Winchester                       | 1,449                             | 1,283          | 474                        |
| Woodhill                         | 1,050                             | 1,460          | 571                        |
| Wormwood Scrubs                  | 7,124                             | 4,259          | 1,039                      |
| Wymott                           | 6,661                             | 3,167          | 1,149                      |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                 | <b>347,683</b>                    | <b>308,140</b> | <b>76,909</b>              |

<sup>1</sup> Breakdown of population between institutions is not available.

<sup>2</sup> The Verne re-opened in 2018.



| Establishment   | Number of additional days imposed |                | Population at 28 June 2019 |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
|   | 2018                              | 2019           |                            |
| <i>Prisons holding women:</i>                         |                                   |                |                            |
| Askham Grange   | 68                                | 91             | 112                        |
| Bronzefield   | 611                               | 636            | 530                        |
| Downview  | 733                               | 1,016          | 273                        |
| Drake Hall  | 3,524                             | 1,281          | 333                        |
| East Sutton Park                                      | 2                                 | 70             | 96                         |
| Eastwood Park   | 1,167                             | 1,689          | 396                        |
| Foston Hall   | 1,148                             | 1,061          | 286                        |
| Low Newton  | 986                               | 536            | 314                        |
| New Hall  | 3,074                             | 2,301          | 358                        |
| Peterborough Female                                   | 560                               | 557            | 339                        |
| Send  | 415                               | 842            | 268                        |
| Styal   | 556                               | 1,760          | 461                        |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                                       | <b>12,844</b>                     | <b>11,840</b>  | <b>3,766</b>               |
| <i>Children's and young adult prisons<sup>3</sup></i> |                                   |                |                            |
| Aylesbury   | 8,625                             | 4,768          | 200                        |
| Cookham Wood  | 453                               | 593            | 164                        |
| Feltham   | 3,713                             | 3,356          | 470                        |
| Swinfen Hall  | 4,391                             | 4,977          | 574                        |
| Werrington  | 1,396                             | 1,844          | 116                        |
| Wetherby  | 1,064                             | 1,502          | 223                        |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                                       | <b>19,642</b>                     | <b>17,040</b>  | <b>1,747</b>               |
| <b>Total (all prisons)</b>                            | <b>380,169</b>                    | <b>337,020</b> | <b>82,422</b>              |

<sup>3</sup> Feltham, Swinfen Hall and Aylesbury included here as they all have wings that predominantly hold young adults. Parc holds all ages so is listed under men's prisons.

## References

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) (2017) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Aylesbury by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons 4-5, 24-28 April 2017*. London: HMIP. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/inspections/hmyoi-aylesbury-2/> [Accessed 28/09/20].

HMIP (2019a) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Hewell by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons 3-14 June 2019*. London: HMIP. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/inspections/hmp-hewell-3/> [Accessed 28/09/20].

HMIP (2019b) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Wetherby and Keppel by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons 11-21 March 2019*. London: HMIP. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/inspections/hmyoi-wetherby-and-keppel-3/> [Accessed 28/09/20].

HMIP (2019c) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Werrington by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons 18-28 February 2019*. London: HMIP. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/inspections/hmyoi-werrington-5/> [Accessed 28/09/20].

HMIP (2019d) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Garth by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons 17 December 2018-18 January 2019*. London: HMIP. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/inspections/hmp-garth-3/> [Accessed 28/09/20].

HMIP, (2019e) *HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales Annual Report 2018-19*, HC 2469, London: HMIP. Available at: [https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/07/6.5563\\_HMI-Prisons-AR\\_2018-19\\_WEB\\_FINAL\\_040719.pdf](https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/07/6.5563_HMI-Prisons-AR_2018-19_WEB_FINAL_040719.pdf) [Accessed 28/09/20].

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons for Scotland (2019) *HM Chief Inspector's Annual Report 2018-9*. Available at: [https://www.prisoninspectoratescotland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publication\\_files/Annual%20report.pdf](https://www.prisoninspectoratescotland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publication_files/Annual%20report.pdf) [Accessed 28/09/20].

Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) (2019) *Procedural Justice: A Summary of Evidence*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/procedural-justice> [Accessed 28/09/20].

Howard League (2015) *Punishment in Prison: The world of prison discipline*. London: Howard League. Available at: <https://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Punishment-in-Prison-briefing.pdf> [Accessed 28/09/20].

Howard League (2020) *Justice does not stop at the prison gate: Justice and fairness in prisons*. Briefing one. Available at: <https://howardleague.org/publications/justice-does-not-stop-at-the-prison-gate/> [Accessed 28/09/20].

Jackson et al (2010) *Legitimacy and Procedural Justice in Prisons*, Prison service journal (191) 4-10. Available at: [http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/29676/1/Legitimacy\\_and\\_procedural\\_justice\\_\(LSERO\\_version\).pdf](http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/29676/1/Legitimacy_and_procedural_justice_(LSERO_version).pdf) [Accessed 28/09/20].

Justice Committee (2019) *Prison Population 2022: Planning for the future*. Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmjust/483/483.pdf> [Accessed 28/09/20].

MA & Others v HMYOI Ashfield [2013] EWHC 438 (Admin) Available at: <https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2013/438.html> [Accessed 28/09/20].

Ministry of Justice (2019a) *The Adjudications Story*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/story-of-the-adjudications-2011-to-2018> [Accessed 28/09/20].

Ministry of Justice (2019b) *Offender Management Statistics Quarterly: October to December 2018, and Annual (calendar year) 2018*. Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/offender-management-statistics-quarterly-october-to-december-2018?utm\\_source=7877ab50-b4b3-462a-a90b-8dea23d0855a&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=govuk-notifications&utm\\_content=immediate](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/offender-management-statistics-quarterly-october-to-december-2018?utm_source=7877ab50-b4b3-462a-a90b-8dea23d0855a&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=govuk-notifications&utm_content=immediate) [Accessed 28/09/20].

Ministry of Justice (2020a) *Offender Management Statistics Quarterly: October to December 2019 and Annual (calendar year) 2019*, published 30 April 2020. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/882163/Offender\\_Management\\_Statistics\\_Quarterly\\_Q4\\_2019.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/882163/Offender_Management_Statistics_Quarterly_Q4_2019.pdf) [Accessed 28/09/20].

Ministry of Justice (2020b) *Safety in Custody Statistics, England and Wales: Deaths in Prison Custody to March 2020, Assaults and Self-harm to December 2019*, published 30 April 2020. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/893374/safety-in-custody-q4-2019.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/893374/safety-in-custody-q4-2019.pdf) [Accessed 28/09/20].

Ministry of Justice (2020c) *Offender Management Caseload Statistics Quarterly April to June 2020*, published 29 October 2020. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/offender-management-statistics-quarterly-april-to-june-2020> [Accessed 12/11/20].

Tyler, T. R. (2008) *Procedural justice and the courts*, *Court Review*, 44, 26–31.

## About the Howard League for Penal Reform

The Howard League is a national charity working for less crime, safer communities and fewer people in prison.

We campaign, research and take legal action on a wide range of issues. We work with parliament, the media, criminal justice professions, stakeholders and members of the public, influencing debate and forcing through meaningful change.

[www.howardleague.org](http://www.howardleague.org)

## Howard League for Penal Reform

1 Ardleigh Road  
London  
N1 4HS  
t 020 7249 7373  
e [info@howardleague.org](mailto:info@howardleague.org)  
w [www.howardleague.org](http://www.howardleague.org)  
@TheHowardLeague

Company limited by guarantee  
No. 898514  
Registered charity  
No. 251926

ISBN 978-1-911114-52-9



9 781911 114529 >

ISBN 978-1-911114-52-9

2020