Thank you for your letter dated 10 February about the Home Affairs Committee evidence session I attended on 9 February. I am writing to provide the additional information that you have requested.

In your letter you asked for the number of asylum seekers accommodated in Middlesbrough as part of the COMPASS contract and if this could be broken down into monthly figures. The Home Office publishes quarterly data on the number of asylum seekers in Section 95 dispersal dispersed accommodation broken down by local authority area. This can be found at (Asylum Vol 4. Table 16q). [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-statistics-july-to-september-2015/asylum](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-statistics-july-to-september-2015/asylum). This shows that, as at the end of September 2015, there were 800 asylum seekers in Section 95 dispersal accommodation in Middlesbrough.

This data does not include failed asylum seekers who are accommodated in Middlesbrough and in receipt of Section 4 support. Internal management information indicates that the total number of asylum seekers in receipt of S95 & S4 support in Middlesbrough, as at the end of September 2015, was 1015. The Home Office recognises that this number is higher than the advisory 1:200 cluster ratio (1 asylum seeker per 200 local population) and has therefore been in regular contact with Middlesbrough Council to agree a population reduction plan. On the advice of the council and the police, we have sought to avoid the rapid relocation of asylum seekers away from Middlesbrough as they will have established themselves in the local community. We are instead seeking to achieve the reduction via a more measured natural attrition.

On your second point, I attach a list of the asylum dispersal areas. I should also like to correct the information I provided to the committee on the number of asylum seekers located in my constituency. Having made further enquiries with officials, I can confirm that as at 30 September 2015, there were 30 asylum seekers in receipt of section 95 support dispersed in the London Borough of Bexley (in respect of which my constituency is located). I apologise for this oversight.

Your letter requested information on the number of people who enter immigration detention who are released and who are not returned, as a numerical total and a proportion of those detained. The nearest available data is published quarterly (table dt_05_q) at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-statistics-july-to-september-2015/list-of-tables#detention](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-statistics-july-to-september-2015/list-of-tables#detention). The latest data shows that in 2014, 29,674 people left detention (down slightly from 2013). Of these, 15,673 (53%) were removed from the UK and 14,001 (47%) released. Of those released, 354 (1%) were granted leave to enter/remain; 2,111 (7%) were bailed; and 11,275 (38%) were granted temporary admission/remain.

You also asked for information on the cost to the taxpayer of keeping someone in immigration detention. This data is published quarterly (Table Dt_2) at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-enforcement-data-november-2015](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-enforcement-data-november-2015).

The latest data shows that the average cost of keeping someone in immigration detention is £90.41 per day.

You asked for a breakdown of the staffing at Yarl’s Wood including information on gender and ethnic minority, by grade, for both the Serco staff and the G4S healthcare staff. This information is attached at annex B. We have requested that it be further broken down by grade but, as some of the grade groups may be small enough that individuals can be identified from this information, this may not be possible.
Following the Committee’s questions on the case of CS (Morocco) you asked for the number of Time Served Foreign National Offenders (TSFNOS) affected by the European Court of Justice decision in CS (Morocco) who may not be deported because they are a parent or sole carer of a child who is an EU citizen.

In the case of CS (Morocco), the UK’s Upper Tribunal made a reference to the European Court of Justice about a specific and technical point of law as to whether a foreign national offender from a non-EU country can benefit from EU law rights if they are a parent with sole care of a child who has EU citizenship.

It is not a question of whether foreign national offenders can be deported, but of what considerations the Government must make (under either the EU law framework or our domestic immigration law) when coming to a decision about whether or not to deport a particular individual.

The Advocate General’s opinion is not binding on the Court of Justice, and we await the Court’s judgment. Once the judgment has been handed down on the specific point of law referred to it, the case will go back to the UK’s Upper Tribunal, which will apply that point of law to the facts of the case to determine CS’s appeal against deportation. As you know, the Government refrains from commenting on the particulars of a case where judicial proceedings are ongoing. I would also highlight the fact that it is subject to an anonymity order, imposed by UK Courts, which must be respected.

The Government continues to consider for deportation all foreign nationals who have been convicted of an offence and sentenced to a period of imprisonment.

Finally you asked about the number of complaints received by the Immigration Enforcement relating to marriages between a UK and non-EU citizen where the marriage has broken down and the UK party wishes the spouse to be removed. It would not be possible to answer this question without extracting information from cases of this specific type. This would involve manually checking records: in excess of 10,000 public allegations relating to sham marriages (Q4 2014 - Q3 2015). It is also important to note that there are circumstances where after a marriage breakdown the non-EU party could lawfully remain in the UK irrespective of the wishes of their estranged UK partner. For example, if the marriage had genuinely subsisted at the time the leave was granted and it was not entered into solely to gain leave to remain in the UK.

If you have a specific case, or cases, in mind I would be happy to ask officials to look into these.

Rt Hon James Brokenshire MP
Annex A: List of all local authority areas in the UK which housed asylum seekers in dispersal accommodation in January 2016:

Barking and Dagenham; Barnet; Barnsley; Belfast; Bexley; Birmingham; Blackburn with Darwen; Bolton; Bradford; Bristol; Broadland; Bromley; Broxbourne; Broxtowe; Bury; Calderdale; Cardiff; Coventry; Croydon; Derby; Doncaster; Dudley; Ealing; Enfield South; Epping Forest; Gateshead; Glasgow City; Gloucester; South Gloucestershire; Greenwich; Hackney; Haringey; Harrow; Hartlepool; Hastings; Hatfield; Havering; Hillingdon; Hounslow; Ipswich; Kingston Upon Hull; Kirklees; Lanarkshire; Lancaster; Leeds; Leicester; Lewisham; Liverpool; Luton; Macclesfield; Merton; Middlesbrough; Milton Keynes; Newcastle Upon Tyne; Newham; Newport; Norwich; Nottingham; City of Oldham; Peterborough; Plymouth; Portsmouth; Preston; Redbridge; Redcar and Cleveland; Renfrewshire; Rochdale; Rotherham; Salford; Sandwell; Sheffield; Southampton; Southend-on-Sea; Southwark; Stockport; Stockton-on-Tees; Stoke-on-Trent; Suffolk Costal; Sunderland; Sutton; Swansea; Swindon; Tameside; Tewkesbury; City of Thurrock; Trafford; North Tyneside; South Tyneside; Wakefield; Walsall; Waltham Forest; Welwyn; Wigan; Wolverhampton.

Annex B: Gender and ethnic minority of staffing at Yarl's Wood as of 17/02/16 and of 24/02 (healthcare).

Correct as of 17/02/16 and 24/02 (healthcare)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yarl's Wood, Bedfordshire</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>% White, British</th>
<th>% BME</th>
<th>% Declined to answer</th>
<th>% Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>% Males</td>
<td>% Females</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by contractors.