

## SPSO decision report

**Case:** 201400854, **Scottish Prison Service**  
**Sector:** Scottish Government and devolved administration  
**Subject:** special security measures  
**Outcome:** some upheld, no recommendations

### Summary

Mr C, who is a prisoner, complained that the prison unreasonably failed to explain to him why they had imposed security measures on him that meant he was unable to attend work or education.

The Scottish Prison Service (SPS) confirmed that Mr C had been placed on risk management precautions. These were measures introduced by the prison to create a safe environment for prisoners and staff, and only related to those prisoners who were deemed to present a risk to others and where it was felt additional conditions should be in place. They said Mr C had received a written note outlining the precautions, and his case manager also met with him to discuss them. They said that, in Mr C's case, they decided to put the precautions in place because of concerns raised in his risk assessment report and his behaviour in the past. They pointed to information in Mr C's risk assessment report that they felt supported their decision. As Mr C had received a document confirming the precautions, and had been involved in discussions with his case manager and as part of the complaints process, we did not uphold his complaint.

Mr C also complained that the governor failed to complete his complaint form appropriately. In particular, the governor had not indicated whether he accepted the internal complaints committee (ICC) decision on Mr C's complaint. In line with the normal process, a governor should tick the relevant box to confirm they accept the decision. If a governor decides not to accept the ICC's decision, they are required to provide a written explanation for this by completing the relevant section on the form.

The SPS confirmed they had spoken with the governor about this and he confirmed that not ticking the relevant box was an oversight. The SPS said the governor apologised and confirmed he accepted the ICC's decision on Mr C's complaint. We noted that the governor had not recorded any objection to the decision, and we took the view that the failure to tick the box was not significant and were satisfied with the explanation provided by the SPS. However, we upheld this part of Mr C's complaint because the governor had not completed the form properly.