

# the Parole Board

working with others  
to protect the public

Parole Reference: AS01062  
Date: 28 August 2008  
Prisoner's Name: CAUL GRANT  
Prison Number: JC8360  
HMP/YOI WORMWOOD SCRUBS

## CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT 1991: PAROLE REFUSAL NOTIFICATION

A panel of the Parole Board considered your application on 28 August 2008 and found you not suitable for early release.

### Reasons

The panel gave the following reasons for their decision:

Mr Grant is serving a sentence of eight years imposed in February 2004 for offences relating to the importation of drugs. The bare facts of the offences are that Mr Grant was apprehended at Gatwick airport with a bag containing over 40 kg of cannabis. Mr Grant admitted committing the acts leading to the offence and indeed accepted that he had acted as a drug courier on previous occasions.

However, it is proper to note that the bare facts of the offences for which Mr Grant has been convicted do not tell the whole story. In 1994 Mr Grant's 14 month old son was admitted to hospital, where he died. Mr Grant was not at his bedside, as a result, he states, of being given misinformation by the hospital. There followed a catalogue of events, including the breakdown of Mr Grant's marriage, litigation against the hospital, litigation against his solicitors and a campaign for truth and justice waged by Mr Grant in the intervening years. In representations from Mr Grant the board noted that he was a committed and eloquent advocate of his cause. It was his cause which led Mr Grant, he says, to commit the index offences in the full knowledge that if he was not caught, acting as a drug courier would fund the campaign, while if he was caught, the subsequent trial would allow him an opportunity to air his grievances in a court of law.

Mr Grant has a number of previous convictions, the majority of which relate to offences committed after the death of his son, and during the course of his campaign. There are 2 early convictions for possession of an offensive weapon, and one for common assault. The latter was against his wife, during an argument, when Mr Grant says that he pushed her, and was dealt with by way of a probation order.

This is Mr Grant's second application for parole. Previously, he had progressed to category D conditions, had been a model prisoner and had undertaken some educational and vocational work. For various reasons offending behaviour work had not been undertaken, and the panel at that stage considered that his risk was not manageable in the community.

Since the last review Mr Grant continues as a model prisoner and is fully compliant with the custodial system. In open conditions he had a significant number of ROTLs, including home



leaves and community work. However, in October 2007 he was returned to closed conditions as a result of letters written to various bodies in pursuit of his campaign, which had been considered to pose an implied threat. Mr Grant considers that he was unjustly returned to closed conditions. As part of that return, Mr Grant was assessed by a psychiatrist, but found to have no psychiatric condition.

In terms of offending behaviour it is clear from the papers that Mr Grant is not suitable for ETS, and there appears to be no other suitable offending behaviour coursework to undertake.

An issue is raised as to a confiscation order of £85,000. There is some confusion as to whether this has been paid. Mr Grant says that the records show that it has been paid but he is unable to produce a receipt and also says that he has not been the one to pay the sum. If repayment is not made, an additional 18 months' custody will have to be served.

Mr Grant is assessed under OASys as a low risk of harm and a low risk of reconviction (although reference is made by the seconded probation officer to a medium risk of harm). His OGRS score is 19% and there is some risk of violence indicated.

The risk management plan is that Mr Grant will be returned to the home of his current partner, their son and his partner's children. There are some employment prospects, but no guaranteed work. There is no indication of drug or alcohol abuse, nor any mental health problems indicated. Risk will be managed through one-to-one reporting within national standards.

The probation officers are equivocal in their recommendations. Both officers commend Mr Grant for his progression through the prison system, his engagement with the parole process, and during his time in open conditions, his compliance with licence conditions. In addition mention is made of his employment, his compliance with the prison system and his low assessed risk. As a result, the SPO indicates that on this basis, parole might be a viable proposition, although she is wary that by his own admission Mr Grant commits offences to draw attention to his campaign. As he remains preoccupied with this she considers it is difficult to know the exact lengths to which he will go to further his campaign. Similarly the HPO considers that arrangements are in place that ordinarily would lead him to recommend that parole be granted. However he stops short of recommending as such, in light of the circumstances of this case.

In considering whether to grant parole the panel must balance the benefits to Mr Grant of early release with the risk of harm should reoffending occur. This is an exceptional case and while the panel are not in a position to revisit the circumstances of the conviction, which came about after trial by jury, the panel have considered Mr Grant's circumstances and personal history as part of the assessment of risk of further offending in this instance. It is clear that Mr Grant has progressed well in custody and that he has complied with requirements made of him within the system. His enhanced status, his time in open conditions, his compliance with licence conditions on periods of temporary leave and his low assessed risk are to his credit. He has a supportive family to return to, and there are reasonable prospects of employment.

However, Mr Grant has for the last 14 years fought a campaign for truth and justice and has exhibited his single-mindedness and determination to carry on that campaign. He accepts that he has committed offences in order to come before the courts and air his grievances and seek a fair hearing, as he perceives it. The index offences were committed for precisely that purpose. He has continued his campaign in custody and the panel were of the view that it was highly likely that he would do so on his release. Given his previous actions, the panel therefore considered that the risk of further offending was likely prior to the NPD and



therefore considered that risk was not manageable in the community. Parole was refused.  
Conditions were imposed at NPD for the management of ongoing risk.

