

DECISION SUMMARY



Date considered: 13 July 2023

Sentence

1. The offender is serving an extended sentence of 9 years, comprised of a custodial term of 6 years and an extended period of supervision on licence of 3 years.

Test for release

2. Before it could direct release, the panel had to consider whether it remains necessary for the protection of the public from serious harm that the offender should be confined.

Decision

3. The panel was not satisfied on this matter, and directed release subject to licence conditions.

Reasons for decision

4. In reaching its decision, the panel considered:
 - a) the circumstances of the index offence, and any offending history;
 - b) formal risk assessments prepared on the offender;
 - c) the offender's conduct since sentence, and intentions if released;
 - d) all relevant information in the dossier;
 - e) the recent period of stability in custody;
 - f) the evidence of the offender's ability to cope with setbacks and seek appropriate support;
 - g) the robust community risk management plan and supports in place, which are tailored to their specific needs; and
 - h) the evidence heard at the hearing.
5. In the minute of the Board's deferred hearing on 11 May 2023, it is stated that the panel was satisfied on the basis of the offender's current position, that their continued confinement was not necessary to protect the public from serious harm if they were released to suitable accommodation. At that time, a place in suitable accommodation was not available and the panel concluded that the offender's release could not be directed, as the necessity of their continued confinement was contingent on a place being available there.
6. At the rescheduled hearing on 13 July 2023, the panel heard that the offender had incurred no further misconduct reports in custody. Reports from all professionals involved in their management were that they remained motivated to be released to suitable accommodation despite numerous setbacks in their case and had sought out support to deal with these challenges in an appropriate

DECISION SUMMARY

manner. The panel also had evidence before it that a place at an alternative accommodation had become available and that the offender was assessed as suitable for that facility.

7. The panel heard evidence from a Prison Link Worker (PLW) at the alternative accommodation who spoke of the meeting they had had with the offender. The panel was impressed by the PLW's evidence, particularly in terms of their vast experience of working with offenders and the high level of support and monitoring that would be available. The panel also heard evidence from the Community Based Social Worker (CBSW), which supplemented the addendum reports they had provided in advance of the hearing. The CBSW recommended the offender's release to the alternative accommodation and confirmed that they were content that the procedures in place would allow the offender's risk to be managed. The panel was impressed with the CBSW reports and evidence throughout the offender's parole consideration, which included a robust community risk management plan tailored to their specific risks and needs.
8. Taking into consideration all the evidence heard throughout the offender's parole consideration, the panel concluded that their continued confinement was not necessary to protect the public from serious harm on the basis that they would be released with a robust risk management plan tailored to their risks and needs. In reaching this conclusion, the panel placed particular weight on the evidence of the offender's ability to seek appropriate supports to deal with the setbacks they have encountered over their lengthy parole consideration, which bodes well for their engagement with supervision in the community. Finally, the panel placed a great deal of weight on the very high level of support available to the offender at the release accommodation, including input and monitoring from extremely experienced staff, gradual community access and the ongoing support available to them to access employment and accommodation.
9. Accordingly, the Board directed release on licence conditions which it deemed lawful, necessary and proportionate to manage the offender's level of risk in the community.

DECISION SUMMARY