

JERSEY / JUDGMENT

In the matter of VV (Secure Accommodation Order)

Source: jerseylaw.je · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

Secure Accommodation Order [2025]JRC027 Royal Court (Samedi) 28 January 2025 Before : R. J. MacRae, Esq., Deputy Bailiff, and Jurats Blampied and Pitman Between Minister for Children and Families Applicant And A (the Mother) First Respondent B (the Father) Second Respondent And VV (the Child) (through her Advocate Chris Hillier) Third Respondent IN THE MATTER OF VV (SECURE ACCOMMODATION ORDER) AND IN THE MATTER OF THE CHILDREN (JERSEY) LAW 2002 Advocate J. A. E. Kerley for the Minister. Advocates A Binnie (8 November) and J-A Dix (12 November) for the First Respondent. Advocate M. R. Godden for the Second Respondent. Advocate C. G. Hillier for the Third Respondent.

judgment

the deputy bailiff:

Background

1. On 8 November and 12 November 2024, the Court sat to determine an application by the Minister for a Secure Accommodation Order under Article 22(1) of the Children (Jersey) Law 2002 (“the Law”). The Minister sought an order for the maximum period of twelve weeks / three months. The Court granted the Minister’s application but made an order for five weeks only, the period expiring on 17 December 2024. The application was granted on 12 November 2024 having been granted on an interim basis at the commencement of the hearing on 8 November 2024. We now give reasons for our decision.
2. The child, VV, whose name will be redacted from the final judgment for the purpose of publication, is fifteen years old.
3. VV was made subject to an Interim Care Order on 30 May 2024 on the grounds that she was beyond parental control. At the time she was ordinarily resident with two other young persons at Accommodation C where she continued to live prior to the making of the Secure Accommodation Order.
4. VV’s parents were represented at the hearing. They are no longer in a relationship with each other and live separately with new partners.
5. The Minister’s concerns were that VV was beyond control, “whether parental or ministerial”. VV lived with her mother until December 2022, when she went to live with her father. She had failed to engage with professionals and spent the majority of her time, day and night, on the streets for up to fourteen days at a time. Numerous missing person reports had been generated in consequence. When VV went missing, she was involved in antisocial and

criminal behaviour. VV has not engaged with her schooling, her emotional and physical wellbeing has suffered as a consequence of her behaviour - leading to self-harm and suicidal thoughts. VV is considered at risk of sexual exploitation and has become involved with adults who are regarded as a potential source of criminal and sexual exploitation. 6. On 19 June 2024, VV became involved with a young female person who was also looked after by the Minister. A Secure Accommodation Order was made by the Court on 25 June 2024. The context for that order was set out by the Court in its judgment as follows: “9. We have heard from the social worker who indicates that [VV], although being placed in [Accommodation A] on 3 June (which is now almost three weeks ago) has only spent two full nights at [Accommodation A]. She has gone missing repeatedly. When she has been found she has refused to return - opting to stay out in the community. On 9 June she escaped through a window and did not return to [Accommodation A] for some three days. We have been furnished with various police reports in relation to these matters, not all of which we will refer to in the course of this short judgment. For example on 8 June [VV] was located at 3:40am with a large group of youths, presenting as very upset and intoxicated. She was taken to hospital owing to concerns about her mental health. She waited there for 20 minutes before leaving without seeing any professionals. She had contacted the police control room an hour before saying she wanted to end her own life. She saw a police officer and reiterated her intentions to end her life, and was briefly detained by the police. The following log speaks about VV leaving [Accommodation A] on foot at 8:40pm and not returning, her being assessed under the Mental Health (Jersey) Law 2016 but discharged into the care of care workers and then having left the care home. Finally, again these are only examples, the log for the 13 June 2024 noted that [VV] had been reported missing at 12:30am, this was the 103rd time that VV has been reported missing. The police report says that she is a 14 year old vulnerable juvenile who had been sleeping rough for months.

10. Further escalation in concern arose from the fact that on 19 June [VV] and another young person entered into a suicide pact which the other person followed through by taking an overdose of paracetamol. That person had to be kept in hospital overnight under observation. The social worker says, and this is a view supported by others, that it is only a matter of time before VV may come to significant harm.
11. These are not the only concerns. VV is now failing to attend school, notwithstanding the fact that she is academically promising. In addition to the threats of suicide and suicide ideation, VV is now encouraging, it appears, younger people to steal on her behalf including alcohol. She has been observed recruiting children aged 10 to 13 years. It is said that she is grooming other young people to commit crimes and also she is at risk from other people her age and older children and young people who have been involved in criminal conduct.
12. In addition to the social worker, we have heard evidence from the head of service at family support and safeguarding this morning. She gave evidence consistent with the material to which we have just referred and has confirmed that there will be school provision over the summer at [Accommodation B] if the order is granted. She also gave evidence about the

necessity of challenging [V's] entrenched behaviour by reducing access to the people with whom she has been associating recently by limitations on access to her mobile phone. The head of service told us, and we accept, that access to her mobile phone has had a negative impact on [VV] and it is the Children's Service which will determine the extent to which she will have access to her phone at [Accommodation B]. We agree with the proposal that [VV] should have a period without access to her phone and then supervised access thereafter, noting what has been said by counsel for the mother about the desirability, subject to the views of Children's Services, of her continuing to enjoy text and other contact with her parents.

13. We heard from Dr Murray, who has written a report that we have read and had regard to. He is a clinical psychologist and he concluded his evidence by saying that a secure accommodation order is in the best interest of [VV] because the pattern of behaviour in which she is currently engaging is very risky. It will be taking a toll on her physical and mental health and that the effect of loss of liberty in her case is outweighed by an immediate need for safety and her long term welfare. He supports the Minister's application for a secure accommodation order. He says that whilst at [Accommodation B] [VV] will need a period to settle in, a period to build up new relationships with people in [Accommodation B] and any plan will need to be drawn up which will take some time to implement. Implementation of that plan will take some weeks.
14. We note that Dr Murray also agreed that mobile phone use has been a trigger affecting both [VV's] mood and focus in an adverse way. He said that access to a mobile phone should be heavily restricted and supervised. Finally he said that accommodating [VV] at [Accommodation A] had been tried without success and he observed that every day that [VV] goes missing is another "role of the dice" and a risk of something adverse happening to her.
15. We finally heard in evidence from the Guardian. She observed that [VV] is now at serious risk of harm. She has been at risk of harm for a significant period of time, some 18 months. But the situation has now worsened, we were told, in two respects. Firstly the suicide pact which [VV] did not reject and secondly that she is now involved in criminality. The period at [Accommodation B] would give her an opportunity to catch up with her education and would bring other advantages as well." 7. In the circumstances, in the exercise of its discretion, the Court made a Secure Accommodation Order for the three month period requested. The Court observed that completion of this period might be important in order to achieve meaningful change in VV's life and disrupt the entrenched behaviours to which the Court referred. 8. The Secure Accommodation Order expired on 19 September 2024. VV then moved to Accommodation C, a small children's home provided by the Minister, referred to above. We note that an application to extend the Secure Accommodation Order granted by the Court in June 2024 before its expiry was withdrawn by the Minister on the 12 September 2024. The evidence of the social worker 9. The events which have occurred subsequent to her move to Accommodation C were described by the social worker in her statement and her evidence.

10. After her placement at Accommodation C, VV returned to school in September 2024. On 29 September 2024, she left the home with two other children without the consent of the staff working at the home. However, staff were able to follow and locate them.
11. On 2 October 2024, VV left with another child but refused to return when the other child agreed to do so. When residential staff found her near Sand Street car park, VV ran away. She returned to Accommodation C the next day.
12. There were similar occurrences on 3, 4 and 6 October 2024. On 4 October, VV was found in the early hours of the morning near Minden Street car park. She ran away from staff and her mother received a message saying that she was going to kill herself. VV also sent a message saying that she was on top of the car park near Fort Regent and was about to jump. She returned to Accommodation C on 7 October 2024.
13. On 8 October 2024, VV had a discussion with a youth worker and said she was struggling in a number of areas in her life, and that she coped by going missing and self-harming. VV was worried this could result in her being placed away from the island or returned to Accommodation B (the location of secure accommodation).
14. VV went missing again on 9 October, 13 October and 16 October (sending a message threatening to jump off the car park). She was assessed by CAMHS and discharged back to the care of Accommodation C on 17 October 2024. On 17 October, she again went missing overnight. On 20 October, she was late returning to Accommodation C and left again at 11.30 and returned just before 4am. Similar occurrences took place on 22, 25, 26, 27 and 28 October 2024. On 28 October, VV met with an officer from CAMHS and said that she had witnessed a fight, been assaulted by another young person and had been traumatised by these events. VV expressed feelings of rejection, hopelessness and lack of self-worth. During these periods, both of VV's parents had spent time with her but this did not affect her behaviour or state of mind to any significant extent.
15. On 28 October 2024, VV went missing in the early hours and sent a message saying that she wanted to die, that she had drunk alcohol and had harmed herself. Again, she threatened to jump off a building.
16. On 29 October 2024, she messaged staff when out saying "I'm going to kill myself, I'm tired of all this shit. I'm going to fucking slit my wrists. I'm not even joking. Tell the police I don't care. Before they find me I'll be fucking dead". On most if not all of the occasions that VV has gone missing, the police have been involved in looking for her and, on occasion, finding her.
17. In late October 2024, VV had a difficult day, having met with her guardian. The Children's Service held a strategy meeting in relation to allegations that VV had made in relation to witnessing a sexual assault, being slapped by a peer and potentially sexually assaulted.
18. On 31 October 2024, VV again went missing overnight, being located after midnight at Minden Street car park.

19. In early November 2024, VV left the home after midnight and was again found at Minden Street car park at 3am. Staff looked for her overnight and witnessed a fight from a distance involving two children. When VV was found, she had a swollen hand with scratches and said she was trying to break up a fight and had punched someone.
20. There were similar incidents of failure to return to the home on 3 and 5 November 2024. At 12.30am on the morning of 6 November, VV asked the staff to open the door to the home, saying that she was going out. They tried to encourage her to stay. VV refused and said “You can’t keep me in and have to open the door”. Staff are recorded to have advised the child that they had a duty of care for her and letting her out at this time of night was not safe. Nonetheless, when she insisted, staff opened the door at 1.04am and VV ran off. Shortly thereafter she sent a message to staff threatening to kill herself. At 4.05am, she sent texts saying she was going to jump off Minden Street car park. She said she was going to another car park and she did not want the police to witness her death. She made similar threats by text and called 999 herself at 4.22am saying that she was going to Pier Road to kill herself. She was found at Pier Road on the cliff path and was coaxed down by the police and residential staff. Five police cars and seven officers spent time engaging with VV and ultimately she was detained under police powers of protection and taken to police headquarters for her own safety. VV told the police that she would run away as soon as she returned to Accommodation C.
21. On 6 November 2024, a strategy meeting took place. VV was reviewed by Dr Keep, a psychiatrist, and CAMHS, and said that she wanted to return to Accommodation C. She was taken to Accommodation B under a seventy-two hour welfare placement authorised by the director of Children’s Services, and a decision was made to apply for a Secure Accommodation Order to ensure her safety.
22. There is no doubt, and it was not challenged, that the test for making a Secure Accommodation Order was met in this case. VV’s mother and father were neutral as to whether or not the Court should make such an order, the guardian did not oppose the making of the order but did oppose the length of the order sought. She suggested a shorter period of approximately one month.
23. The picture is not all bleak. The social worker said that VV had formed good relationships with key professionals such as her care coordinator, a school teacher and some residential staff. As to the other children in the placement, they consisted of a seventeen year old who does not go missing from care and a fifteen year old who does, but much less frequently than VV. VV often goes missing on her own and / or with children of a similar age, some of whom are in care and some of whom are not.

24. The social worker said there were no single or “solo” placements in Jersey provided by the Minister, and no Jersey based foster carers who could meet her needs. It would be possible to seek a solo / single placement in the United Kingdom, but this is against VV’s wishes and that of her parents. A secure accommodation placement would be designed to support VV to effect change in Jersey with the encouragement and assistance of professionals.
25. Apart from secure accommodation at Accommodation B and a return to Accommodation C - where VV was likely to continue to go missing and be at risk of harm - the only other vacancy at a children’s home operated by the Minister in Jersey was at a home where the “match” with the two children currently residing there was not, in the Minister’s view, suitable.
26. The Minister did set out, through the social worker’s statement, a plan for VV’s time at Accommodation B which had some structure. We were told that the Accommodation B regime had become “more structured” since VV was last in Accommodation B because there was a new manager who had introduced more structure and routine into the lives of the young people residing there.
27. The social worker thought that the Accommodation C provision was the most suitable available for VV at the moment. She was not sure how many of the staff who worked at Accommodation C had received training in trauma informed care, which apparently Miss Frances of CAHMS and others may be able to provide.
28. On behalf of VV, Advocate Hillier raised concerns about the practice of care home staff permitting her to leave the home when she was plainly suicidal, ostensibly in breach of the duty of care that the Children’s Service agreed that they owed to her.
29. It was accepted that Les Ormes in St Brelade had been used for placements for short periods, but the social worker said that it could not be set up for a temporary placement in these circumstances. The opinions of the Independent Reviewing Officer were put to the social worker. The IRO said that she had been disappointed with how Children’s Social Care had worked in this case. She said “The whole situation is failing as Dr Murray said it would. This is not a criticism of [Accommodation C] but a criticism of Children’s Social Care and CAMHS”. VV had been placed in Accommodation C despite an impact analysis assessment which indicated that this was not the best placement for her.
30. The social worker accepted that they needed a plan for when VV was released from Accommodation B. VV’s views
31. We met VV, and she wrote us a letter. The letter was well written, and VV was very articulate.

32. Much of her letter we will set out verbatim: “Dear Court I do not want to stay in [Accommodation B]. I feel there is better ways to help me rather than a Secure Accommodation Order. [Remainder of letter redacted. VV referred to particular needs that she felt were not being met in secure accommodation and explained why she felt that it was the wrong place for her. This has been redacted in order to ensure that VV cannot be identified.]” Dr Murray’s reports and the CAMHS plan
33. At the hearing, reliance was placed on Dr Murray’s evidence (in his report) that a sole placement would be best for VV and most likely to prevent her from going missing. Placement in residential care with other adolescents would be “particularly risky”, since most of the young people in such a setting had their own significant needs. Nonetheless, the Minister simply has no such accommodation in Jersey and there is nothing that the Court can do about that.
34. Dr Murray also said that VV would benefit from a family environment but apparently there is no such foster placement available in Jersey. As to returning to her parents, any return to the mother would according to Dr Murray be “very likely” to result in conflict and breakdown. As to a return to her father, whilst both he and his partner are “positively motivated”, there would be a significant possibility of breakdown which could jeopardise the current good quality of contact between them.
35. Dr Murray was disappointed to note that the therapeutic assistance that he had recommended for VV had not been implemented whilst she was at Accommodation B under the three month order. A therapist had been identified but had made little progress. He also noted in his report dated 29 August that CAMHS staff had “expressed frustration at not being invited to important meetings”. He said “I do think it crucial that there is good collaborative working: the staff there have a lot of expertise in dealing with young people with complex presentations and could usefully provide advice and consultation around a range of issues...” including how to get VV back into education successfully. VV was keen to engage in psychological therapy but this had not been implemented. This was a point that Dr Murray made again in the email he sent on 9 September 2024, just before the last Secure Accommodation Order came to an end. Nonetheless, Dr Murray did express the view (in his report dated 9 August 2024), that secure accommodation had improved VV’s overall wellbeing compared with the period beforehand, that she had been able to develop meaningful relationships with staff and, as we have said, was ready to begin psychotherapeutic work. The plan for her care after secure accommodation was an “urgent need”. This was one of the Court’s concerns in relation to what the Minister proposed – there appeared to be no clear planning for VV’s life when the Secure Accommodation Order came to an end other than a return to Accommodation C.
36. The Court was assisted by a treatment and support plan for VV prepared by CAMHS dated 15 October 2024, which had the objective of helping her process past traumatic experiences that contributed to her current emotional distress and behavioural challenges. VV was to have a role in selecting the form of trauma therapy suitable for her. Therapy would also

address themes including her relationship with her parents, her self-esteem, her emotional regulation skills, her relationship with peers and tackle the causes of her self-harm and suicidal ideation. In order to manage “missing episodes”, the plan involved providing VV with structured activities, making her aware of the influence of peers, establishing expectations about curfews and boundary setting, and putting together a crisis plan for missing episodes.

37. We were told that the plan will be implemented whilst VV was at Accommodation B. The evidence of Mr Williams
38. Between the commencement of the hearing on 8 November and resumption of the hearing on 12 November the Minister prepared, as directed by the Court, a proposed daily routine for VV whilst in secure accommodation providing for, inter alia, education, leisure and other activities. The Minister also filed a statement from Hal Williams, head of improvement for residential services for Children’s Services. This explained the thinking behind the placement of VV at Accommodation C, and the qualifications of the staff who were to undergo Maybo training – a form of behavioural support designed to resolve conflicts without force or restraint. Mr Williams repeated the view expressed by the social worker that secure accommodation at Accommodation B was the only option that could keep VV safe at this time. The service was not able to offer a sole occupancy for VV, particularly when there was a significant shortage of staffing across its existing residential estate with forty vacancies. In evidence, Mr Williams said that seventeen of the vacancies were currently filled by agency workers. Further, staff across the existing estate do not have the specialist skills and training required to provide therapeutic care to a child with VV’s needs. The Minister was developing a six to eight year plan for reshaping the residential estate which was soon to be signed off by the Minister and will require significant investment. Such work is plainly necessary.
39. As to deprivation of liberty, Mr Williams said “Although the Court proposed that deprivation of liberty ought to be considered for [VV] this power does not exist in Jersey legislation and therefore the Minister has been unable to consider this”. This remark was difficult to follow in circumstances where deprivation of liberty orders are made pursuant to the Court’s inherent jurisdiction, not under statute, and the Minister has in recent years sought such an order. (See In the matter of EE [2023] JRC 114).
40. Further, there is no difficulty, in principle at least, with the Court imposing a partial restriction on a child’s liberty as a matter of its inherent jurisdiction in appropriate circumstances along the lines that are suggested by VV in this very case – a restriction sufficient to ensure that she does not escape from home at night when she appears to be most at risk. This is a risk that she has appreciated and identified herself. Mr Williams went on to say “The use of inherent jurisdiction would not be practical to apply (for example door locking and the use of window restrictors) at any of the Children’s Service residential homes due to the impact on other children living in the homes”. Again, we found this difficult to follow. Whilst the Minister has parental responsibility for a child, then there is no difficulty

in principle for other children to be subject to the same sort of restrictions that VV suggested in this case – preventing children in care from going out after midnight when most children in a family environment would not only be expected to be asleep in bed but would be required by their parents not to leave the home in the middle of the night, particularly in circumstances where they were presenting or may present a risk of harm to themselves and others.

41. Mr Williams went on to say that if such restraint was authorised, then the staff involved would need special training. That is obviously correct and such training should not be difficult, in our judgment, to procure and provide.
42. These issues are ones that will need to be revisited by the Court if necessary and ought to be reconsidered by the Minister.
43. In evidence, Mr Williams said that in the event of a child wishing to leave a children's home in the middle of the night, the staff would try and settle the child down and try to get between them and the door, but ultimately if the child wished to go out staff would unlock the door and then follow the child and keep an eye on them until they went missing. He accepted this was "not good enough". He accepted that in this case permitting a child who was threatening to harm herself to leave the home was not keeping the child safe. He accepted that physically preventing a child from leaving a property would be "difficult", but plainly it was much easier if the door remained locked, and the child knew that it would remain locked.
44. When cross-examined by counsel for the mother, Mr Williams accepted that the report that had been commissioned in relation to Accommodation C predicted various of the problems which had materialised when VV was placed at Accommodation C. He said "This speaks of the lack of capacity in our system. We had two vacancies – one at Accommodation A and one at Accommodation C. We had the best of two not great options". He went on to say that the Children's Service was developing a multi-year plan to have a trauma informed workforce. He accepted the consequence of VV being out all night is that she would be tired the following day and unable to participate in education.
45. Mr Williams said that there were some children whose needs cannot be met in Jersey. They may need specialist therapeutic placements away from Jersey. He said that in the future they wanted to match VV to a more suitable child in a more suitable building where she had more space for herself, alongside continuing the work with CAMHS following a therapeutic plan in a more therapeutic environment. Such an environment may be more suitable for her than Accommodation C.
46. It is plain that much of the going missing is when other children are involved, arranged by the use of a mobile telephone. Mr Williams said that VV will not have access to her mobile telephone whilst in secure accommodation. The evidence of the Guardian and our decision
47. The parents did not give evidence.

48. The Guardian gave evidence and recorded that both parents felt that they had been let down by the Minister's intervention during the proceedings. The father in particular felt that the Minister had not made every effort to support VV's mental health and education during the period that she had been in care, including the period in Accommodation B. The father expressed the view that VV should be kept away from her mobile phone and have a reliable and busy routine. He felt that Dr Murray's recommendation should have been implemented. The Guardian said that with hindsight it was clear that a more robust, extensive and multi-agency plan was needed to prevent VV's distress affecting all aspects of her life. The Guardian observed that VV's voice was difficult to capture, partly because she is on occasions selectively mute but also because she struggled to manage her anxiety. Nonetheless, as set out above, she wrote an accurate and articulate letter to the Court to which we gave significant weight.
49. The Guardian agreed that VV's missing episodes were of "great concern". During some of these episodes, she has used substances which have affected her mood, and she had been admitted to hospital due to concerns about her mental health and suicidal ideation.
50. On a previous occasion, VV had said that she would like to live with a foster family. She told the Guardian that she would be happy to live in a solo placement if there was a consistency of staff. VV engaged well with E, her CAMHS care coordinator. She saw both her and F weekly. E assessed VV after she went missing at the end of October and gave advice about how best to support her when she feels overwhelmed. This includes giving VV consistent emotional support, a safe space to express her feelings, clear and compassionate responses, routine and structure to give a sense of stability and collaborative care planning in which she should set her own personal goals.
51. The Guardian said that VV plainly has the potential to do well – we have noted that she is academically able and a strong sports woman.
52. The Guardian expressed the view that the Minister had missed opportunities to implement support that could have made a difference for VV and would have enabled her to introduce long-term changes that would have kept her safer. The Guardian shared the parents and the Independent Reviewing Officer's views that Children's Social Care had been reacting to circumstances, rather than planning interventions. There had been an over-reliance on residential staff who had not been either trained or prepared to implement the advice given by CAMHS about how to best support VV. Whilst the Guardian agreed with a short period of secure accommodation, she agreed with the Independent Reviewing Officer that "robust forward planning" alongside direct / therapeutic work must be addressed for there to be any positive outcome. A key focus must be on the exit plan and identifying a suitable foster placement for VV. Better options for residential placement should be identified if foster placement was not possible.

53. The Guardian said that VV felt that a further period in Accommodation B was unfair to her. VV repeated through the Guardian that she would be happy with the Court making orders that would help her to stay in at night and not run away. She did not want to go to Accommodation B which she did not feel was a proper home. VV wanted a home modified to cater for her needs which would keep her safe and secure at night. If she returned to Accommodation B, there should be a proper structure and routine, including provision of tutoring.
54. On behalf of the father, it was suggested that the period of secure accommodation should end prior to Christmas to give VV the opportunity (if she wished) to go away with her father for the Christmas holiday on a planned break away from the island.
55. We agreed that the threshold for making a Secure Accommodation Order was met. We reminded ourselves that such an order was a last resort for any child. We had careful regard to the welfare checklist and made an order which we thought was appropriate and for the shortest proposed time that was necessary to ensure the child's safety in the circumstances. When making the Secure Accommodation Order, we did not approve of the Care Plan or the Schedule to the Care Plan. We regarded the provisions of the Schedule to the Care Plan as too restrictive. The plan should be finalised in consultation with VV and provide for physical exercise outside Accommodation B, the provision of a tutor as part of the pupil premium available to her, and therapy provided by CAMHS. To the extent appropriate, the Care Plan should also reflect the recommendations made by Dr Murray. Preparations for VV's discharge from Accommodation B should begin immediately. We were concerned that her return to Accommodation C might result in the repetition of the behaviours which had led to the application before us. *Authorities Children (Jersey) Law 2002. In the matter of EE [2023] JRC 114.*

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

ORIGINAL SOURCE <https://www.jerseylaw.je/judgments/unreported/Pages/%5B2025%5DJRC027.aspx>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/jersey/in-the-matter-of-vv-secure-accommodation-order-2025>

Prepared on 27 October 2026 · Esheria