

*Yorkshire and Humberside No Recourse to Public Funds
Regional Meeting*

30th September 2008 (14:00 to 16:00)

Leeds Civic Hall

Attendance:

Bradford (Chair)
Leeds
Sheffield
Rotherham
Kirklees
Barnsley
Home Office

Apologies

Wakefield
Calderdale
North Lincs

1. Bradford opened the meeting and made introductions. The group was reminded of the forthcoming NRPF/Red Cross Conference which was to be held in Leeds on 7th October.
2. The Minutes of the last meeting were agreed. No matters arising.
3. **Brief Regional reports:**

Leeds was concerned about the cost burden on local authorities.

Bradford reported that it is supporting approximately 100 cases, with approximately 2/3rd in Children's Services and 1/3rd in Adult services. This includes economic migrants, chronically sick and disabled asylum seekers, and overstayers and women claiming to flee DV. Barnsley asked about the length of support, and Bradford reported that this varies but some cases were being dealt with more quickly.

Kirklees reported that the decision making process was speeding up. Continuing issues in Kirklees included incidents between various groups, and single people with NRPF. The second group was often "off radar". It was understood that, in the near future, many Section 4 clients may lose their support.

Barnsley reported a large number of Section 4 families, and concern about what problems would arise if and when they got a decision.

Sheffield shared the problems that Kirklees reported, with more decisions in the last quarter and that numbers hadn't altered much. They were supporting many who were chronically sick with mental health problems. They reported good relations with the UK Border Agency.

Rotherham reported a shared budget to support NRPF claimants and a Common Assessment Form to be used to collect information.

4. **Slough Judgement:**

Rotherham reported on the Slough Judgement and its applicability to a wider constituency than HIV/AIDS sufferers.

Sheffield recommended that each authority seek an opinion from its legal department then, as a group, we can discuss further.

5. **Domestic Violence:**

Sheffield asked what other authorities did about single people claiming DV.

Kirklees felt it was beneficial if claimants were seen by the police, but claimants could not be forced to report incidents to the police.

Claimants should have a clear evidentiary trail to support claims for leave to remain, including medical evidence, police evidence and any evidence from Court.

In the Khan case the court ruled that there wasn't a power for an authority to support if the problem was confined to destitution. Only an OISC regulated immigration adviser can give immigration advice, and claimants must seek immigration advice from an OISC regulated immigration adviser.

Our role is confined to providing support when we have a duty to do so.

Barnsley reported many Section 4 cases and foresaw problems.

UKBA reported work in Leeds on legacy cases and attempts to speed it up, with business as usual for Section 4 cases.

6. **Common Assessment:**

Rotherham introduced a *pro forma*. The form is designed to prompt relevant questions.

Other authorities have done similar work, and Bradford and Rotherham will pull together existing work.

7. **Any Other Business:**

Leeds asked about a training programme seen advertised in the NRPF Briefing which might be of interest to the group, (<http://tinyurl.com/5pkdut>), and it was agreed that we'd make further enquiries.

It was agreed that a legal update might be a regular agenda item.

Rotherham suggested that the group should look at ways of identifying and sharing good practice.

It was suggested that UKBA open future meetings with an update.

8. Date of next meeting:

09.12.2008