

## PAPER DECISION

<b>Date of Paper Review:</b>	21/04/2026		
<b>Paper Review Type:</b>	Post Member Case Assessment (MCA)		
<b>Prisoner full name:</b>	John Derek Worboys		
<b>Date of birth:</b>		<b>Age:</b>	68 years
<b>Prison number:</b>			
<b>Prison:</b>			
<b>Review number:</b>	First since sentence in 2020		
<b>Panel</b>	HH Peter Rook KC (Judicial Chair), Dr Tim McInerny (Psychiatrist) and Zaiada Bibi (Independent)		

## DECISION

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>No direction for release and no recommendation for open conditions</b>
------------------	---

## CONTEXT AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

<b>Type of case:</b>	Life sentence on or post tariff review
<b>Secretary of State referral:</b>	Release or Open
<b>Outcome sought:</b>	Release
<b>Test:</b>	Parole Board panels must consider and apply the codified public protection test as set out in the annex below when making a decision about release. The Board must not give a direction for release unless the Board is satisfied that it is no longer necessary for the protection of the public that the prisoner should be confined [in prison]. If release is not directed, panels are to consider if a recommendation for transfer to open conditions can be made in line with the Secretary of State's

	directions to the Parole Board as set out in the annex below.
<b>Reconsideration:</b>	This case is eligible for reconsideration.

**INDEX OFFENCE AND SENTENCE INFORMATION**

<b>Index offence(s):</b>	2009 Rape of a female aged 16 or over Administering a substance with intent (x12) Attempted sexual assault Sexual assault upon a female (x4) Sexual assault on a female by penetration  2019 Administering a drug with intent (x2) Administering a substance with intent (x2)		
<b>Sentence(s):</b>	2009 Imprisonment for Public Protection (IPP) with a minimum tariff of 8 years less the 432 days he had already served  2019 Life imprisonment with a minimum tariff of 6 years		
<b>Date of sentence:</b>	17/12/2019	<b>Age when sentenced:</b>	62 years
<b>Tariff expiry date:</b>	17/12/2026		

**VICTIM INFORMATION**

<b>Victim statements provided?</b>	Yes
------------------------------------	-----

<b>How were they presented?</b>	In writing by gist in the dossier
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**DOSSIER SUMMARY**

<b>Number of pages in dossier:</b>	725
------------------------------------	-----

<b>Non-disclosure:</b>	Non-disclosure of 5 victim personal statements approved on basis gist provided.
<b>Representations:</b>	Yes
<b>Details:</b>	Closing representations dated 20th April 2026 on behalf of Secretary of State, dated 23rd April 2026 on behalf of Mr Worboys.

### **Any other information**

Mr Worboys' case was referred to the Parole Board by the Secretary of State (SoS) in March 2025. The case was initially reviewed by a single case MCA member on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2025 and was adjourned for further information. The case was again considered by the MCA member on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2025. On the 14<sup>th</sup> November 2025 the member directed the matter to an oral hearing.

On 14<sup>th</sup> January 2026 the Chair of this panel, following an application for a public hearing by Professor Stephen Shute, directed that there were good reasons for departing from the general rule that parole reviews should be heard in private and that it was in the public interest that this case should be heard in public. The case was fixed to be heard on 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> June 2026.

In 2026 a representation was received from Ms Bender on behalf of Mr Worboys dated the 20<sup>th</sup> February 2026 seeking a negative decision on the papers. It was indicated that Mr Worboys did not want to make a premature application. He was disappointed to discover that the prison psychologist felt that there was further core risk reduction work to be completed and understood that whilst there is such work to be completed, neither his community offender manager (COM) nor his prison offender manager (POM) would recommend progression.

It was indicated by Ms Bender, on his behalf, that Mr Worboys entirely accepts the pervasiveness of his offending and the harm he has caused to many victims requires him to address every area of risk to a high standard so that the Parole Board and the public can be confident he meets the public protection test. Mr Worboys has indicated that he wishes to forgo making a release application so he can undertake any recommended further work. Bearing this in mind and having considered the principles set out in *Osborn, Booth, and Reilly* (20230 UKSC 61, the Panel agreed to do so after directing certain further reports and written representations from the parties.

## REASONS

### 1. Analysis of Offending Behaviour (The Past)

1.1 Mr Worboys' convictions relate to 16 occasions between 2001 and 2008 when he was working as the licensed driver of a London Black Taxi.

1.2 The offending involved both significant preparation and substantial deception. Mr Worboys would pick up women in his London black cab in the early hours of the morning at times voluntarily with the promise of a free or reduced fare, or telling victims he lived nearby and they were his last fare of the night. He would then inform them he had won money and insist they celebrate with him with a glass of alcohol. This often involved showing them a bag of money. Mr Worboys would drug their drink to incapacitate the victims and then often sexually assault the victims, with on one occasion this resulting in rape. Victims found short journeys would take hours they could not account for, and they often woke up confused, disorientated and unwell. Some victims reported what had happened to police immediately whereas others reported the offences later.

1.3 Mr Worboys has accepted that the offences were meticulously planned. He told a psychiatrist in 2019 that he was excited at the prospect of having control over young attractive women in his cab and the risks he was taking.

#### **2009 convictions**

1.4 On the 13 March 2009 Mr Worboys was convicted by a jury of 19 serious sexual offences. The pre-sentence and psychiatric reports at the time of sentence identified Mr Worboys as a continuing risk to women and a significant risk of re-offending. On 21 April 2009, Mr Worboys was sentenced to a sentence of Imprisonment for Public Protection (IPP) with a tariff of 8 years less time spent on remand. His Tariff Expiry Date for those offences was 14 February 2016.

1.5 Following his conviction, Mr Worboys was the subject of successful civil actions by some of his victims against the Metropolitan Police. The number of female victims who suffered at the hands of John Worboys was said by the trial judge (Green J. as he then was) in *DSD and NBV v Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis* [2014] EWHC 436 (Admin) at [6] to be "*in excess of 105 rapes and sexual assaults upon women who he was carrying late at night in the back of his black cab*".

1.6 After the tariff for his 2009 convictions had expired, Mr Worboys' case was referred to the Parole Board in accordance with the law. Mr Worboys was the subject of a well-publicised decision to release made on 26 December 2017, which was subsequently quashed by the High Court upon judicial review in *March 2018: R (DSD) v Parole Board* [2018] EWHC 694. The judicial review, brought by two victims, challenged the decision to release Mr Worboys and was successful on the ground that the Parole Board should have considered the other offences which Mr Worboys was alleged to have committed but for which he was not tried and which he denied. In particular, the High Court found that there should have

been further inquiry into the extent to which the limited way Mr Worboys had described his offending undermined his overall credibility and reliability. The Parole Board was directed to consider the case again and the original decision was overturned. A no release decision was made by the panel on the papers at a time when historic allegations against Mr Worboys were being investigated.

### ***Mr Worboys' unconvicted sexual offending***

1.7 The extent and nature of Mr Worboys' overall criminality remains a live issue in respect of the assessment of the risk he currently poses. In our current assessment of risk, the panel have considered how we should approach the judgement of Green J (as he then was) in *DSD and NBV v The Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis* [2014] EWHC 436 (QB), when applying the civil standard of proof. Whilst we have not heard from Mr Worboys on the issue, the prisoner-commissioned psychologist in her report dated August 2019, refers to his acceptance of 90 victims. In the circumstances, the Panel have followed the approach as set out by Lord Hughes in the Supreme Court decision *R (Dean Pearce) v Parole Board* [2023] AC 807 and have adopted Green J.'s finding as providing important evidence on the balance of probabilities as to the scale of Mr Worboys' unconvicted offending in respect of serious sexual assaults. However, the Panel are unable to make a finding as to how many of those cases involved rape. Many will have been serious sexual assaults.

1.8 Further victims came forward and after a review by the Crown Prosecution Service, Mr Worboys was charged with similar offences relating to 2001, 2003, 2007 and 2007/8 indicating, if proved, that his offending spanned 5 more years than previously known. On 17<sup>th</sup> December 2019, Mr Worboys pleaded guilty to these offences, although he unsuccessfully sought to challenge the date of one of the offences at a Newton hearing which was highly relevant to the time span of his offending.

1.9 A MCA member decided that Victim Personal Statements should be withheld from Mr Worboys and that the material should only be disclosed in the form of a gist. The statements provide details of the wide-reaching, emotional and psychological impact the offences have had on the victims to date and the ongoing impact this continues to have on their lives. The circumstances and nature of the offending mean that it is likely to have involved serious harm whether the offending amounted to rape or not.

## **2. Analysis of Evidence of Change (The Present)**

2.1 Mr Worboys' behaviour in prison has been of a high standard with only one relatively minor negative IEP warning in 2010 and no adjudications. There have been positive NOMIS entries in respect of his work ethic and attitude. He is described as compliant, engages with his case management team and works in the Health Care Department. The Prison Offender Manager speaks positively of his behaviour in prison praising his willingness to undertake tasks.

2.2 Due to his denial of his offending until 2015, Mr Worboys did not participate in any accredited programmes until 2015. He then undertook the SOTP Foundation programme and in 2016 completed the Core Sex Offender Programme (SOTP) (2017). A Forensic Psychologist noted that he had strong negative views about certain types of women and he was strongly influenced by perceptions of his mother as a moral compass before her death. She concluded that Mr Worboys had reduced his risk to some degree. She noted he had a high level of treatment needs associated with sexual offending and how he had worked hard to address these.

2.3 It should be noted that the formulation that is based on the case that Mr Worboys is strongly influenced by perceptions of his mother as a moral compass has not been shared by all professionals. A psychiatrist who prepared a report for the December 2019 sentencing hearing could not see any link between the death of Mr Worboys' mother and his decision to become a sexual predator. In his view, Mr Worboys' sexual offending related to his personality style and his high sex drive. He described him as having an obsessive preoccupation with sex and being proud of his sexual prowess.

2.4 Mr Worboys completed My Strength Workbook (self-led) in 2021. He undertook 20 sessions (each one hour) of one-to-one work developed by a Senior Registered Psychologist at prison in May 2023. In November 2024, a Senior Registered Psychologist confirmed that Mr Worboys worked hard during one-to-one psychology sessions. He showed strong motivations to explore his outstanding risks such as his attitudes towards women and his sexual preoccupation.

2.5 However, whilst Mr Worboys has undertaken extensive psychological work, more is recommended. The prison psychologist does not assess that there has been a significant reduction in risk. She recommends further work to change the long-term attitudinal functions that motivated his offending or to enable him to have new ways to soothe emotions and manage his critical thoughts, without detaching and distracting them. The community offender manager has indicated that it cannot be confidently assured that Mr Worboys would be able to complete this work within a community setting.

2.6 In her submissions on behalf of Mr Worboys, Ms Bender refers to this work, and stresses that Mr Worboys has chosen to forgo making a release application so as to undertake the recommended work.

2.7 *Honesty, reliability, credibility and openness.* Mr Worboys denied his 2009 convictions at trial. Following conviction, he sought permission from the Court of Appeal for leave to appeal and then pursued an application for his case to be considered by the Criminal Cases Review Commission as a miscarriage of justice.

2.8 Ms Bender has indicated that Mr Worboys accepts that he initially lied about his offending at court and then found it difficult to be open about all his offending over the years. It is clear that Mr Worboys has in the past attempted to minimise his offending and reduce his risk level. For example, Mr Worboys only accepted his responsibility for the offending behind the 2009 convictions in 2015 some 9

months before the expiry of his then tariff when all appeal options had been exhausted. Furthermore, although he pleaded guilty to the further matters which led to two life sentences in December 2019, he then sought to minimise the time span of his offending by challenging the date of one of the offences. Prior to his second conviction it was not understood that his offending dated back to 2001, which might have significantly changed how professionals would look into his offending triggers and the extent to which the death of Mr Worboys' mother was a trigger. Mr Worboys remains adamant that his offending started 2 years later.

2.9 It is clear that Mr Worboys lied in his accounts to psychologists and at the Parole Board hearing in 2017. When sentencing in December 2019 to life imprisonment with a minimum tariff of 6 years, Mrs Justice McGowan stressed that 2 aspects of the case remained of '*great concern – Mr Worboys' ability to manipulate others and his failure to acknowledge the risk he posed because he had only ever admitted the bare minimum of the offences that could be proved against him*'. It follows that that any future Parole Board panel will need to consider whether he has finally admitted the full extent of his offending. Any apparent progress needs to be considered in the context of how open Mr Worboys has been with his treatment providers.

2.10 The Panel share these concerns and, if there had been an oral hearing, the Panel would have fully investigated these matters in evidence.

### **3. Analysis of the Manageability of Risk (The Future)**

3.1 The statistically weighted predictive scores OGRS3 (Offender Group Reconviction Scale version 3), OGP (OASys General Re-offending Predictor) and OVP (OASys Violence Predictor) scores indicate Mr Worboys falls into the low bracket of general re-offending; however, these scores are not reflective of sexual offending.

3.2 Whilst the OSP-I (OASys Sexual Re-Offending Predictor - Indecent Images) indicates a low risk of re-offending, the OSP-C (OASys Sexual Re-Offending Predictor - Contact) indicates a high-risk reflecting Mr Worboys' contact sexual offending on a large scale over a number of years.

3.3 Continuing risk factors are Mr Worboys' sense of sexual entitlement, his belief that rape of certain vulnerable women was 'not rape' and acceptable, his sexual preoccupation, his alcohol misuse and his problems with relationships. Protective factors include managing current sexual preoccupations, exploring hostility towards women and exploring intimacy deficits experienced within relationships, and demonstrating motivation to fully engage with treatment providers and to work with them to address his risk factors.

3.4 The prison offender manager has warned that Mr Worboys' willingness to engage and general affable presentation should not necessarily be considered a substantive protective factor since he used such skills when grooming victims and may be driven by a more deviant motive i.e. learning how he can show 'change' (rather than undergo actual change).

3.5 There is a history of significant disagreement between forensic clinical psychologists in respect of Mr Worboys' current risk. This is linked to the issue as to whether Mr Worboys has at last taken full responsibility for all his offending, how much weight should be given to his earlier denials and obfuscation, how open and honest Mr Worboys is when he comes to deal with professionals given his earlier denials, and whether the motivation for his sexual offending has been properly understood.

3.6 The prison psychologist believes Mr Worboys' motivation for sexual offending against women that he judges to be immoral without their awareness of his offending needs to be further explored. She considers it unsurprising that Mr Worboys needs more therapy time given the number of years during which his sexual offending behaviour was reinforced. In an Addendum Report dated 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2026 she has set out the nature of the psychological work she recommends Mr Worboys to undertake as part of the Personality Disorder pathway. She has also explained how Mr Worboys may be able to produce tangible evidence of risk reduction by identifying when certain emotions are triggered and addressing them with pro-social behaviour.

3.7 In contrast, the prisoner-commissioned psychologist, disagrees with the prison psychologist. She suggests that it is arguable that the recommendation for release on licence with a robust risk management plan that she made in September 2017 before the last Parole Board hearing remains valid. This raises the issue whether subsequent revelations about the nature and sheer scale of his offending have an impact on his risk.

3.8 Furthermore, she disagrees with the prison psychologist in her view that further core risk reduction work is necessary before release. In her view, Mr Worboys has sufficiently addressed these areas. This is based on both the very detailed report of the senior registered psychologist who conducted the one-to-one therapy in 2024 and Mr Worboys' account at interview. She contends that the evidence from many years in custody would suggest no difficulties in his relationships with female staff, his emotional management, particularly given that he regularly discusses any areas of concern with others with whom he has trusting relationships. She suggests that Mr Worboys' offending behaviour is well understood.

3.9 She concedes that since her last assessment in 2017, Mr Worboys has provided a more detailed narrative regarding the onset and trajectory into offending behaviour, highlighting the importance of risk factors associated with sexual preoccupation and how central this was to his identity, in addition to an understanding of how his negative views of women were both developed and maintained. However, in her view this does not fundamentally change the risk assessments of those professionals who assessed him in 2017 as these factors were already known.

3.10 She concludes that it is improbable that the Parole Board would consider Mr Worboys' release prior to further progression through the closed prison estate.

She encourages him to fully engage with the interventions set out by the Psychology Department at the prison in order to work towards his future release.

3.11 Mr Worboys is a MAPPA Cat 1 Level 3 case. A robust risk management plan has been prepared involving extensive multi-agency planning. This collaborative approach is intended to ensure the safe and appropriate management of Mr Worboys and the protection of the wider community in relation to any Approved Premises placement. The plan includes stringent licence conditions and a period of up to 12 months in an Approved Premises. Mr Worboys would be managed by the National Security Division. He would also be subject to police management as part of his Sexual Offending Registration (SOR) and Sexual Harm Prevention Order (SHPO).

3.12 The panel have no doubt that the extent of Mr Worboys' offending and the number of victims should be taken into account when assessing Mr Worboys' risk. In the panel's view, Mr Worboys continues to represent a high risk of committing further serious sexual offences upon women.

#### **4. Conclusion**

4.1 The issue for the Panel is whether, on all the evidence, the Board is satisfied that it is no longer necessary for the protection of the public that Mr Worboys should be confined. The test is not met unless the panel consider there is no more than a minimal risk that, were he no longer confined, he would commit a further offence the commission of which would cause serious harm.

4.2 Although Mr Worboys' conduct in custody has been exemplary, neither his prison offender manager nor his community offender manager support his release whilst there is outstanding 'core risk reduction work' to be undertaken.

4.3 Whilst it is acknowledged that Mr Worboys is working well towards change and working hard to demonstrate and understand management of his risk, concerns persist as to assessing his engagement with interventions, relationship building and his sincerity of change because of the nature of his offending.

4.4 Ms Bender has indicated that Mr Worboys accepts that he does not currently meet the test for release. This is a wholly realistic concession given the current state of the evidence, particularly the view of the prison psychologist who does not assess that as yet there has been any significant reduction in risk even though he has made progress. Accordingly, even with the multi-agency risk management plan in place, the panel have concluded the release test is not met.

4.5 Clearly it is important that the outstanding work is appropriately focused and targeted and it is to be hoped will be provided as promptly as possible to ensure any treatment gains are maintained and progressed. Beyond that the panel are not asked in this referral to comment on or make any recommendation about specific treatment needs or offending work behaviour.

4.6 The Panel are also invited to advise the Secretary of State whether Mr Worboys, if in closed conditions, should be transferred to open conditions in

accordance with the Secretary of State's directions to the Parole Board on the transfer of indeterminate prisoners to open conditions.

4.7 There appears to be a broad consensus that Mr Worboys does not represent a risk of absconding. However, it is not a realistic possibility that Mr Worboys can undertake the outstanding work in open conditions.

4.8 The Panel have concluded that although Mr Worboys has made some progress, it is clear that he has not made sufficient progress in addressing and reducing risk to a level consistent with protecting the public from harm (in circumstances where the prisoner in open conditions might be in the community, unsupervised under licensed temporary release).

### ***Issue for future Panels***

4.9 There are issues which the current panel do not have to resolve in reaching our decision which are likely to be important to any future Panel. These include whether Mr Worboys has now acknowledged the full extent of his offending and whether there has been offence-paralleling behaviour when he has misled professionals in past. The Panel are not able to evaluate the extent to which Mr Worboys has developed appropriate internal controls as to his risk factors. This will require careful exploration in evidence.

4.10 This case has many unusual features, not least the nature and scale of the sexual offending. It may be beneficial for one of the original experienced psychiatrists, who prepared assessments in their reports on Mr Worboys for the sentencing hearing in 2019, to review his progress for his next Parole Board Review. This would include a consideration of the impact of the extensive therapies he has now completed and any insight he may have gained from them in the context of his greater acceptance of responsibility for his conduct. The psychiatrist should be invited to provide a current review of risk and any recommendations regarding future programmes.

### ***Remorse***

4.11 Ms Bender invites the Panel to comment within this decision upon Mr Worboys' expressed enormous regret, remorse and shame he claims he feels for the women he has harmed and their families and friends. Whilst there is some evidence that his remorse is genuine, the Panel are not in a position to evaluate his sincerity without having heard oral evidence from Mr Worboys.

### ***Categorisation***

4.12 Similarly, the Panel has not been asked to comment upon or to make any recommendation in respect of Mr Worboys' categorisation and do not propose to do so as it is a matter for the Category A Review Team (CART). It is noted that he is working towards a downgrade of his security category but that has not taken place. A professor, who is a Consultant Forensic & Clinical Psychologist, wrote in his report in May 2025 that in his view Mr Worboys does not meet the criteria for categorisation as a Class A prisoner.

4.13 The Panel propose to do no more than refer to remarks made by the prisoner-commissioned psychologist in a report dated 17<sup>th</sup> February 2026. She explains that Mr Worboys accepts that in order for him to progress towards his desired outcome of release, it will be imperative that he can demonstrate a significant reduction in his risk of sexual recidivism to satisfy the Category A Review Team (CART) that he should be downgraded. She states that Mr Worboys is highly motivated to do whatever is asked of him by the Psychology Department.

## Annex B

### **The Codified Public Protection Test**

*The codified public protection test (called a "public protection decision"), set out in section 28ZE of the Crime (Sentences) Act 1997 and section 237A of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, reads as follows:*

*A "public protection decision", in relation to a prisoner, is a decision as to whether the decision-maker is satisfied that it is [not necessary, or no longer necessary,] for the protection of the public that the prisoner should be confined.*

*The decision-maker must not be so satisfied unless the decision-maker considers that there is no more than a minimal risk that, were the prisoner no longer confined, the prisoner would commit a further offence the commission of which would cause serious harm.*

*In making that assessment, the decision-maker must consider the risk that the prisoner would engage in conduct which would (or, if carried out in any particular part of the United Kingdom, would) constitute an offence specified in [Schedule 18B to the Criminal Justice Act 2003].*

*When making a public protection decision about a prisoner, the following matters must be taken into account by the decision-maker—*

*(a) the nature and seriousness of the offence in respect of which the relevant sentence was imposed;*

*(b) the nature and seriousness of any other offence for which the prisoner has at any time been convicted;*

*(c) the conduct of the prisoner while serving the relevant sentence (whether in prison or on licence);*

*(d) the risk that the prisoner would commit a further offence (whether or not specified in [Schedule 18B to the Criminal Justice Act 2003]) if no longer confined;*

*(e) the risk that, if released on licence, the prisoner would fail to comply with one or more licence conditions;*



*(f) any evidence of the effectiveness in reducing the risk the prisoner poses to the public of any treatment, education or training the prisoner has received or participated in while serving the relevant sentence;*

*(g) any submissions made by or on behalf of the prisoner or the Secretary of State (whether or not on a matter mentioned [above]).*

*When making a public protection decision about a prisoner, the decision-maker must in particular have regard to the protection of any victim of the prisoner.*

*For the purposes of [this test]:*

*a "victim" of a prisoner is a person who meets the definition of victim in section 1 of the Victims and Prisoners Act 2024 by reference to the conduct which constituted the offence for which the relevant sentence was imposed.*

*..."relevant sentence" means the sentence in respect of which the public protection decision is made.*

*This [test] does not limit the matters which the decision-maker must or may take into account when making a public protection decision.*

## **Secretary of State's Directions to the Parole Board 1 August 2023**

### **Transfer of indeterminate sentence prisoners (ISPs) to open conditions**

#### ***Directions***

*1. Before recommending the transfer of an ISP to open conditions, the Parole Board must consider:-*

*i. all information before it, including any written or oral evidence obtained by the Board;*

*ii. whether the following criteria are met:*

- the prisoner has made sufficient progress during the sentence in addressing and reducing risk to a level consistent with protecting the public from harm (in circumstances where the prisoner in open conditions may be in the community, unsupervised under licensed temporary release); and*

- *the prisoner is assessed as presenting a low risk of abscond.*
2. *The Parole Board must recommend a move to open conditions only where it is satisfied that the two criteria (as described at 1(ii)) are met.*

#### TACT Prisoners

3. *There is a presumption that a prisoner serving an indeterminate sentence for a specified terror or terror connected offence will be unsuitable for open conditions unless exceptional circumstances can be evidenced. Where the Secretary of State considers that exceptional circumstances may apply, the Parole Board will be invited to consider whether the ISP is suitable for a transfer to open conditions.*
4. *Before recommending that an ISP (as described at 3) be transferred to open conditions, the Parole Board must be satisfied that the exceptional circumstances have been evidenced, that the two criteria (as described at 1(ii)) are met.*

#### Foreign National Prisoners

5. *Pursuant to Prison Rules, an ISP who has been served with a deportation order and who has exhausted all their in country appeal rights is not eligible to be considered for open conditions. An ISP who is liable for deportation, but has not exhausted appeal rights may still be considered for transfer to open conditions.*
6. *Before recommending that a foreign national ISP (as described at 5) be transferred to open conditions, the Parole Board must be satisfied that the ISP presents as a very low risk of abscond, that the first criterion (as described at 1(ii)) is met.*

## **Information Sheet**

The decision in this case has now been issued.

### **Reconsideration**

This case is eligible for Reconsideration under Rule 28 of the Parole Board Rules 2019 (as amended). This means that the decision about release or a licence termination (where applicable) is provisional at this stage.

If a party wishes for this case to be reconsidered, then they must make an application setting out the basis on which they say the decision is 'irrational', 'procedurally unfair' and/or there has been an 'error of law'.

Applications for this case to be reconsidered must be sent to [reconsideration@paroleboard.gov.uk](mailto:reconsideration@paroleboard.gov.uk). We do not accept applications made to any other email address.

Further guidance and an application form for prisoners (form CPD2) is provided on the Parole Board section of the Gov.uk Website.

[Routes of challenge - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

Under Rule 28 the time allowed for an application is 21 days from the date it is sent to the parties. Any application made after the 21-day time limit will not be accepted by the Parole Board. However, under Rule 9 of the Parole Board Rules 2019 (as amended), the time limit may be reduced or extended by the panel chair or a duty member where it is necessary to do so for the effective management of the case, in the interests of justice or for any such purpose as the panel chair or duty member considers appropriate. Any request for an extension or reduction must also be made before the 21-day time limit expires.

If an application for reconsideration is not received within the 21 days (or any altered time limit), then the decision becomes final.

If an application is received, the party which has not made the application will have 7 days to submit their own representations, unless varied under Rule 9 by a panel chair or duty member. The application is then sent to the decision maker for consideration.

When a decision is made on any reconsideration application, both parties will be notified of the outcome. If reconsideration is directed, the decision will set out what happens next. If the application is rejected, the decision will then become final.

