

Hind Ibrahim



Position

Partner

Practices

- [Civil Liberties, Human Rights & Police Actions](#)
- [Prison Law](#)
- [Private Client Criminal Defence](#)

Office

London Warren Street

Contact tel

02073888333 (ext.6512)

Email

ibrahimh@tuckerssolicitors.com

Hind heads up the Civil Liberties & Human Rights Department, which encompasses Police Law, Prison Law and Public Law.

Hind specialises in civil actions against the police and other bodies within the criminal justice system. She also acts for the families of individuals who have died in police custody.

Hind's background as a very experienced criminal defence solicitor, allows her to draw extensively on her criminal law knowledge and advocacy skills. As a criminal solicitor Hind specialised in youth justice and she brings to the department a passion for safeguarding the rights of young and vulnerable people within the criminal justice system.

She has brought successful claims against the police and other statutory agencies for assault, false imprisonment, malicious prosecution, misfeasance in a public office, negligence, breaches of the Data Protection Act, breaches of the Human Rights Act and damages from claims arising out of deaths in custody.

Her case load also extends to civil claims against the Ministry of Justice and the Secretary of State for the Home Department. Hind has the unusual and challenging experience of having represented one of the few individuals subject to a Control Order and relocation in complex litigation around the legality of the Control Order.

Hind is a member of the London Criminal Courts Solicitors Association, Police Actions Lawyers Group, Association of Prison Lawyers, Inquest Lawyers Group and is a member of Amnesty International.

Recent concluded cases include:

Mussarat Habib v Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police: civil proceedings for the family of Habib ‘Paps’ Ullah, who died during a stop and search in July 2008. Hind secured substantial damages for claims in negligence, assault and under the Human Rights Act against Thames Valley Police and a formal letter of regret to the family. This brought to an end a nine year campaign for justice involving two inquests, public police misconduct proceedings and proceedings in the High Court. Additionally the family have had to challenge decisions made by the IPCC and the CPS, arising out of the IPCC investigation.

R (on the application of SM) v Independent Police Complaints Commission: successful challenge to the IPCC’s decision to dismiss SM’s complaint appeal against the Metropolitan Police’s findings, on the grounds that their decision was unlawful. The IPCC conceded that they had failed to apply the law correctly; failed to take account of relevant evidence and had regard to irrelevant evidence and in all the circumstances; and, failed to strike a proportionate balance between the interests of the Claimant and the officers and thereby reached an irrational decision.

AB v Chief Constable of West Yorkshire: involved a 17 year old youth who was unlawfully arrested, assaulted and detained in police custody, thereafter being issued a youth caution for a public order offence. Hind successfully had the youth caution removed and secured damages for assault, false imprisonment and misfeasance.

CF v Chief Constable of Hertfordshire Police: a vulnerable woman, who was a victim of domestic violence, was subjected to a number of sexual assaults by an investigating officer. Hind successfully represented CF in a civil claim for assault/battery, misfeasance, deceit, negligence, harassment and pursuant to s.7 of the Human Rights Act 1998, in relation to articles 3 and 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. Liability was admitted and substantial damages were secured.

BW v Chief Constable of West Midlands Police: liability admitted and damages secured for a young person for assault and false imprisonment. BW was forcefully dragged out of a vehicle, handcuffed and searched and detained for allegedly swearing at a police officer whilst leaving a pub.

Robert Grimsley (deceased): Hind represented the family of Robert Grimsley who died during police contact in July 2015. The family instructed Hind three months after the death of Robert, having not received any satisfactory answers regarding the death of Robert from the police or IPCC and with a Coroner whose starting point was “whether an inquest was even necessary”. Hind undertook the advocacy for all PIRs (eight in total) as well as the preparation of the case, securing a five day, Article 2 - jury trial.

JC (Protected Party) v Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis: successfully represented JC, a man with a significant disability who was represented by his litigation friend, For civil claims for assault/battery and false imprisonment, Hind brought proceedings in the High Court . The claims were settled before trial with the Defendant agreeing to pay substantial damages.

R (on the Application of JM) v Independent Police complaints Commission : Hind successfully challenged the IPCC’s decision to dismiss JM’s complaint appeal against the Metropolitan Police’s findings, on the grounds that their decision was unlawful. The IPCC conceded that they had failed to apply the law correctly; failed to take account of relevant evidence and had regard to irrelevant evidence and in all the circumstances; and, failed to strike a proportionate balance between the interests of the Claimant and

the officers and thereby reached an irrational decision.

OT v Chief Constable of Kent Police: Hind secured a substantial settlement for OT, who at 18 years of age was strip searched in her own home by Kent Police Officers. Liability was accepted for breaches under the Human Rights Act, as well as trespass, assault and false imprisonment.

Shanice Goff (deceased): Hind represented Mildred Goff, the mother of Shanice-Paris Goff at the Inquest in to her death. Shanice Paris Goff fell to her death from the 17th floor of a tower block shortly after two Metropolitan police officers entered to arrest her. Hind's knowledge of youth justice, was beneficial in shedding light on to the resources that would have been available to officers, and should therefore have been utilised when undertaking their risk assessment prior to them entering the address they had attended to arrest her. The Jury at the inquest gave a narrative verdict where they determined that the officers failed to use all resources and sources of information available to them when deciding to convert their 'recce' into an arrest and, that a major contributing factor in Shanice's death was inadequate supervision by the officers, and in particular that the risk of falling had not been recognised.