the Parole Board
working with others to protect the public

ORAL HEARING DECISION

17 November 2026

Date of hearing:	21/10/2026		
Date of earlier hearing(s)	22/10/2026		
Prisoner full name:	William Vincent Dunlop		
Date of birth	[Redacted]	**Age:**	63
Prison number:	[Redacted]		
Prison:	[Redacted]		
Review number:	4		

DECISION

Decision:	**Direction for release**
	The Secretary of State must give effect to the direction of the Parole Board as soon as is reasonably practicable in all the circumstances including, in particular, the need to make arrangements in connection with any conditions that are to be included in the person's licence.

CONTEXT AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Type of case:	Life sentence on or post tariff review
Secretary of State referral:	Release or Open
Outcome sought:	Release
Test:	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.
Reconsideration:	This case is eligible for reconsideration.

INDEX OFFENCE(S) AND SENTENCE INFORMATION

Index offence(s):	Murder		
Sentence(s):	Life: Minimum Term: 17 years less time spent on remand.		
Date of sentence:	06/10/2006	**Age when sentenced:**	43 years
Tariff expiry date:	15/09/2021		

ORAL HEARING ATTENDEES

Panel:	H.H. Nick Coleman	Judicial	R
	Ms. Zaiada Bibi	Independent	R
	Dr. Tim McInerny	Forensic Psychiatrist	R
Witnesses:	[Name Redacted]	POM	R
	[Name Redacted]	COM	V
	[Name Redacted]	Prison Psychologist	R
	[Name Redacted]	Prisoner Commissioned Psychologist	V
Legal rep:	Dean Kingham	Reece Thomas Watson	R

Was the Secretary of State represented by an advocate	Yes: Counsel, Thomas Jones: also present at the hearing with SoS representative, Ms. Kath Stokes.

T – Telephone V – Video R – in hearing room in prison (with prisoner)

VICTIM INFORMATION

Victim statement provided?	**Yes**

Statement 1-3:

How were they presented?	Read by the family of the deceased at the hearing. One VPS was read to Mr. Dunlop in public and in his presence at the hearing. Kevin Hogg's VPS is at p. 961 of the dossier.

DOSSIER SUMMARY

Number of pages in dossier:	990
Non-disclosure:	Yes: VPS Gists disclosed.
Additional papers at the hearing:	None
Details:	
Additional papers after the hearing:	Final Submissions.
Details:	Mr. Jones and Mr. Kingham were given leave to prepare and lodge closing submissions. Mr. Jones submissions were directed to be lodged on or before 5 November (14 days) and

	Mr. Kingham was given leave to respond by 12 November. Mr. Jones submissions are at p. 994 of the dossier. Mr. Kingham's submissions are at p. 1003 of the dossier. The decision therefore became due on or before 26 November 2026. An adjournment Notice was issued. The total number of pages of the dossier was extended to 1009.

Any other information

The Panel had the benefit of submissions lodged prior to the hearing by the representatives: see pp.980 and 987.

Mr. Jones cited 4 areas of concern, viz: "Assessed High ROSH"; "Limited opportunities in closed conditions to be exposed to triggers"; "Unaddressed risk factors" and Recent Destabilising events".

Mr. Kingham addressed the following matters: "Professionals opinions and the matters submitted by Mr. Jones.

The hearing was held in public. The proceedings were transmitted to the public who were in attendance, having sought permission to be there, at the IRDC in London. Present also at the IRDC -permission to observe, were three victims. They too had been given permission to observe the proceedings. They were Ann Ming, the deceased's mother, the deceased's sister and the deceased's son, Kevin Hogg.

The victims had also been given permission to read their statements to the panel. Ann Ming and the deceased's sister did not wish Mr. Dunlop to be present when they read their statements. Kevin Hogg was given permission to read his VPS in public to Mr. Dunlop and Mr. Dunlop agreed to be present for the reading. This process took place prior to the commencement of the receipt of evidence from the witnesses.

The VPS statements provided the Panel with a clear and unforgettable picture of the consequences of Mr. Dunlop's crime.

To facilitate the hearing being held in public, two case management conferences were held (CMC's). The Panel chair issued an agenda for discussion and drew up a minute of the decisions taken. It was agreed that the public hearing would be held in two parts. On day one, it was decided that the first part would be held in public: the Open Hearing. Day 2 would be the Closed Hearing. Topics and named persons and places which could not be discussed on day one would be referred to

in more detail on day 2. The list of topics to be discussed in the open part of the hearing is set out in the post meeting minutes of the CMCs which can be seen at pp. 728 and 951. Mr. Dunlop was present at the CMCs and for both parts of the hearing.

In the decision letter there is reference to open and closed hearings. Evidence that was heard in the closed hearing is reported in the decision letter because it was information which the panel looked at again in more detail and it could have formed part of the open process. Sensitive material has been redacted because it was discussed in closed hearing and not in the open hearing.

The Case Summary following the last release decision was available to the public (see p. 956 of the dossier). This delineated, to a certain extent, the amount of information which could be heard in the Open part of the hearing. For example, previous victims could be referred to but not by their names.

PREVIOUS ALLEGATIONS: This decision concerns a murder which took place on 16 November 1989. Mr. Dunlop became eligible for parole on 15 September 2021. This is the 4th review of Mr Dunlop's case.

At the first review of the case, on 16 June 2019, when he was at HMP [prison name redacted] (a pre-tariff review chaired by a Judicial Member of the Parole Board) the panel concluded that Mr. Dunlop should not be released nor was he recommended for a transfer to the open estate. The Secretary of State was represented at the hearing.

The Panel notes that from February 2019 reporting psychologists within the prison system were recommending Mr. Dunlop’s transfer to the open estate (see the report at p. 175 of the dossier). This will have prompted the pre-tariff review in that year.

At the second and third reviews of his case, held on 26 August 2022, when he was still at HMP [prison name redacted] and then in December 2024 (adjourned to February 2025), after his transfer to HMP [prison name redacted] (which occurred in December 2022) the panels did not direct release but each panel recommended that Mr Dunlop be transferred to the open estate.

On each occasion the Secretary of State rejected the recommendations.

At the last review, first held over two days, in December 2024 and then on a third day, on 12 February 2025 (decision issued on 2 March 2025) the panel, again chaired by a judicial member, investigated many other allegations of crime in which Mr Dunlop was said to be involved. The allegations ranged from other murders, sexual abuse of children, intimate partner violence, generalised violence, and threats to kill. The panel made an assessment of the risk presented by Mr. Dunlop’s involvement in those other matters.

At this hearing Mr. Jones represented the Secretary of State.

Following the two days of fact finding, in line with the Supreme Court decision in **R -v- Pearce** the panel prepared a lengthy document setting out the source of their information, and their conclusions regarding the impact on Mr. Dunlop’s level

of risk. The findings are at p. 85 et seq. of the dossier. The document should be read in detail to understand the findings made but, in essence, that panel, assisted by a Detective Chief Inspector, examined (where available) witness statements and reports of previous crimes/alleged crimes said to have been committed over the period starting in the 1970s through to 1998. Mr. Dunlop gave his explanation to the evidence produced by the police. If there was an adverse finding the panel set out what effect this had in their estimation of the risk Mr. Dunlop presented.

The current Panel and both Mr. Jones and Mr. Kingham accepted the conclusions of the previous panel.

At the CMC it was agreed that this panel would not re-write the conclusions of the previous panel. However, it was also agreed that the findings of fact by the panel could be explored, and the decisions arrived at. This was necessary for this Panel to explore the risk Mr. Dunlop currently presents. It was also agreed that the parties could, if they so wished, revisit the facts behind the allegations, and do so both in the Open and Closed part of the proceedings (within the agreed limits in the Open part of the proceedings e.g. victims would not be named or identified).

This decision records the findings of the previous Panel and refers to evidence given by Mr. Dunlop in this hearing about the previous allegations.

Non-Disclosure Applications: NDAs were lodged in relation to the VPS statements of Ann Ming and Julie Hogg's sister and in relation to the licence conditions.

However, on the 13th of October, out of time and a week before the hearing (it should have been lodged prior to 8 weeks before the hearing: see the Parole Board Rules 2019 (As amended) Rule 17(2)), the Secretary of State lodged a late application seeking leave (out of time) to invite the panel to consider another NDA (re. Allegation 5). The information was not disclosed to Mr. Dunlop. Mr. Kingham received the information having provided the usual undertakings. The Panel Chair granted leave to add a gist to the papers in the case (see p. 990). The application was lodged too late for legal submissions to be sought. The Panel was told that Mr. Jones had not been asked to advise the Secretary of State prior to the application. At the end of the hearing of the case a closed session was held, by agreement, in the absence of Mr Dunlop. Following the receipt of oral submissions from the parties, the Panel concluded that no evidential weight could be placed on the closed material within the application. Frankly, having regard to the basis of the contents of the notice, the information therein, and the investigation carried out by the last panel it is difficult to understand why it was thought to be in any way relevant to the issues confronting this Panel.

REASONS

1. Analysis of Offending Behaviour (The Past)

1.1. Mr. William Dunlop ("WD") is now aged 63. When he was c. 26 years old, on 16 November 1998, at her house in Billingham, Teeside, WD murdered a young lady, Julie Hogg, by strangulation. He then mutilated her body before hiding it behind a panel in her bathroom. It was not discovered until the victim's mother, Ann (Ming), found it, on the 5 February 1990.

1.2. On 6 October 2006 WD pleaded guilty to the murder and received a life sentence. He has now been in custody for c.28 years by reason of a sentence of imprisonment he received for an offence of Causing Grievous Bodily Harm (s.18) on 6 May 1998 (see below) and a later sentence for the offence of Perjury (see below). In September 2021 WD became eligible for release having served the minimum term of the sentence imposed by the judge in relation to the murder. He has made an application to this Panel of the Parole Board that he be released: his first formal application for release (the last application for release was withdrawn at the previous hearing of his case). Having carefully considered all the facts of the case, the evidence presented to the Panel, and the many reports about WD, and the risk he presents, and for all the reasons set out below the Panel has concluded that WD meets the statutory Codified Public Protection Test for release (CPPT): as set out above and at the end of this decision) and therefore directs his release.

1.3. **Background**: There is a wealth of information about WD's early years, in particular information in several psychological risk assessments. The Panel has considered it all.

1.4. It is widely reported that WD had a very difficult upbringing. He was born in 1963 and was the third of four siblings. He had an older brother, [name redacted], and an older sister, [name redacted] (4 and a half years older). He has a younger brother, [name redacted].

1.5. It is reported that he had a difficult and unsettled childhood. His father was very strict, and violent, towards him, with "a real temper." His father would frequently go out drinking, returning home drunk and then would be abusive and violent towards WD's mother. WD Reported that his father would also be violent towards him and then claim that the violence "did not hurt." His older brother would provoke WD to fight in front of friends. His older brother then left home and from the age of 10 (or thereabouts) WD began to use violence: "to seek positive regard from older peers or allow violence to be inflicted on him (e.g. whipping), for the entertainment of others". He developed a strong desire to be liked and reportedly placed few limits on the things he would do to gain the approval of his peers, including committing crime, assaulting others, and party tricks to try and get attention like setting his armpit hair on fire or allowing people to punch him to prove how strong he was.

1.6. WD soon realised that his ability to take a beating and show no pain earned him respect. Early reports describe that both his brothers were both violent towards him. [Personal family related information redacted].

1.7. From the age of 9/10 WD became exposed to [sensitive information redacted] by reason of [name redacted] and this was the start of [sensitive information

redacted], on WD. It only ended when [name redacted] abruptly ceased. WD was aged 10 at the time the [sensitive information redacted] started. In addition, WD started to mutually masturbate with his male friends which led to truanting. He was then placed into care, aged 12, in November 1975. It is reported that he was placed into care on 3 occasions. He was involved in acquisitive crime from a young age, being small and able to fit through windows in order to let older peers into the premises to take the belongings.

1.8. WD began misusing alcohol at an early age and, in his late teens, proscribed drugs (cannabis, amphetamines and LSD). However, it was alcohol that became a feature of his violent behaviour.

1.9. It appears that WD had two "serious" relationships. In early 1984, aged 20, he met [name redacted] by whom he had [redacted] children, [name redacted] [name redacted] (now deceased), [name redacted] and [name redacted]. The relationship lasted 12 years. It was violent and WD has admitted controlling and manipulative behaviour. He used a knife to threaten her (see below). Thereafter, he had a relationship with [name redacted] which lasted a "few months" and they had his [redacted] child, [name redacted]. There are grandchildren (see below para. 1.75).

1.10. WD has an extensive offending history acquiring 28 convictions over 11 court appearances, starting at the age of 12 years old with a conviction for assault, in 1975. In 1981 he was convicted of assault and possession of an offensive weapon. He was convicted for Taking a Conveyance without Authority (3 counts) and an additional conviction for Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm in 1982 and in 1985 he was convicted of ABH. He has self-reported (to psychologists) that during his teenage years he engaged in burglary and theft and the documentation states this was dealt with by care order, conditional discharge detention centre, and borstal training when apprehended.

1.11. On the night of the index offence, WD had a fight with another man and knocked him unconscious and gouged his eyes (see below: Allegations: para 1.24). The other man was in hospital for 3-4 days. It does not appear that Mr Dunlop was convicted of this offence, but it is a matter he admits. In 1997 he was sentenced to 4 months in prison for threatening to kill his ex-partner's [name redacted] new partner and then, on the 6 May 1998 he was sentenced to 7 years for the S.18 Wounding with intent offences against his ex-partner [name redacted] and her new partner. The last conviction has resulted in his detention in prison since that date (see p.82 of the dossier: CRO file).

1.12. **Index Offence**: The index offence took place on the night of 16 November 1989. WD has reported that previous to the night of the offence he and his friend, a neighbour of the victim, Julie Hogg (nee Ming), had engaged in consensual sexual activity with the victim. The next morning and on an occasion subsequent to this the victim had not invited WD in again but had still engaged in sex with his friend. On the night of the murder WD attended a rugby club party at which it was rumoured that there would be 'blue strippers.' This meant they would undress the men and engage in sexual acts with them. WD had felt anxious about

this beforehand because he was worried about being undressed in front of others or being embarrassed in some way. At the event this did not happen and he reported that in fact the strippers did not engage in those activities with any men in the audience. During the party he had a disagreement and this led to a confrontation and a fight in the car park. WD was angry and extremely violent to the other man, striking his head on the concrete and attempting to stick his thumbs in his eyes. He himself had a gash on his face and a friend of his offered to take him to hospital for stitches. On the way he made a sexually inappropriate remark to his friend's wife. He left the hospital quickly, on seeing the victim of his earlier assault, for fear of being arrested, and headed to his friend's house, next door to the victim's home. The lights were out at his friend's house, but they were on next door at the victim's house, so WD went to knock, but then deciding to go in through the back door to avoid being seen by anyone. He reported that he "*briefly wondered*" if he might be able to have sex with Ms. Hogg. She let him in and he reports that they spoke for a while over a cup of tea before the victim made a remark about the injuries to his face, saying '*If you'd looked like that last time I'd never have gone there.'* Mr Dunlop reports that he *'flew at her'* and strangled her due to the feelings of anger and the rejection he felt at her remarks. He reports strangling the victim and then immediately afterwards experiencing a feeling of euphoria at the control he had over her. Despite the level of violence, it seems that the murder was not premeditated.

1.13. After he had killed Ms. Hogg, WD sat for a long time before he started to think about what he needed to do to cover up what he had done. It is reported that he undressed the victim, placed a blanket around her, and carried her upstairs, intending to conceal her body in the loft. However, he found it difficult to get her into the loft. He has been asked why he would choose to place his fingers into her vagina to put her body in the loft and he explained that he was thinking about places he could put his hands to "*get the most grip*." Whatever the motivation, this made him feel aroused. WD dropped her body and fell, becoming angry and kicking at her and as a result [sensitive information redacted]. He then placed her body over the bath and cleaned up the floor, but then, on looking at her naked body laid over the bath he was again aroused and still angry and humiliated at the rejection. He pushed his hand into her vagina. The extent of the Ms. Hogg's vaginal injury has been discussed with WD as it was noted by report writers to be very significant.

1.14. [Sensitive information about the index offence redacted]. This, again, appears to have aroused him sexually. He then masturbated over the victim's body stating he did this to "*recreate the euphoria he had felt when he had killed her."* WD then concealed the body behind a panel in the bathroom (which housed the bath). It was not discovered until February when Julie Hogg's mother, by chance, made the discovery.

1.15. In 1991 WD was tried on two occasions on the charge of murdering Julie Hogg in her home. He lied under oath during both trials when he gave evidence stating that he was innocent of the crime. After the retrial and after he was acquitted, he was discharged by reason of the double jeopardy rule (the prosecution offered

no further evidence as two juries could not agree). An aggravating feature of his conduct was that WD, after his discharge, also went onto local news outlets protesting his innocence.

1.16. Around 10 years after the murder, during his prison sentence for the conviction of Wounding with Intent against his ex-partner [name redacted], believing he was "*in the clear*", he admitted the murder of Julie Hogg to a Prison Officer and to others, including in statements lodged in proceedings in the family court. Clandestine recordings were made of WD admitting his guilt by the prison. However, due to the double jeopardy law, the law prevented him from being retried for the murder. Instead, in 2000, whilst still in custody, WD was convicted of Perjury, admitting in court his guilt for the offence of murder. He received a sentence of six years.

1.17. The victim's family (in particular, Ann Ming campaigned successfully for the law to be changed and on 18 December 2003 the Criminal Justice Act 2003 came into force including provisions, where appropriate, for the re-trial of a man who has been (wrongly) acquitted by reason of the "double jeopardy" principle. On 6 October 2006, in the first case to be re-tried under the new law, Mr Dunlop admitted the murder of Julie Hogg and was sentenced to Life Imprisonment with a tariff of 14 years, 11 months and 9 days. The tariff expiry date was the 15 September 2021.

1.18. In sentencing WD, the sentencing tribunal, Mr. Justice Calvert-Smith, stated: *"Despite your eventual admission I see little evidence of real remorse."* However, he did add: "*There may also be evidence in that confession of a desire to rid himself of the violent streak which has ruined his life and that of so many others."* As noted above WD had been sent to prison in May 1998 and has not since been released. He has, therefore served more than 28 years, much of that as part of the minimum term imposed by Mr. Justice Calvert-Smith.

1.19. WD went on to describe his current views about the index offence. He told the Panel that he thought he had been "*disrespected by Julie*" and he "*intended to take her life*." He told the Panel that he had thought about the impact this murder would have but thought that it was "*all about me*." He said he now understood the level of violence in what he did, something he had known for several years. He spoke of his past. "*I was just a horrible, violent person*." He said that his rules were enforced by threats and violence. His attitude had been: "*you shall respect me*." He then added:" *That has been my identity until the last 10 years*". He said that: *"If he hadn't gone to prison he would have gone on to commit further offences, even murder*" ….. He told the Panel that he did not believe "*life means life" …." people can be rehabilitated" …" I am far happier than I was as a violent man"*.

1.20. The Panel noted the further answers regarding his response to the VPS and the reading by Kevin Hogg, given during the course of the current review. WD told the Panel that he found that listening to Kevin Hogg's VPS was "*very moving*" …." Adding: "*with my recent bereavement I can empathise*." "*It was a horrendous thing I did to his mother. If I think about [name redacted] I think about Julie*."

He told the Panel about the hopelessness, the devastation and loneliness he felt following the loss of [name redacted] The panel deals with this issue, the recent death of [name redacted] when considering evidence regarding his conduct in the last year and, in general his conduct since the last review of his case (see below).

1.21. **Allegations: Unproven further misconduct.** As noted above the previous panel reviewed WD's offending history, in part, some of his convictions, but principally matters that have not been prosecuted. The purpose of the exercise was to review WD's risk in the light of unproven allegations and to what extent they undermine risk assessments carried out by those responsible for the examination of WD's risk. The Panel has carefully reviewed their conclusions and carefully questioned the witnesses from whom they heard during the current review.

1.22. The allegations (the numerous offences of violence and sexual for which he was not prosecuted and some for which he stood trial and was acquitted) which are referred to below deal with WD's criminal activity over a period in the early 1970s through to 1998. The Panel sets out the nature of the allegation(s) and the finding of facts in summary form. The detail is within the previous decision letter and, more particularly, in the dossier at pp.85 – 111. The Panel has distilled the allegations in the interests of brevity. The findings of the last panel are underlined. That said, all the relevant material has been carefully considered and assessed and WD has been questioned about the allegations in the Open and (in more detail) in the Closed session on Day 2 of the hearing.

1.23. It is necessary to set out (albeit in outline) the allegations and the bulk of the Panel's conclusions to ensure that in any review of the Panel's decision there is an understanding that the current Panel undertook a full review of the risks WD presented before he received the life sentence and to understand to what extent WD has addressed those risks both before, and since, that conviction.

1.24. The previous panel stated as follows. *"WD had a relatively minor record of convictions from 1975 to 1988, which included a detention centre order, Borstal training, and prison sentences for offences of dishonesty and assault. From about 1988 onwards WD began drinking heavily and committing numerous offences of violence, for which he was not prosecuted. He lived in an area where he was well-known, and he cultivated the notoriety that his violent behaviour brought him. As a result, many of the people he injured were frightened of him, and of the consequences of reporting him to the police. The evidence also shows that, although he was in a steady relationship from 1984, and had three children, he was sexually promiscuous, as were many of his group of friends."*

1.25. ***Allegations 1-4:*** *allegations of sexual assault on children between 1985 and 1992, for which WD was tried and acquitted. <u>The panel considers that there is a serious possibility that the allegations of sexual activity between WD and the children who made the complaints may be true</u>.*

Allegations 5 and 7*: two allegations of murder, one in 1989 and the other in 1994/1995. <u>The panel gave no weight to these allegations</u>.*

Allegation 6: *sexual assault on a girl older than him during the 1970s. The panel cannot properly attach any weight to this allegation.*

Allegation 8*: sexual assault on a child in the early 1990s. The panel gave no weight to this allegation.*

Allegation 9*: sexual violence against an ex-partner in 1997. WD denies this. The panel found, on a balance of probabilities, the following facts: On 1 April 1997 WD visited his ex-partner [name redacted] in [location redacted]. While there, he subjected her to a very violent attack, had sexual intercourse with her without her consent, and tried to push his fist completely inside her vagina. He said, "I have been in this situation before." After the intercourse and the fisting, he got up and went to the kitchen, saying he was getting a knife and was going to make [name redacted] watch him do whatever he was intending.* The panel concluded: *"The current panel was provided with more evidence than the previous panel saw, which allowed it to make these findings (as set out)."*

Allegation 10: *physical abuse of partner between 1994 and 1996. WD accepted to the panel 4 incidents of violence against this (another) partner, including one close in time to the murder, where he beat his partner with a pickaxe handle until her face was almost unrecognisable. Looking at the whole of the evidence, the panel considered it to be extremely unlikely that WD was as selective in his use of violence as he suggests. The panel concluded that REDACTED violence was a consistent feature of WD's behaviour at least from 1988 to 1996.*

Allegation 11*: physical abuse of children. The evidence about this was thin, and physical abuse is denied by one of the children, [name redacted], now an adult. The panel considered it probable that WD was rough with [name redacted], but the evidence does not support a finding of deliberate or persistent cruelty.*

Allegation 12*: physical abuse of another partner: This relates to the partner [name redacted] who was, with her new partner, the victim of the s18 assaults for which WD was sentenced in 1998.. WD denied the assaults, though he admitted cutting up the victim's clothes. The panel believed the account given by the victim.*

Allegation 13*: burglary of [name redacted] house. There is no evidence that this offence was committed by WD.*

Allegation 14*: threats to [name redacted]. The panel found this was intended as a threat, though generalised and not directed specifically at [name redacted].*

Allegation 15*: violent behaviour in [location redacted]. Given his mental state at the time, the panel did no more than note this incident.*

Allegation 16*: threats, intimidation and breach of bail. WD denies this. The panel accepts [name redacted] account.*

Allegation 17*: letters containing threats, intimidation, and harassment. WD admitted sending a number of letters from prison, before his conviction for the murder.*

Allegation 18*: Threats, intimidation, and harassment of [name redacted]. The panel took no account if it.*

Allegation 19*: Assault on a male on the night of the murder (see above: para 1-11). WD admits this assault but disputed attacking the man from behind. Again, the conduct forms part of WD's pattern of violent behaviour at the time of the murder of JH.*

Allegation 20*: Assault and threats to kill [name redacted] whom WD had intercourse. The principal incident here took place on Saturday – Sunday [date redacted]. The panel sees no reason to doubt this. The complainant describes a later threat in [date redacted]. Again, the panel accepts this account, which WD denies: it is very much part and parcel of WD's behaviour at the relevant time.*

Allegation 21*: Threat to kill. The panel accepts the evidence of this complainant. Again, it is an example of a pattern of behaviour.*

Allegation 22: *threat to kill [name redacted]. The panel takes no account of this allegation.*

1.26. ***The (previous) Panel's conclusions****: The foregoing sets out the result of the panel's analysis of the evidence available in respect of the allegations placed before it on behalf of the SSJ. Some of these findings do no more than add detail to the general picture already set out. The panel asked the professional witnesses specifically about whether some of these findings affected their view of the risk presented by WD: in particular, Allegations 1-4, where allegations of sexual activity with children were considered by a jury, which acquitted WD; Allegation 9, where the panel found proved on the balance of possibilities allegations of sexual activity without consent, possibly motivated by a desire for revenge as well as for control; and Allegation 19.*

1.27. *WD's response to some of these allegations caused the panel to question whether he is now being open and honest about his behaviour at the relevant time. In particular, in giving his account of Allegation 19 (the eye-gouging), he told the panel that he would not attack someone from behind. Bearing in mind his proven history of cowardly attacks on women, and on an unarmed man whom he attacked with a baseball bat, the panel was concerned that WD still holds on to an unrealistic self-image with regard to his behaviour at the time. And, of course, the panel is concerned at his denial of* ***Allegation 9 and Allegation 10,*** *(IPV including sexual violence) both of which the panel found proved.* The panel explored this aspect of the case with the professional witnesses.

1.28. It is important to note that the current Panel took notice of these finding and conducted a similar investigation when questioning report writers as to the extent these findings might affect and cause adjustments to be made to the risk assessments made of WD.

1.29. **Risk Factors**: Having considered his conduct until he was finally detained and, to some extent, his prison behaviour, the Panel has formed the following view about WD's risk factors. Risk factors are those matters which if left unaddressed mean that it is more likely that a person will re-offend. The abovementioned

background history of his upbringing and his conduct in his 20s and 30s, including the allegations found proved by the last panel, raises concerns about WD's capacity to cause serious and fatal harm to others through his use of extreme general and sexual violence. He also developed a capacity for deception, manipulation, and dishonesty and, it is said, a failure to take responsibility for his actions. The Panel agrees with an earlier assessment that WD's offences of perjury were also indicative of his capacity to deceive and manipulate the truth.

1.30. It has been reported that major risk factors, linked to his offending history, also include: complex personality disorder traits, with elements of antisocial, borderline, histrionic and avoidant personality disorders, and high levels of psychopathic traits. There is historic evidence of a willingness to resort to extreme levels of violence (see above), which greatly increases the risk of harm to others. Attitudes supportive of the use of violence; substance misuse, which can act to disinhibit WD, making him more likely to offend and behave in an aggressive, violent or inappropriate manner; anti-social peers who reinforced violence and substance misuse attitudes and behaviour; poor problem-solving skills, impulsiveness and a lack of victim empathy which can cause him to fail to understand the harm and fear of harm that he causes; a problem managing stress/coping and his emotions within and around intimate relationships, which can lead to Mr Dunlop being violent; attitudes which condone the use of violence in intimate relationships; sexual preoccupation; sexual entitlement; distorted attitudes about women and sex, and (possibly) children and sex; attitudes which support or condone the use of sexual violence; interest, or at least a capacity to be aroused by sexual violence, including the act of murder and sight of a dead body/failure to be disinhibited by a dead body and the use of weapons. In addition, the Panel identified the ability to self-harm; maladaptive coping strategies; distorted thinking and an ability to manipulate.

1.31. The Panel explored with all the professional witness whether there were any "active" risk factors. Their answers were clear. No witness suggested any risk factor was active.

1.32. The issue for the Panel is this: to what extent has WD addressed the risk he has presented? Moreover, to what extent has he addressed the concerns set out in the letter from the Secretary of State after the last hearing? Is there any credible evidence of the criticisms made of him?

1.33. The Panel looked carefully at the history of the interventions (the updated list is at p. 486 of the dossier in the first COM report (2025)). This is an important chronology because although some interventions were undertaken before the life sentence was imposed, the most important, and, in the view of the Panel, the most effective, took place following the imposition of the life sentence.

1.34. In order to address the identified risks he presented, firstly, **prior** to the conviction for murder in 2006 (following his re-arraignment), WD undertook the

following interventions: Enhanced Thinking Skills (ETS) (2002) and Alcohol Awareness (2002). He then went to HMP [prison name redacted] and joined the Therapeutic Community [date redacted]: this was not entirely successful. However, it is reported that he did undertake an intervention called Stress Management (2003). He then transferred to [location redacted] and undertook Dialectic Behavioural Therapy (DBT) within the Personality Disorder Treatment Service (2005-2006). Having considered the reports and the nature of the intervention the Panel has concluded that this was a beneficial move and the work he did at [location redacted] appears to have laid a strong foundation for future interventions.

1.35. Then, in October 2006 WD received the life sentence. Thereafter he remained at HMP [prison name redacted] for a year and in July 2007 he was transferred to HMP [prison name redacted]. It wasn't until 2012 that he was placed on the [unit name redacted]. By all accounts, it was in that unit that he appears to have made the most significant changes. He undertook Psychoeducation, Motivation & Engagement (M&E) under the [unit redacted] Personality Disorder Treatment Service (2011-2015); Emotion Modulation, Social Competence, and Creative Thinking (2012); Problem Solving, and Handling Conflict (2013). The Panel refers to more detail below.

1.36. At p. 241 of the dossier is a report from [previous Psychologist] dated February 2019. She was a reporting psychologist at HMP [prison name redacted] which is where he went after leaving the Category A estate. Her findings have been carefully considered by the Panel as she concluded that WD's risks could be managed, even if he had access to the community. Accordingly, she recommended a transfer to the open estate. In her report she summarises the process referred to: see para 1.36. She states that WD, following the interventions in 2002, was transferred to [location redacted] in that year, but he did not remain there for long. In February 2005 he was transferred to [location redacted] as he "*refused food and was sectioned"*. He remained there until July 2006. It is reported that he admitted that he was trying "*to blag it and get sectioned so I wouldn't have to go to court for the murder."* He said that he was trying to avoid court, but, he said, somewhat paradoxically, that "*I was bullied and intimidated there so I didn't want to go back."* It was reported that "*his intelligence and his ability to manipulate should never be ignored*", a matter that has characterised criticism of him since this episode. That said, to be detained at [location redacted] WD must have been assessed by psychiatrists in order for him to be sectioned. As noted it was there that it was decided to place him on the first therapeutic course. The DBT intervention proved successful. In 2006 it was confirmed that he did not suffer from a mental illness, but that he had psychopathic and personality disorder traits.

1.37. The DBT Intervention was carried out in the [location redacted] Personality Disorder Treatment Service between 2005 and 2006. In that year, October 2006, he received the life sentence. Further treatment following the DBT then appears to have been put on hold.

1.38. It was not until he was transferred to the [unit name redacted] at HMP [prison name redacted] 2011 as a Category A offender that further important work started. WD remained in this unit for 5 years. The report of the work he did is at p. 157 et seq. of the dossier. Some of the work is touched upon above in para: 1.36. It also included Intimacy and Relationship Skills; Chromis Problem Solving; Chromis Handling Conflict; Chromis Schema Therapy; Iceberg (referred to in the OASys report at p. 807 of the dossier as the drug and alcohol component of the intervention); and a Progression Maintenance Programme. WD told the Panel in the closed session that the most significant intervention he received was the "Emotional module."

1.39. Following the completion of the work in the [unit name redacted] WD remained at HMP [prison name redacted] until 2018 when he transferred to HMP [prison name redacted].

1.40. The Panel notes that in 2015 a SARN was proposed (see p. 171) to determine what his needs were "*in terms of sexual offending".* This was subsequently addressed at HMP [prison name redacted] by the successful completion of the SOTP.

1.41. Those who assessed him at HMP [prison name redacted] clearly felt that there were unaddressed risk factors. Thus, in 2016 WD undertook the Core SOTP programme and in 2016-2017 Interventions with the Drug and Alcohol Recovery Team (DART). WD told the 2024 panel that the "*SOTP showed me that my heinous crime doesn't define me. It gave me the confidence to see myself and accept myself as a sex offender. It helped free me up to talk about the sexual side of my offence and of my life. The shame I carried from it which prevented me discussing it before."* WD repeated this in evidence to the current Panel.

1.42. [Previous Psychologist] summarised the progress in her report at p. 241 of the dossier: WD "*consistently demonstrated motivation to engage and comply with all treatment offered to him*, and this has been the case for a prolonged period of time. It was stated that "*Mr Dunlop is also responsive to treatment he engages in and demonstrates progress in his insight and implementing learning from all treatment he has completed*" (ATNA Report, 10-09-15: the report from the psychologist in HMP [prison name redacted] at p.123, was cited by her and the Panel has considered this). It was also reported that now (2019) there was "*no further identified treatment interventions recommended for Mr Dunlop*," and that there were "*concerns regarding treatment saturation."*

1.43. Reflecting on the key drivers to his progress and change during this sentence, when recently discussing his interventions with [Prisoner Commissioned Psychologist] WD identified his time at the [location redacted] and the [unit name redacted] as his '*turning points.'* It is reported that he completed individual work with a certain psychologist who '*opened me up like a can of worms".* He started to accept his vulnerabilities, which had previously been used as intimidation and violence to mask. Mr Dunlop told [Prisoner Commissioned Psychologist]: '*I was never truly happy or understood myself before [location redacted].'* These insights were developed further during his time on the [unit name redacted], a

place he told [Prisoner Commissioned Psychologist] that he learned more about his "*emotions, personality and the impact of his trauma*."

1.44. Another view is provided by the CBT staff from the [location redacted]. It is reported that WD attended every session of Chromis Schema Therapy. It sets out how well WD worked to address to change his responses to things which historically would trigger an angry and sometimes violent response, for example, rejection, feeling disrespected or humiliated. He is said to have developed real insight into his personality and violent cycles. "*He showed behavioural change*." He brought detailed thought records and completed all assignments thoroughly, actively using these to develop his insight into both his behaviour and attitudes. The full reports from the therapists who treated WD appear at p. 438 of the dossier.

1.45. The Panel cites one comment (of many similar ones): *"I thought Mr Dunlop developed real insight into his personality and violent cycles and showed behavioural change. His goals were also well thought out, for example, he was very focussed on becoming more comfortable experiencing and expressing emotions he had always struggled with such as shame, sadness, and anxiety, rather than supressing such emotions and going straight to anger. I thought this was a very important goal for Mr Dunlop."* (CBT Therapist).

1.46. It was on 21 March 2018 that WD was transferred to HMP [prison name redacted], and he received Category C status in the same year.

1.47. The 2019 panel of the Parole Board reviewed WD's progress and the report from [previous Psychologist]. They concluded that WD had made "*substantial progress*" but that there was "*much consolidation work to be done*." WD accepted that he had "*further work"* to do. The decision was that he should remain in the closed estate. He was encouraged to continue with his "*schema logs/diaries"* which he did. As the Panel saw at the current hearing he continues to do so. These are seen by those who are responsible for him.

1.48. As noted above, following the 2019 review, psychological risk assessments within the dossier, indicate that report writers were concluding that WD's risk could be managed in the open estate and were making that recommendation from then on.

1.49. HMP [prison name redacted] had an open estate section [wing] where prisoners had their own keys and freedom of movement. WD was to be placed on the unit, but COVID appears to have "*condemned*" it (see the report from [previous Psychologist 2]] at p. 274 of the dossier). In fact, WD caught COVID. The 2022 report indicates that instead he made progress to what was then called, the "*community wing".* WD's behaviour remained *"stable"* and the panel which reviewed his progress noted that although he "*avoided proven adjudications*" he was "*linked to some inappropriate behaviours"* involving rudeness to staff, unauthorised items, "*unexplained scratches to his neck,"* and a "*verbal altercation*" with another prisoner in June 2021.

1.50. In 2022 the next panel of the Parole Board reviewed WD's progress and recommended a transfer to the open estate. Their conclusions are at pp 646 et seq. Not only did the panel have the benefit of [Previous Psychologist]'s PRA, another psychologist at HMP [prison name redacted], this time [previous Psychologist 2] prepared a fresh PRA (report p. 262 of the dossier) which arrived at a similar conclusion to [previous Psychologist]. His evidence to that panel is summarised at p. 642 of the dossier. In the judgement of that Panel, the panel had a "*positive view"* of WD's progress. The panel agreed "*with the universal evidence of the professional witnesses*" all recommending a move to the open estate. However, this did not happen. The Secretary of State rejected the unanimous opinions.

1.51. Then, in December 2022, WD was transferred to the HMP [prison name redacted]. The Panel has not been made aware of the reasons behind this decision but no doubt those responsible for the management of WD felt that he should face the challenge of a progression unit.

1.52. As the Panel were told the Unit at HMP [prison name redacted] requires a prisoner to progress through stages, starting with Stage 1 (available to all prisoners on arrival) and reaching Stage 3 only by the approval of a Governor led review to agree to a move to Stage 2 and then, after a further period, during which positive progress has to be shown, a final move to Stage 3. WD has been a Stage 3 prisoner since 19 October 2023. He is now one of the most trusted prisoners in HMP [prison name redacted] (see below). An example of the work he has completed appears at p. 440 of the dossier, a handwritten "Relapse Prevention Plan" which the Panel has considered. The Panel also notes the report from the [charity name redacted] (August 2024) which commends WD for his work on NHS "*talking therapies"* based on CBT (Cognitive Behaviour Therapy) interventions.

1.53. The last panel to consider WD's case did so in December and February 2024/2025. The decision was issued in March and appears at p.112 of the dossier. It was chaired by a Judicial Member of the Parole Board and had 3 additional panel members, including a psychologist. The hearing was held in public. Having considered the evidence of the proven (and unproven) allegations, the progress made by WD, and the level of risk he was said to then present, based upon the proven crimes and allegations and concerns about aspects of risk emanating from the unproven allegations, the panel was still, nevertheless, prepared to recommend that WD be transferred to the open estate.

1.54. It is noted that the last panel were concerned about WD's minimisation (the eye gouging incident); his denial of Allegation 9 [IPV with his former partner [name redacted] and the difficulties associated with continuing contact with [name redacted]. The panel thought that the "*desire to control and the ability to manipulate"* were still present, but they did accept that WD used his skills to "*manage those aspects of his personality."* Nevertheless, the panel concluded that WD could not have maintained the behaviour he has shown since 2014 unless there had been a very substantial change in his "*degree of self-knowledge and*

self-control" which persuaded the panel that he fitted the criteria for the recommendation they made.

1.55. The Panel did not recommend release. The witnesses to the hearing (and indeed WD himself, took the view that he was not ready for release into the community: see p. 128 of the dossier) However, as they stated, having heard evidence from the [current POM], the [current COM], the [former COM], [WD's key worker] and [current Prison Psychologist], the last Panel concluded as follows: "*The panel therefore turns to the question of a recommendation for open conditions. After careful consideration of a very great deal of evidence, both written and oral, the panel is satisfied that William Dunlop 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 in open conditions he may be in the community, unsupervised under licensed temporary release). William Dunlop is assessed by all witnesses as presenting a low risk of abscond, and the panel agrees with that assessment. The panel reaches its conclusion on all the evidence, taking account of the concerns expressed above and the evidence about them. There has undoubtedly, in the panel's view, been a very substantial reduction in William Dunlop's risk from the extremely high level of his period of grave offending around and after the index offence of murder. The question is whether the reduction is sufficient to pass the test set out above"* (see p. 128 of the dossier).

1.56. Again, the Secretary of State rejected the recommendation. The letter to WD is at p. 136 of the dossier.

1.57. The letter cites wording from the decision letter and which summarises the panel's confidence if WD were to be allowed access to the community, as he would be, if he transferred to the open estate. The letter focussed on the phrase "*sufficient progress*." Had WD made *"sufficient progress*" in the opinion of the Secretary of State that WD had presented a "*wholly persuasive case*" for transferring to the open estate? Having heard the evidence of the professional witnesses, the panel thought he had. The Secretary of State disagreed, despite not hearing the evidence.

1.58. The letter from the Secretary of State cited WD's "*self-image" …" minimisation*," and "*denial of some of the allegations*;" the reliance on self-reporting; and a "*significant history of dishonesty*." The letter went on to refer to the decision's reference to matters such as *"deceit*," "*dishonesty and manipulation*," and the "*desire for control and the ability to manipulate being "still present",* referring back to the murder trials and the admission as to perjury. Cited also was the application to transfer to [location redacted]. However, there was, it seems, apart from WD's continuing denials of guilt relating to the allegations, no current evidence before the last panel of continuing deceit. The Secretary of State's letter refers to historic findings. Finally, the letter referred to the lack of support in the community and the relationships with WD's [name redacted] and [name redacted].

1.59. The current Panel explored all the concerns put before WD by the Secretary of State in the letter of rejection. This was undertaken with the professional witnesses (where appropriate), and WD, when he was questioned, not only by the Panel, but also by the Secretary of State's representative, who questioned WD about his history and current progress. Thus, it should be noted that (again) WD told a Panel of the Parole Board about historic matters (the allegations) when he was questioned in some detail by the Panel, and also Mr. Jones.

1.60. In looking at the learning he had acquired from the past, the Panel was told by WD that the therapy in the mental health hospital and the "*rehab"* had "*made him curious*." REDACTED "*had not worked out*" as he was not then strong enough to work within a group. However, the REDACTED covered "*every aspect of his life*" (he cited, in particular, parts of the interventions such as the Chroma Schema Therapy) and, in consequence, how his conduct had improved.

1.61. He told the Panel that "f*or 30 years"* he had been "*a dangerous fighting man*" and at the REDACTED he had changed. He had last been adjudicated upon in 2010 and gained enhanced status (which status he had not lost) in 2011.

1.62. The Panel considered the contents of the letter from the Secretary of State very carefully. The question for the Panel is this: To what extent has WD made the necessary progress since the last hearing to meet the suggested concerns?

1.63. The Panel has reviewed this history in some detail as it is important to be satisfied that WD has addressed the risks he presented and has had chance to consolidate his learning. It is not easy to overlook the amount of work he has done and the time he has spent in custody since the last formal intervention.

1.64. **[CLOSED HEARING: EVIDENCE from WD redacted].**

1.65. Comment: As the Panel notes later, when referring to the information in the recent/updating reports, all the information regarding proved and unproved allegations has been fed into the assessments carried out by the two psychologists. Quite independently they used the findings of the previous panel when they carried out their updated assessment for this hearing (see below). [Current prison psychologist], was aware of the findings of the last panel when she prepared her report for it in 2024/2025, and she and [current prisoner commissioned psychologist] have independently prepared fresh reports for the purposes of this assessment. The Panel has concluded that, put simply, the fact that there was no significant alteration to the answers to the allegations against him in the course of this assessment by the current Panel this means that the actuarial assessments will have considerable weight.

1.66. The Panel's view was that he was sincere in his denials, despite the adverse finding of facts by the last panel. He is in a sense the victim of the false dilemma (known as Morton's fork), although the dilemma is real in his case. As he pointed out: if he admits the matters he has consistently denied he will be accused of dishonesty. If he does not admit matters he has either a) been acquitted of at trial or b) found to have committed on a balance of probabilities or that there is

a "serious possibility" he has committed the act (s) he will be accused of historically seeking to mislead the previous investigators.

1.67. The Panel notes the submissions of the Secretary of State in relation to the issue of the historic allegations and the suggestion that there is a continuing risk. The Secretary of State, in closing submissions, cites, for example, a report from 2008 (see p.1001).

1.68. In the judgement of the Panel the Secretary of State's representative gives insufficient weight to the evidence of the professionals referring to more recent risk assessments, not just the POM and the COM, but the psychologists who have reported on WD, in particular, early report writers (post his move to REDACTED in 2018) and those who have, more recently, since he moved to REDACTED reassessed his risk, in particular the psychologists who have re-assessed his risk and considered whether he has addressed the risks identified by the findings of the previous panel. There is, as a previous panel put it: "universality" in the opinions of those reporting on WD.

2. Analysis of Evidence of Change (The Present)

2.1. The Panel notes the evidential review of the previous panel of this topic which is at p. 122 of the dossier, some of which has been touched upon already in this decision.

2.2. This section of the Decision Letter sets out a summary of the current information provided by report writers and additional information regarding what WD said to this Panel in the Open and Closed Sessions. The Panel has reviewed the work undertaken by WD and the interventions he has completed to understand whether the recommendations made by those responsible for the management of WD can be supported.

2.3. It must be remembered that if WD is to be released it will be the first time he has been at liberty outside the closed conditions of a prison in 28 years. The Panel was keen to ensure that WD had the necessary skills allied with the relevant support to navigate a changed world.

2.4. As for prison conduct it should be noted that WD's current continued good behaviour is not a new person. Earlier reports from psychologists ([previous psychologist 2], for example at p.302 of the dossier) described in May 2021 how WD continued to manage issues well. He reported as follows: *"Mr Dunlop's current behaviour continues to be very stable and has been for a number of years. He has consistently adhered to rules, was a Programmes Mentor for a number of years, with excellent feedback from the staff involved and has been a trusted employee in places like the Kitchen. The only changes since my last assessment have been positive. For example, he spent a period as 'Wing Chairman' which meant he managed issues and problems on the wing, chairing meetings and supporting other prisoners (he has now passed this role on to someone else which is part of the process). He is now in a trusted Red Band position, and he continues to manage issues well, speaks to staff about problems and all notes on NOMIS are positive. He continues to discuss issues and concerns with his POM and other*

staff, as well as completing his thought diaries and reflections to help him to manage any problems or negative feelings, demonstrating a positive approach to problems. There are currently no concerns regarding his supervision and engagement."

2.5. [Name redacted] is WD's current POM. All her evidence was considered in the **Open Session**. She has provided 2 reports and a recent update (another positive entry in WD's records since her second report). The hallmark of the reports is that they continue to reveal the compliant and obedient conduct of previous placements and no adjudications or MDTs, negative MDTs since then, and continuing positive case notes. There is 1 negative entry where WD was verbally abusive to a PO who was bullying other prisoners.

2.6. The concluding paragraphs (at p. 853 et seq. of the dossier) set out why [the current POM] is of the opinion that WD meets the statutory test for release and why she now prefers that way forward as a recommendation. She states: "*the risk management plan that is in place offers significantly more monitoring, supervision and intervention than would be available to him in the Open estate and would therefore be more effective at managing the risk he poses."*

2.7. Her second report (P. 851: September 2026) reports on how WD has coped with his grief regarding his son. It is quite clear to all those responsible for the management of WD that having re-established his relationship with his son after a very long time when there was no contact, his son suddenly died in tragic circumstances. WD was thought to be so affected by the bereavement that he was briefly place on an ACCT. Referring to the ACCT and how WD was so grief stricken [sensitive information redacted] [the current POM] reports that the attempt was "*about feeling in control of his life and taking control of his destiny*." At that time, he felt that he was unable to "*face progression"* in prison without his son. However, she describes how he manged to show good insight and the bereavement counselling in January was concluded to good effect. The ACCT was quickly removed. One important feature to emerge was that WD was driven to realise how difficult the loss of her daughter has been to Mrs. Ming.

2.8. The Panel has referred to WD's evidence about his son in para 1.74 (supra).

2.9. [The current POM] described how WD had coped over the last year, dealing with the sudden loss of his son, and how it had guided her conclusions: "*he has shown an ability to cope*." Her report goes into greater depth (see p. 469 et seq.): "*At times this has resulted in him isolating and withdrawing from staff as well as unfairly directing his anger at them. However, he has consistently engaged with me during this time."*

2.10. [The current POM] explained how WD came to change his job. He had previously worked in the gardens. He had contacted [name redacted], his son, and then, last August he learnt that he had died. He has not learnt how, and in what circumstances, but knew there was to be an [sensitive information redacted]. She told the Panel that he struggled with his grief and was experiencing the normal aspects of grieving. However, at times this had resulted in him isolating and withdrawing from staff as well as unfairly directing his anger

at them but still managing to engage with [his current POM]. He was self-neglecting and not eating and was briefly subject to an ACCT. As he ascertained more details about the death he began to cope. This triggered a rebuilding of his relationship with [name redacted], and a deeper understanding of the loss Mrs. Ming had suffered with the death of Julie Hogg.

2.11. [The current POM] told the Panel that it "*had been a really difficult time for WD…and he struggled…the staff on the unit were not compassionate..*" Since then, however he had received bereavement counselling (see p. 944 of the dossier: a statement from the Counsellor) and managed his grief well, talking openly to [his current POM] and, as she confirmed, seeking out support.

2.12. She explained in evidence how WD successfully negotiated the structure of the Staged progression regime at HMP [prison name redacted], describing how it works in some detail (see p. 468 et seq,). Stage 3 is described thus: "*a Stage 3 resident is a resident who is evidencing that they understand the things that have led to their previous offending and to their problems with compliance. They will have insight into their own risk and what is required for a reduction in risk of recall/reoffending. They will be evidencing their ability to manage these factors (i.e., clear presence of the behavioural indicators of* ***risk reduction*** *and not simply an absence of evidence of negative behaviour). They will be engaging well with staff, taking on board feedback, and showing they are able to put this feedback into practice. They will be working pro-actively toward release by engaging with their Prison Offender Manager and Community Offender Manager (if appropriate), discussing with them their risk management and relapse prevention plans for release. These Residents will also be pro-actively involved in positive aspects of the regime, such as evening activities and charity work, demonstrating that they want to be a part of and enhance the community ethos of the progression regime."* From his arrival at HMP [prison name redacted] in December 2022 that it took WD only 10 months to reach Stage 3, where he remains.

2.13. [The current POM] explained how WD had made good use of the PDP (Personal Development Plan) as a mentor for other prisoners (see below), how his compliance was good and that, generally, Mr Dunlop continues to engage well with both his keyworker, and her, in order to explore the management of his risk factors. She told the Panel that he is willing to discuss these areas and will provide examples of any challenging situations that have arisen and will reflect on how he has dealt with these (see her first report at p. 466 et seq.).

2.14. [The current POM] had considered whether it would be appropriate to recommend a transfer to the open estate but had concluded that release to a supporting AP (either an enhanced AP or a PIPE) and a sound RMP would provide greater support. She had attended the MAPPA meeting in August which had discussed WD's case (see below). She said that on release WD would benefit from a "*therapeutic environment"* with "*skilled forensic practitioners*" and restricting licence conditions, including polygraph testing. Her report, at p. 858 sets out all the advantages of the enhanced AP[], which she favours: [licence conditions

redacted] curfews; daily signing in; movement logs; GPS and/or trail monitoring; drug and alcohol testing; room searches; polygraph testing; an NSD psychologist and personal relationships.

2.15. [The current POM] also suggested that WD would benefit from a period (3 months) in the [unit name redacted] at HMP [prison name redacted] if there was a release decision and a period when arrangements were being put in place for when he could go to the AP. [Unit name redacted] replicates life in [RMP details redacted] within the confines of the prison: more freedom of movement; check in times; own keys, a kitchen, a bathroom and a sitting room, and a room of their own, all in a separate unit.

2.16. The Panel notes the comments of the Secretary of State in the submissions drawn by Mr. Jones at p.1001, which Mr. Kingham has commented on at p 1007, para 26 of the dossier. The Panel was told that [unit name redacted] is designed to give released prisoners a glimpse of life outside the confines of a prison. WD has been in prison for 28 years. The Panel understands that the unit is designed to assist a long-time detained prisoner. It is quite clear to the Panel that the decision to place him there does not contradict the findings of the professionals.

2.17. [The current POM] reported that WD had seen the TV drama about his case, featuring (it is said, principally, Mrs Ming) and "*he expressed a huge amount of guilt and shame after watching it."* However, there were no adverse reactions after he had seen it, she said.

2.18. [The current POM] told the Panel that there was no evidence of "*impression management*" and no evidence of "*live*" risk factors such as substance misuse or problems with being "*challenged*" or "*feeling belittled*." She was able to comment favourably on WD's "*emotional self-regulation*." She told the Panel that WD had protective factors, such as insight, good coping skills, and a positive attitude towards professionals. In her opinion there was no need for more time being observed in custody. She agreed with the actuarial risk assessments.

2.19. She was asked by Mr. Jones why she was not concerned about WD being released into the community when he had "*no support*." She said that WD would have a "*therapeutic environment"* and the assistance of his COM, adding that "*he is very good at seeking out support*." He has an ability to "*self-report*." Her opinion was that she was in support of WD's application for release.

2.20. She told the Panel that there was no more core risk reduction to undertake and that she supported WD's application for release. "*He meets the statutory test*." She said that WD has consolidated his skills – and applied them. She added, later, that if he had been struggling to implement his skills "*they would have seen it*." He has "*good insight*" into his offending and into his schemas. There was no evidence of any active risk factors. WD will seek help from the professionals when necessary. WD's warning signs, if they manifested themselves, were, she said, "*easily detectable by professionals*."

2.21. WD told the Panel about life at HMP [prison name redacted]. Having been at Stage 3 for 3 years he is now subject to a minimal level of security and works as

a painter having moved on from market gardening, a move which helped him recover from the death of his son. The Panel notes that records show that WD has acquired a wide range of qualifications over the years (see the contents of his Release Plan at pp.887 – 888).

2.22. For a time, he explained he was helping fellow prisoners in the role of a mentor under the PDP scheme (Personal Development Plan), a responsible position in the prison.

2.23. A security report dated November 2025 is a positive read and outlines how WD has engaged in "*multiple group sessions*" from 4xSMART Recovery" to Healthy Relationships and Coping with Knockbacks (see p. 460 of the dossier). He has engaged well with Phoenix Futures completing a relapse plan in February 2024 (see pp. 458 et seq. and the previous positive report at p. 317). His file was suspended in January 2025 as it was agreed that there was no further substance misuse support needed and he had developed the necessary tools and strategies to manage his recovery independently. He has not drunk alcohol since 1997. His last adjudication was in November 2010 (fighting) and, of course, he has retained his enhanced status for many years.

2.24. The Panel reminds itself that it cannot be overlooked that since his move to HMP [prison name redacted] in 2018 and his re-categorisation to Category C, WD has received assessments from psychologists which indicate that no core risk reduction work was then necessary and has never since been thought to be necessary: a situation which has not altered in 7/8 years. In consequence those report writers supported a move to the open estate. See [previous Psychologist]: report page 202, February 2019 at p. 258, and [previous Psychologist 2] report p.262, May 2021 at page 279.

2.25. The Panel regards these continuing positive assessments as a preliminary guide to the current assessment of risk. They cannot be overlooked. More particularly they clearly indicate how WD was screened out of further core risk reduction work such as undertaking the [programme redacted] intervention (see the report from [previous psychologist 2] at p. 305, for example). This matter is reviewed by the Panel when considering the evidence provided by the current psychologists in the light of the findings relating to allegations made by the previous panel.

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

3.1. The Panel reminds itself that there has been no evidence of violence in custody by WD since 2015. The Panel examined the current assessed levels of risk. In the most recent OASys report the actuarial assessments are as follows. The OASys dynamic Reoffending Predictors are: **All Reoffending**: 30.33% - **Low**; **Violent Reoffending**: 22.76: **Low**; **Serious Violent reoffending**: 0.84%: **Low**.

3.2. Direct Contact – Sexual Reoffending: **Low**. Images and Indirect Sexual Contact: **Low**. **COMBINED SERIOUS REOFFENDING PREDICTOR: CSRP:** 1.63%: **Medium**.

3.3. The OASys assessment of the **Risk of Serious Harm** (ROSH) sets out (at p. 835 of the dossier) as follows: **Public: High,** and a **Known Adult**: **High**; Children: **Medium**; all other assessments are **Low**. **SARA** assessment (at p.840 of the dossier: **High** risk to **partners** and **public**.

3.4. Two psychologists have assessed the current risk WD presents. The current prison instructed psychologist, [name redacted] (Chartered Forensic Psychologist), who has worked with the prison service since 2002 and prepared reports for the last panel (having considered their findings of fact: see pp 322 – 5/2024 and p. 377 (12/2024) of the dossier). She reported again for the current Panel whereby she reviewed her previous assessments and considered WD's conduct since the last decision of the Parole Board in March 2025 (see p. 675 of the dossier). She told the Panel that she had spent, in all, *"40 hours"* with WD.

3.5. [Name redacted] (Clinical Psychologist) was independently instructed to report on behalf of WD by Mr. Kingham. No independent report was prepared for the last panel. Her report is at p. 734 of the dossier.

3.6. The psychologists used the same actuarial assessment tools: HCR20-v3 (risk of sexual violence and of intimate partner violence; sexual violence protocol: RSVP-2 and SARA v3. They both also used SAPROF to identify protective factors in this case. The evidence from the psychologists was unanimous. They prepared a **Joint Report** which is at p. 945 of the dossier. The assessed levels of violence appear at p. 946. In general, using the tools at their disposal they concluded that WD's risk in custody is **Low**, and in the community: **Moderate**.

3.7. When considering imminency, at p.946 they conclude that any future risk is "*not imminent*." This conclusion would only be altered if WD encountered "*relationship difficulties*" and "*he did not use his insight and repertoire of healthy coping strategies he has acquired*."

3.8. [The current COM] contended that the ROSH scores and the Predictor scores were, in his opinion, accurate. He told Mr. Kingham that one would expect to see an assessed High risk of serious harm towards previously identified classes of person until an offender had been in the community for some two years or more. The High-risk assessment was not surprising to him, nor to the Panel. The Panel is aware that the historic assessment is customarily used to ensure proper management of the offender in the community, as a precaution. The critical issue is whether the totality of any extant and observable risk factors can be managed in the community.

3.9. [The current Prison Psychologist] and [current Prisoner Commissioned Psychologist] (along with the POM and COM) have reviewed WD's conduct both before and since the last panel hearing and factored in the loss of his son. They state: "*We both agree that Mr Dunlop's risk to the general public seems to have lowered over the years. We feel he has shown enormous resilience and largely*

consistent application of his healthy coping skills over the past 12 months in the face of significant loss and interpersonal difficulties". They comment on the SAPROF findings (assessment of protective factors) and the RMP recommendations. They have concluded that there is no core risk reduction work to be undertaken and "*it is time for him to progress."*

3.10. They state: "*We agree the proposed risk management plan is very robust and considers all risk potential, such as restrictions to Mr Dunlop's contact with past and current partners, children, tagging, and exclusion zones. We feel the risk management plan will offer more intensive levels of scrutiny and observations in Mr Dunlop's risk management than he would receive in open conditions, which we agree is a clear disadvantage of that pathway.*

3.11. They conclude: "*We are both currently of the opinion that Mr Dunlop meets the test for release and we would both support his release, i.e., that there is no more than a minimal risk that he would commit a further offence that could cause serious harm to the public if released. Our opinion is based on the lack of imminency of his risk of sexual and non-sexual violence, the lack of offence paralleling behaviours for many years, his impressive insight into his risk, and the very robust risk management plan in place."*

3.12. Having regard to their expressed unanimity, which, in the experience of the Panel, is not common, the Panel closely examined the experts in both the open and closed session.

3.13. **Psychologists: Open Session:** The psychologists each told the Panel that "*they largely agreed on every area*." They explained how they understood WD had come to do what he did as a younger person. They both recommended release and they took the view that there was, in place, a *"helpful release plan."* In their view the warning signs would be "*quite evident*."

3.14. They were each asked if they had heard anything during the hearing to alter their views. They said: "*No*." They said that they thought that WD had candidly "*answered anything he was asked*." The Panel was told that they had concluded that he had reflected on the views of the Secretary of State since the last hearing and *"reflection has been achieved…. last year showed how he was able to manage a significant event…."*

3.15. In their recent sessions with WD they had witnessed no "*manipulation, deceit, or dishonesty, nor minimisation…"* His emotional responses were "*consistent…as was his narrative".* There was "*no recent evidence of fabrication of symptoms or misleading or exaggerated information."* Nor was there any evidence WD had resorted to using a *"script*," as put by Mr. Kingham. As [current Prisoner Commissioned Psychologist], commented, when asked, WD "*would have to cover every eventuality*."

3.16. Their views on WD's protective factors were expressed as follows: *"empathy towards others;" "PDP – work with other people;" "self-management skills;" "reflections on previous behaviours,"* and *"a strong protective factor- his ability to discuss matters with professionals."*

3.17. The Panel were concerned to examine whether there were any outstanding treatment needs, particularly in the light of the findings of the previous panel. The experts told the Panel that having regard to the use of the RSVP tool there was "*no need for more intensive work than has been done to date."* They indicated how they had reviewed their "**coding**" and explained that there was, in this case "*a diverse range of offending*" which had been factored into the calculations.

3.18. Mr. Jones pressed the witnesses. The experts confirmed that they had taken into account the many findings in their assessment of the risk WD presents. Mr. Jones sought to suggest that if WD was being "*untruthful*" that must undermine their findings. They explained that their formulation is based on assessments which allow for them to code as "*present*" or "*partially present*." This factors in the findings of fact made regarding allegations denied by WD. The Panel was told "*it does not change our overall risk assessment*."

3.19. When asked about these matters [current Prisoner Commissioned Psychologist], referred Mr. Jones to p.750 of the dossier and the allegations regarding name redacted] which had concluded [outcome redacted]. There she sets out: "*There is limited information regarding them, so it is hard to confidently score whether psychological coercion featured or explicit acts of violence. It could be hypothesized that this was likely given Mr Dunlop was an [role redacted].*

3.20. Regarding unproved IPV allegations she adds: *"The alleged sexual violence against [name redacted] suggests possible evidence of physical coercion and evidence of psychological coercion (as he reports using emotional blackmail to get sex). Denial and minimization do not in themselves raise risk concerns, but these features can lead to uncertainty and can make it more challenging to ensure risk features are addressed. Mr Dunlop has previously completed very in-depth offence focused work, and I agree with previous psychological views that the risk drivers and motivations for these alleged incidents of sexual violence were likely similar to his other sexual and non-sexual offending and addressed by the facilitators in the SOTP (who had knowledge of these allegations*)."

3.21. Mr. Kingham invited the psychologists to consider whether the last year for WD, which he, Mr. Kingham described as "*turbulent*," should affect the ROSH assessment and the test for release. They said *"no*." Moreover, the experts said when asked by Mr. Kingham, should there be no decision for release there was, in the judgement of the experts "*a wholly persuasive case*" for a move to the open estate.

3.22. **Closed Evidence: Psychologist/s evidence [Redacted]**

3.23. His later report altered that view. He explained why. [The current COM] gave evidence in both the Open and Closed sessions of the hearing.

3.24. In the **Open Session** he told the Panel that as he heard the evidence it was clear to him that WD would mobilise his support network and reach out. Moreover, he added, he "*has a real grasp of what he is talking about, for example, his protective factors*. He will challenge himself so that he does not hold himself

in low esteem. He had no concerns that WD was engaging in "*impression management*."

3.25. [The current COM] had now arrived at the conclusion that there was no need for WD to spend any more time in the closed estate, nor the open estate. The reasons he gave in evidence (explaining the view he had arrived at in his report at p.775 et seq. of the dossier: an extensive review which has been carefully considered by the Panel) were that, for example, if WD was in the open estate he would not be eligible for the assistance provided by, for example PERS – if needed (see below para. 3.64). [The current COM] said that he had reconsidered his earlier view and he was now of the opinion that his risk could be managed in the community. The strategies WD had in place were "*robust enough*."

3.26. He told the Panel that in his opinion there were no active live risk factors. *"He had addressed everything he need to cover…. all his risk factors;" a*dding, by way of example, substance misuse; old me thinking, and his sexual offending, all of which had been adequately addressed. There were "*no outstanding treatment needs*." He pointed out that during his custodial sentence WD's poor behaviour had "*receded*" and he had a "*good insight into his risk."* In his written reports he had stated that there was no evidence of violence in his conduct, nor substance misuse, nor any evidence in his journals of unhealthy sexual thoughts and, overall, he had demonstrated "*honesty with the professionals."*

3.27. [The current COM] was asked about the suggestion that WD may seek to manipulate people. He said he had no evidence of this: "*not in my time*," he added. Nor was he "*disingenuous"*, said REDACTED/COM. "*What he has told me has always been true. There was no evidence of deceit or dishonesty."* He had no concerns about WD's presentation or his "*self-image*."

3.28. Mr. Jones challenged [The current COM] regarding the historic evidence of "*minimising*" and "*manipulation*." REDACTED/COM told the Panel that he had seen no evidence of this. It was pointed out that this conduct was evident in his answers to the allegations against him. Mr. Jones added that "*this suggests WD continued to seek to manipulate."* [The current COM] told the Panel that he was referring to WD's "*behaviours…what could be observed*." Mr. Jones pressed [The current COM] pointing to the witness evidence to the Panel in 2024, suggesting WD had "*not been truthful"*. REDACTED/COM said that he was giving evidence about the behaviour of WD "*we can observe now*."

3.29. [The current COM] opinion, as he told the Panel was that it was no longer necessary for the protection of the public that WD should remain confined. He poses "*no more than a minimal risk,"* he said. He added that he had "*moved away*" from his erstwhile view that WD should move to the open estate because there had been a "*positive response*" to the events of last year (the death of his son) and his risk could now be managed in the community. There was now, he added, "*a wholly persuasive case for release*."

3.30. [The current COM]was asked about the warning signs. These would be, for example, if the journal was not being written up; but, WD was, he said "*a slow burner*" and the signs would be apparent. He said that, in consequence, all the

licence conditions were proportionate and necessary. No other conditions needed to be added. GPS monitoring would go on for 18 months.

3.31. The Panel considers the licence conditions below.

3.32. **Closed Evidence: COM evidence [Redacted]**

3.33. **William Dunlop Evidence** WD was asked about the last decision and the letter from the Secretary of State. He said "*it had happened before*" and when he received it he asked those responsible for his management: "*How do we move forward*." He gave an example of how he had changed. He had received a report from his COM in preparation for this hearing, which recommended release. He was talking about it when a young man came over and butted in. WD suggested to him that he was not being respectful. The young man threatened him and asked what are you going to do about it. WD said" *I'm going to do absolutely nothing*." He told the Panel that he does not get emotional now and he feels most proud of that.

3.34. He was asked about what piece of work he found the most useful. He told the Panel that he found "*bits from every course*" to be helpful. The most significant were teaching on primary and secondary emotions. He told the Panel about the diary (the "Journal") he does every day which the Panel examined it (as noted above). It is very detailed and logs events, emotions, and feelings. "*It tells me where I am in my head,"* he said. "*I know how to cope*." He said he was not interested in "*hurting people*." He had a "*joy"* helping people.

3.35. He then added that [sensitive personal information redacted]." He said that the bereavement had had an enormous impact. name redacted he said, was going to be a major part of his life. He felt he could now face up to "*any obstacle after what had happened to me*." He had done a lot of reflecting on his life and the event (paradoxically) had "*given him hope*." Since the last hearing WD had changed even more because the death [name redacted] had provided the opportunity for those responsible for him in prison to see a lot more of him than before. He added: "*I won't hold back on things*."

3.36. The death [name redacted] had occurred last year, as the reports reveal. [Redacted sensitive information.]

3.37. As the Panel has noted after [name redacted] death, it was observed that WD [Redacted sensitive information] (later removed after bereavement counselling started: see the report from the counsellors at p. 944 of the dossier). Some negative IEPs were issued by unsympathetic prison officers (as the Panel was told) but later rescinded by a Governor. WD was permitted to change his job to provide distance from other prisoners. He has recovered, and overcome grief, to great extent, it would appear, from his evidence and the evidence of the POM, but the loss of [name redacted] has had long term sequelae. Of importance (as revealed by the POM and COM) WD can now relate to Mrs. Ming's loss of her daughter. He told that to the Panel. Moreover, the experience has brought him to realise that "*he can manage himself in the most stressful of situations*." He is

proud over how he has "*turned his life around*." This has not been lost on those responsible for him.

3.38. The 2025 Journals reported on his hope of building and establishing a positive relationship with [name redacted]; his work round the wing; work with AA and the over 50's group and the park runs. [Closed evidence redacted].

3.39. WD told the Panel that he had read the Licence Conditions and had no problem with any of them. He explained, in great detail, what he would do if he met another woman. He explained what would trigger the need to speak to those responsible for his management and what he might have to say to any woman he met - more than fleetingly. He clearly understood the obligations imposed.

3.40. WD said that he understood the reasons for the exclusion zones. [location redacted unless permitted, [location redacted] respecting the wishes of [name redated]. He would build his life in the [location redacted] area starting with the AP. Alcohol was, he said, a *"no no"* (he still attends AA and will continue to do so). He had every intention of engaging with the RMP and the part that IIRMS would play, and all the other aspects of life in a [location redacted] for at least 12 months. In particular he was content to be monitored in the tagging processes for the 18-month period (if required) and work with those responsible for his management, reporting when and at whatever time he was required so to do and undertaking polygraph testing.

3.41. WD told the Panel that he was aware of his warning signs and he "*would tell them"* (people responsible for him). Age and maturation had "*played a part*," as had his overall health, to the changes he has made. He insisted that he was not a risk to the public. He was ready for release. He can "*relate to the man who came into prison*."

3.42. He told the Panel that he had reflected on the letter from the Secretary of State after the last hearing and he thought the added period in closed conditions had been "*beneficia*l." He was prepared to discuss "*whatever was put in front of me*." He would continue with his journals, and they would be open to anyone who wanted to read them.

3.43. WD said that he was happy to go to [location redacted] if release was directed. The Panel considered the detailed Release Plan prepared by [The current COM] (and MAPPA) and WD's Release Plan information (pp. 884 – 943 of the dossier) in which WD sets out in great detail his hopes and expectations for the future, living in the community in the area he will be residing in. Therein he charts support organisations, places where he might find work and the skills he has acquired in prison to gain employment (see for example p.799 and p.887 of the dossier (skills)): and see also, for example, at p. 896: "Strategies to Manage/overcome Setbacks").

3.44. The Panel had ample opportunity to consider the evidence provided by WD in the open and closed sessions. He was quiet, reflective, and careful in his responses. He did not manifest any troubling characteristics. There was no evidence of impression management, nor disingenuity, nor, for that matter, open

hostility, which is frequently seen in oral hearings. The Panel was satisfied that WD confirmed the opinions formed of him by those responsible for his management and those who had been instructed to assess his level of risk.

3.45. The Panel has carefully explored the RMP. The Panel is mindful that WD is being released into a world he has not inhabited for 28 years but he will have some time in [location redated], where a place awaits. Moreover, when he is taken to the AP in [location redacted] it is clear that those responsible for him believe that he will have a clear understanding of the boundaries placed upon him. The Panel agrees.

3.46. The Panel has referred to the Licence Conditions in the course of reviewing the evidence presented to it by the various witnesses. There are 19. The Panel's judgement is that they are all necessary and proportionate and WD has a complete understanding of them.

4. Conclusion

4.1. The Panel has carefully considered the submissions made by Mr. Jones and Mr. Kingham, both the submissions lodged prior to the hearing and those lodged following its conclusion. The Panel is grateful to both of them for the assistance they have provided and for the way they approached the management of the Public Hearing. Having regard to the Panel's conclusions arising out of the evidence presented to them the Panel has considered Mr. Jones' submissions with rather more detail than those provided by Mr. Kingham.

4.2. It is a matter of regret that Mr. Jones, on behalf of the Secretary of State has not assisted the Panel with how they might approach the totality of the evidence which arrives at the same conclusion, namely "Release". To direct that WD should remain in closed conditions the Panel would be driven to reject the conclusions of report writers.

4.3 The Panel has also carefully reviewed the evidence of the professionals and has not found them, any one of them, to be ill informed or contradictory in their views and conclusions about WD. The witnesses have all gained a considerable amount of knowledge about him. Nor, in the judgement of the Panel did the professionals demonstrate any disposition towards bias. Moreover, their views are supported by an overarching MAPPA report which the Secretary of State (from the SoS's observer's report) could assess whether the law enforcement agencies had, in some way arrived at an ill-informed conclusion.

4.4 Mr. Kingham quite properly refers to the unanimity of the evidence and the Panel agrees. Indeed, having had the opportunity to view the witnesses, if the Panel were to come to a different view it would render itself open to a suggestion that its conclusion was irrational. It is not the first time that a panel, reviewing WD's progress, has referred to the "universality" of the opinions of report writers. In this case the Panel found the evidence of report writers to be convincing and given by witnesses who were impressive and not, ostensibly, disposed towards bias.

4.5 Panels of the Parole Board are frequently criticised for arriving at a decision which is said to be "irrational", when the Panel rejects well held unanimous views of those responsible for the management of a prisoner, particularly about the risk a prisoner presents and whether it can be managed in the community. Sadly, whilst Mr. Jones conducted himself and his arguments with great skill he has not addressed these issues in his closing submissions. Aliter, this may have assisted the Secretary of State, who will no doubt review the conclusions of the Panel.

4.6. Mr. Kingham outlined the case for WD. He emphasises the quality of the RMP following years of good behaviour. As he puts it: "*The panel heard extensive and cogent evidence as to why taking into account the totality of the material that Mr. Dunlop meets the statutory release test"* ……adding: "*The professionals were probed in detail, and all cogently explained their recommendations. Of course, the panel is not bound to accept the recommendations, but we seek to persuade there is no reason not to. Risk is well understood and there are no current live risk factors.*

4.7. With respect to the arguments put by Mr. Jones, the Panel has concluded that Mr. Kingham's submissions are correct.

4.8. The Panel is mindful of the feelings of the victim (s), particularly Mrs Ming, who take the view that WD should never be released. The Panel fully understands their feelings and has great sympathy with their views. Mrs Ming, Ms. Hogg's sister and her son Kevin will have enormous difficulty being persuaded that WD has, in the judgement of the Panel, served his punishment and been rehabilitated. However, if a prisoner presents as a person who, on the totality of the evidence available to the Panel, meets the statutory test for release then the Panel is obliged by law to conclude that his release must be directed.

4.9. Finally, this: the Panel has considered the decision of Mrs. Justice Cheema-Grubb DBE in the case of Secretary of State -v- Glyn Razzell [2026] EWHC 2172 (ADMIN) where the provisions of s.32ZAA Crime (Sentences) Act 1997 are considered for the first time. The Panel notes that the Panel's decision to release Mr. Razzell was not upheld. There, the issues were different, but the underlying principles were made clear by the learned Judge.

4.10 The Panel has had regard to the matters referred to by Cheema – Grubb J. at paragraphs 27 – 33 where she states: "*It is not whether the Board's decision was irrational, procedurally unfair or erroneous in law. It is not whether the decision was reasonably open to the Board to make. The statutory question for the High Court is whether it is satisfied that it is no longer necessary for the protection of the public that the prisoner should be confined. That is an independent statutory task, although the Board's decision, its reasoning, and the evidence before it will ordinarily be highly relevant to the court's work. The Secretary of State must consider, among other matters, whether release would be likely to undermine public confidence in the parole system and whether the High Court might not be satisfied that continued confinement is no longer necessary. Once the case is before the court for hearing, the court must apply the statutory public protection test for itself. The Secretary of State must*

consider, among other matters, whether release would be likely to undermine public confidence in the parole system and whether the High Court might not be satisfied that continued confinement is no longer necessary. Once the case is before the court for hearing, the court must apply the statutory public protection test for itself."

4.11 It is of course a matter for the Secretary of State to seek to have the Panel decision reviewed if he or she so chooses. However, the Panel has had the advantage of seeing and hearing the witnesses, and, in particular, WD. The Panel has concluded, as set out at the outset, that WD meets the statutory test for release. Applying the terms of the test as set out in Annex B (below) 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". The Panel is of the view that its decision to release WD, after the time he has spent in custody and process of rehabilitation he has steadfastly pursued would not, in the judgment of this experienced panel, undermine the confidence of the public in the parole system. Accordingly, the Panel directs his release.

LICENCE CONDITIONS (in addition to standard licence conditions)

The Panel considers the following licence conditions to be both necessary and proportionate for the management of risk in the community:

1. You shall confine yourself to an address approved by your supervising officer between the hours of 08:00 pm and 06:00 am daily unless otherwise authorised by your supervising officer.

This condition will be reviewed by your supervising officer on a **monthly** basis and may be amended or removed if it is felt that the level of risk that you present has reduced appropriately.

2. You shall report to staff at nominated Approved Premises [location redacted] at 11am and 3pm daily, unless otherwise authorised by your supervising officer. This condition will be reviewed by your supervising officer on a **monthly** basis and may be amended or removed if it is felt that the level of risk you present has reduced appropriately.

3. You shall not undertake work, or a particular type of work, unless it is approved by the supervising officer and notify the supervising officer in advance of any proposal to undertake work or a particular type of work.

4. You shall not have unsupervised contact with any children under the age of 18 years without the prior approval of your supervising officer except where that

contact is inadvertent and not reasonably avoidable in the course of lawful daily life.

5. You shall not enter the areas of [location redacted], [location redacted], and [location redacted] as defined by the attached maps without the prior approval of your supervising officer.

6. You shall not to seek to approach or communicate with [name redacted] or any member of Ms Julie Hogg's family without the prior approval of your supervising officer.

7. [Drug and alcohol licence condition – specific details redacted].

8. You shall attend appointments, as directed, to address your dependency on, or propensity to misuse, a controlled drug.

9. You shall not delete the usage history on any internet enabled device or computer used and to allow such items to be inspected as required by the police or your OM. Such inspection may include removal of the device for inspection and the installation of monitoring software.

10. You shall comply with any instruction given by your supervising officer requiring you to attend polygraph examination and participate in polygraph sessions and examinations, as instructed by or under the authority of your supervising officer, and comply with any instruction given to you during a polygraph session by the person conducting the polygraph.

11. You shall notify your supervising officer of any developing personal relationships, whether intimate or not, with any person you know or believe to be resident in a household containing children under the age of 18. This includes persons known to you prior to your time in custody with whom you are renewing or developing a personal relationship with.

12. You shall not reside (not even to stay for one night) in the same household as any child under the age of 18 without the prior approval of your supervising officer.

13. You shall notify your supervising officer of any developing relationships (male or female), including the ending of any relationships.

14. You shall not contact or associate with a known sex offender other than when compelled by attendance at a Treatment Programme or when residing at Approved Premises without the prior approval of your supervising officer.

15. You shall comply with any requirements specified by your supervising officer for the purpose of ensuring that you address your sexual and violent offending behaviour problems.

16. You shall provide your supervising officer with details (such as make, model, colour, registration) of any vehicle you own, hire for more than a short journey, or have regular use of, prior to any journey taking place.

17. You shall allow person(s) as designated by your supervising officer to install an electronic monitoring tag on you and access to install any associated equipment in your property, and for the purpose of ensuring that equipment is functioning correctly. You must not damage or tamper with these devices and ensure that the tag is charged, and report to your supervising officer and the EM provider immediately if the tag or the associated equipment is not working correctly. This will be for the purpose of monitoring your exclusion zone and location monitoring licence condition(s) unless otherwise authorised by your supervising officer.

18. You will be subject to trail monitoring. Your whereabouts will be electronically monitored by GPS Satellite Tagging, ending on (date 18 months from his release), and you must cooperate with the monitoring as directed by your supervising officer unless otherwise authorised by your supervising officer.

19. You shall allow person(s) as designated by your supervising officer to install an electronic monitoring tag on you at HMP [prison name redacted] and access to install any associated equipment in your property, and for the purpose of ensuring that equipment is functioning correctly. You must not damage or tamper with these devices and ensure that the tag is charged, and report to your supervising officer immediately if the tag or the associated equipment is not working correctly.

20. On release, you shall be escorted by the Prisoner Escort Custody Service (PECS) to nominated Approved Premises.

Annex B

the Parole Board
working with others to protect the public

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.*

<u>TACT Prisoners</u>

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.*

<u>Foreign National Prisoners</u>

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.*

the Parole Board
working with others to protect the public

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. 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)

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.

Setting Aside

This case is eligible for Setting Aside under Rule 28A of the Parole Board Rules 2019 (as amended). Applications can be made to set aside a release decision once the decision has become final.

The Parole Board (Amendment) Rules 2025 removed errors of law or fact as grounds for setting aside final decisions. This means that only directions to release a prisoner can be set aside.

Applications to set aside a decision must be sent to settingaside@paroleboard.gov.uk. We do not accept applications made to any other email address.
Further guidance and an application form for prisoners is provided on the Parole Board section of the Gov.uk Website Routes of challenge - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Setting aside Parole Board decisions to release

A decision *to release* may be set aside prior to the release of the prisoner, but not once the prisoner has been released into the community.

The Parole Board has the power to set aside a release decision, where the case meets the following criteria:

- Where a direction has been given by the Parole Board for the release of a prisoner that the Parole Board determines it would not have given if:

    i. information that was not available to the Board when the direction was given had been so available, or
    ii. a change in circumstances relating to the prisoner that occurred after the direction was given, had occurred before it was given.

Time Limits

An application to set aside can be made at any time from the date the decision became final up until release takes place.

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 set aside application, both parties will be notified of the outcome. If the application is granted, the decision will set out what happens next. If the application is rejected, the decision remains final.