



A GUIDE TO THE HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT

**The border controls dividing our
communities – and how we can
bring them down**

Edited by

LIBERTY

May 2019

Contents

4	Foreword
6	Introduction
10	Schools Against Borders for Children
14	Higher Education National Union of Students (NUS)
18	Health Doctors of the World UK
23	Policing Liberty
28	Banking Liberty
32	Housing Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI)
36	Driving Liberty
40	Employment Migrants' Rights Network (MRN)
45	Migrant families and social support Project 17
50	Rough sleeping North East London Migrant Action (NELMA)
54	Immigration Raids Anti-Raids Network
59	Conclusion
61	Further reading

Foreword

When we first launched this Guide in April 2018, we had no idea that we were on the brink of events that would lay bare the cruelty of the hostile environment and the inner workings of the Home Office: the Windrush Scandal

[Testimonies](#) of Windrush citizens published in early 2018 set out how people who came to the UK as citizens and had lived here for decades lost their homes, livelihoods, and basic social rights as the introduction of the hostile environment meant that public authorities and providers of essential services began to demand proof of their immigration status.

It has since emerged that more than 80 Windrush citizens were wrongly deported, with an unknown number of other people left with no choice but to leave the UK. Some people died before the Home Office was able to trace them and attempt to make amends.

This wasn't a simple matter of people not having the right documents. In 1973, when the Immigration Act 1971 came into force, people settled in the UK were granted indefinite leave to remain, but people were not given documents to prove it.

However, some Windrush citizens accused of being in the country unlawfully gave the Home Office extensive evidence of their time in the UK, only to be [refused](#) because they were missing documents for a handful of years out of decades.

In 2014, the Home Office was [warned](#) that precisely this group of people risked being made vulnerable to the hostile environment, and failed to act. And it also emerged in May 2018 that in 2010, the

Home Office had [destroyed landing cards](#) that would have helped people evidence their stay in the UK.

The Windrush Scandal is far from over. The Government established an interim hardship fund for people in urgent need, but only nine people were granted support. The full compensation scheme has been heavily criticised on several grounds. It requires significant evidence, and people will not be granted legal aid to ensure that a lawyer can assist them with their application. Nor is there any legal aid for people making applications to confirm their citizenship status under the Windrush scheme. 600 people who did apply have been refused, and it is not clear what will happen to them next, as there is no appeal right.

In the meantime, many other Windrush citizens remain afraid to come forward, enduring significant financial hardship and very limited access to essential public services in the meantime. You can support Windrush citizens' ongoing fight for their rights by following Windrush Action [here](#) and [here](#).

The Windrush Scandal exposed just why the hostile environment is a human rights issue. It causes destitution, ill-health, and exploitation. It shouldn't have happened to the Windrush generation – and it shouldn't happen to anyone.

If the Windrush Scandal brought to light the cruelty of Government policy, the last year has also seen incredibly encouraging resistance to it. It is heartening to have had to re-edit this Guide to include so many successes: from the end of NHS Digital's dodgy data-sharing deal with the Home Office and amazing litigation to take down landlord immigration checks, to the removal of embedded immigration officers in local authorities and the steadfast determination of the Stansted 15.

While there's still lots to do to dismantle the hostile environment, with your help, we're more confident than ever that we will.

Since 2010, the Government has launched a new wave of attacks on the human rights of undocumented people in the UK through a set of policies known as the ‘hostile environment’.

Although Government has tried to rebrand them as the ‘compliant environment’ since the Windrush Scandal broke, very little has changed. These brutal policies prevent people from accessing housing, healthcare, education, work, bank accounts, benefits and even drivers’ licences. They were dreamt up by the “hostile environment working group” under the Coalition Government and are implemented primarily by the 2014 and 2016 Immigration Acts.

The hostile environment is a sprawling web of immigration controls embedded in the heart of our public services and communities. The Government requires employers, landlords, private sector workers, NHS staff and other public servants to check a person's immigration status before they can offer them a job, housing, healthcare or other support. Landlords and employers can face fines and even criminal sanctions if they fail to do so.

Immigration controls are now embedded in everyday interactions between trusted public sector workers and the people they are supposed to serve: nurses and patients, police and victims of crime and teachers and their pupils. New offences mean undocumented migrants find themselves criminalised for doing what they must to survive – in some cases simply for working or even driving.

Alongside these measures, ministers have drawn up a swathe of shadowy data-sharing arrangements. Now, when an undocumented migrant does something as innocuous as sending their child to school or registering with a GP, the address they give can be hoovered up by the Home Office and used for immigration enforcement. We now know that the [Home Office](#) has aspirations to create a massive hostile environment database to make it easier for landlords, employers, and other bodies to exclude people from essential services.

Of course, government-sponsored hostility to migrants began well before the 2014 Immigration Act. De facto hostile environment policies, designed to limit migrants' rights and deter them from accessing services, have operated for decades. That's why this guide also includes information on the intersection of higher education and border control, and rocketing charges for healthcare services.

And while the guide doesn't talk about the injustices of the immigration system more generally, it must be read with that system in mind. It's all too easy to forget just how people end up losing their immigration status and the terrifying raids, detention centres, and

mass deportation flights that await them when they do.

Far from intentionally trying to evade the rules, people often become undocumented because they're unable to scrape together ever-increasing application fees, challenge poor Home Office decision-making, or pay a solicitor to help them keep up with rapidly changing immigration rules.



What these measures mean for the society we live in

The hostile environment is by its very nature discriminatory, so it is no surprise that it encourages discriminatory – even racist – behaviour. Preliminary evaluations of some of the measures suggests that BAME and visibly “foreign” people are more likely to be asked for proof of their entitlement to services than white British people. For example, 58 per cent of landlords turned down or ignored an enquiry from a BAME tenant without a passport in a [mystery shopping exercise](#) conducted by JCWI to investigate landlord immigration checks. When JCWI took the Government to [court](#) over this policy, the judge agreed that the scheme is causing landlords to discriminate where they otherwise would not.

The requirement for people to show ID documents in their interactions with public services also disproportionately affects young people, homeless people and those on lower incomes, who are less likely to have a passport or other form of ID. As the Windrush Scandal showed, it can also cause huge difficulties for people in the UK lawfully but do not have the documents to prove it if their immigration status is called into question.

The hostile environment has a huge impact on people who run and deliver services too. By requiring frontline workers to check people's immigration status or share data with the Home Office, government policies are shattering the carefully cultivated relationships of trust

they have built with the communities they serve.

It prevents services from supporting people they know are in dire need of assistance, and burdens already overstretched workers with complex immigration-related tasks that have little to do with their training or job descriptions.

And ultimately, it creates a society in which we are all conditioned to show ID and have our interactions with the State logged, as the Government's obsession with monitoring and policing migrants demands surveillance of every one of us.



Who this guide is for

This guide is for anyone who cares about the kind of society we live in, including public sector workers, and members of the public.

Crucially, it aims to signpost you to some of the formidable groups working to defend migrants' rights, and actions you can take to join that struggle.



Part 1

SCHOOLS

Against Borders for Children

A Guide to the Hostile Environment

10

Every child has the right to education.

But since 2015, the Home Office and Department for Education (DfE) have [shared](#) the school records of up to 1,500 children a month for immigration enforcement purposes.

This data-sharing agreement allows a child's name and home address, collected by their teachers for the school census, to be handed to the Home Office so they and their parents can be tracked down and potentially removed from the country.

By the time it was finally exposed, the arrangement had been operating for more than a year with no public knowledge or parliamentary scrutiny. A recent [report](#) reveals that the Home Office now considers the scheme to be 'business as usual'.



Collecting nationalities and countries of birth

From October 2016 to April 2018, the DfE required schools to collect the nationality and country of birth of children aged between five and 19 through the school census. The department claimed this was to help them “assess the impact of pupil migration on the education sector”.

Against Borders for Children organised a mass boycott of the data collection, and, represented by Liberty, began legal action against the Department for Education. In April 2018, the DfE [announced](#) that it would no longer require schools to collect children's nationalities and countries of birth, and has updated its [census guidance](#) to reflect this. However, it is refusing to delete the nationality and country of birth data that it has already collected. Liberty and ABC have complained to the Information Commissioner's Office about this.

The now abandoned nationality and country of birth checks were introduced as a compromise on harsh measures Theresa May – then Home Secretary – had wanted to introduce in the 2015 Immigration Bill. The information serves no educational purpose, as teachers already assess children’s language needs through different measures.

The Government had intended this new nationality data be handed over to the Home Office once collected through the school census – showing that previous ministerial promises that the details would be “solely for internal departmental use” were entirely false.

The data-sharing arrangement between the DfE and Home Office was only amended to remove nationality and country of birth from the process in October 2016, after parents and campaigners raised concerns.

Even if nationality and country of birth data is not currently part of the Home Office-DfE data-sharing deal, the pledge that it will not be used for immigration enforcement could be withdrawn at any moment – and potentially in secret.



Why we're opposed to border controls in classrooms

Some parents will now fear that schools are not a safe place for their children – and may withdraw them from education entirely. This will have a huge impact on children’s futures, as well as removing them from the protective influence of an institution that is supposed to protect them from harm.

Migrant children have reiterated their right to “go to school and feel safe”. [Some feel](#) immigration control measures in schools push them “into the shadows”.



What you can do

- » [Let Us Learn](#) and [Sin Fronteras](#) are groups led by young migrants speaking out about issues that affect them. Consider supporting them or getting involved yourself.
- » Liberty is campaigning for a firewall between education data and Home Office immigration enforcement. Sign the #CareDontShare pledge [here](#).
- » [Against Borders for Children](#) would love for new people to join in with the campaign against border controls in the classroom. Contact us at hello@schoolsabc.net.

Part 2

HIGHER EDUCATION

LONDON SOUTH BANK
UNIVERSITY



The National Union of Students (NUS)

Universities should be concerned with broadening horizons and intellectual inquiry. But the hostile environment is turning them into hotbeds of division and discrimination.

Over recent years, international students have endured a series of policies that have made them feel under attack and unwelcome.

A significant step in this direction was the scrapping of the post-study work visa in 2012, which allowed students to stay in the UK and work for up to two years after graduation. This took away the right of international students to gain vital work experience after their studies.

In addition to rocketing visa fees, visa requirements have tightened to the extent that it is impossible for some students to access education in the UK. Those who brave the application process are forced to undergo credibility interviews, show they can fulfil the minimum maintenance requirement in advance and prove their planned studies constitute “academic progression”.

International students are also expected to pay exorbitant fees – up to [four times](#) as much as UK students on some courses– which can rise [without notice](#). There are tight restrictions on international students’ access to work, which is capped at 20 hours a week.

While monitoring arrangements may vary from university to university, many international students must register with the police within seven days of their arrival, meaning they are sometimes forced to [queue](#) at police stations for hours. They are also required to apply for a biometric residence permit and pay an [NHS surcharge](#), and are subject to [landlord immigration checks](#) if they do not live in university halls.

If an institution loses its licence, it can no longer recruit international students or fulfil requirements for students' visa applications. International students have little protection in circumstances like this, and face huge disruption to their studies. They also lose fees they have already paid and must find a new institution to sponsor their visa. Many students from such institutions end up simply leaving the country, out of pocket and with no qualification.



Why we're opposed to a hostile environment for international students

The Government's misguided effort to identify so-called "genuine" students among those they claim want to abuse the system has resulted in disproportionately stringent visa requirements and a restrictive application process that places major barriers on international students' ability to come to the UK to study.

Universities have been coerced into carrying out immigration enforcement by the threat of having their licences removed by the Home Office.

The NUS is aware of [universities](#) that have far exceeded their statutory duties in a clearly discriminatory way by not accepting students from "high risk" countries.

Some institutions are also performing discriminatory attendance monitoring of international students – requiring them to sign in

to class or fingerprint themselves in to lectures in front of their UK classmates.



What you can do

- » Reach out to your local students' unions to see what kind of activity they are involved in to support and engage international students.
- » Lobby your local university to create more bursaries and protection schemes for international students so they do not slip through the net.
- » Get in touch with the [NUS International Students Campaign](#) for more information on our national campaigns.
- » Unis Resist Border Controls is a national campaign that tours universities to collect evidence of their implementation of border controls and supports students to mobilise for an end to the hostile environment in higher education. Contact them through their [Facebook page](#) to get involved.

Part 3

HEALTH



Doctors of the World UK

A Guide to the Hostile Environment

Access to healthcare is a fundamental right, but the hostile environment is undermining it.

All migrants in the UK are entitled to free primary healthcare and accident and emergency (A&E) treatment, as well as family planning (excluding termination of pregnancy) or treatment in secure mental health settings.

However, the Immigration Act 2014 means most migrants are charged for most other kinds of treatment. [Temporary workers](#) and [students](#) must pay a health surcharge of £400 as part of their visa application. The Government doubled this fee from £200 per applicant in January 2018.

Other migrants, if not exempt¹, are charged for treatment at an exorbitant 150 per cent of the cost to the NHS. New rules introduced in 2017 made ID checks and upfront charging of these migrants obligatory in hospitals and NHS-funded community health services (including those delivered by charities).

Unless their condition is considered urgent or immediately necessary, a person will be charged the estimated full cost of their treatment upfront and treatment will be withheld if they cannot pay. If a clinician decides their treatment is urgent or should not wait until they are in their country of origin, they can be treated without payment but billed afterwards.

¹ There are [some exemptions](#), including asylum seekers and refugees. People with indefinite leave to remain, people with healthcare insurance in another EEA member state and those from countries with a bilateral agreement with the UK, can use the NHS in the same way that ordinarily resident British nationals can.

In practice, urgent and immediately necessary care is often wrongly delayed and withheld from children and other vulnerable migrant patients following misinterpretation of the Urgent and Immediately Necessary criteria. Charging in secondary care also deters patients from treatment due to errors, intimidation and/or gatekeeping.

If a person fails to pay, they may be pursued by debt collection agencies. If a person owes a debt of more than £500 to the NHS two months after being billed, this is likely to prejudice any future immigration application they make.



What's happening to patients' data?

The NHS is one of many public services that is increasingly affected by cross-departmental data-sharing arrangements to support Home Office immigration enforcement.

In January 2017 the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the NHS and the Home Office, which allowed Immigration Enforcement teams to request confidential patient information, such as home address, from patient records held by the NHS. Following widespread condemnation of the MoU after a Health & Social Care Select Committee inquiry, the parties amended the agreement and halted data-sharing in 90% of cases. Following legal action brought by the Migrants' Rights Network, represented by Liberty, the government withdrew the MoU entirely in November 2018. However, a [new MoU](#) is currently being drafted.

Patients are not informed when their personal information is shared with the Home Office, and most frontline health workers are not aware that the confidential information they collect from their patients may be used in this way.

Data-sharing is also embedded within the NHS charging programme. The personal information of patients is shared with the Home Office by NHS trusts in order to apply charges for NHS services and to report debts. Any patient who is unable to pay a bill of more than £500 after two months is reported to the Home Office.



Why we oppose border controls in healthcare

Charging and immigration checks in healthcare settings undermine the founding principle of the NHS: that its services should be free at the point of use for anyone who needs them.

They also undermine the mission and duty of NHS workers. Rather than seeing patients first of all as people to be supported, staff are forced to ask for documentation and potentially deny care.

Data-sharing is also undermining the fundamental principle of patient confidentiality and causing many people to avoid seeking healthcare for fear of being apprehended.

These measures are a cruel and disproportionate attempt to enforce immigration controls at the expense of migrants' rights to healthcare, to physical and mental wellbeing, to freedom from inhuman and degrading treatment and – ultimately – to life.



What you can do

- » If you work in a GP practice, download our [Safe Surgeries toolkit](#) for practical guidance on how to improve access for migrants.
- » Add your name to the Doctors of the World [Free to Care](#) petition, a call for medics and the public to stand alongside NHS doctors and nurses who want to be left to treat their patients without getting caught up in immigration status checks.

- » [Docs Not Cops](#) is a grassroots direct action group who are opposed to all of the Government's attempts to restrict migrants' access to healthcare. They need all hands on deck for their [#PatientsNotPassports](#) campaign and can help you set up your own local group. Contact docsnotcops@gmail.com.
- » Liberty is campaigning for a firewall between patient data and Home Office immigration enforcement. Sign the #CareDontShare pledge [here](#).

Part 4

POLICING



Liberty

A Guide to the Hostile Environment

23

Everybody who has been a victim or witness of a crime should be able to approach the police without fear.

Police are not under any legal obligation or duty to pro-actively share data on undocumented victims of crime, or witnesses to crime, with the Home Office. However, they often [do so](#).

In 2017, a woman who was five months pregnant went to report being repeatedly raped to the police, but was subsequently [arrested](#) at a medical centre for victims of rape on immigration grounds.

In [another case](#), a man who reported an assault to the police ended up in immigration detention himself.

Last year it was reported that more than half of UK police forces have referred undocumented victims of crime to the Home Office for immigration enforcement purposes.

Liberty and Southall Black Sisters lodged a [super-complaint](#) regarding this practice by police forces, arguing that it is potentially unlawful as well as a breach of human rights. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS), the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) and the College of Policing have agreed to conduct a full investigation and it is hoped that they will recommend that all police forces should firewall their data from Home Office immigration enforcement – they should not pass on victim or witness data for immigration enforcement purposes.



A broader climate of collaboration

Police-Home Office data-sharing on victims and witnesses of crime is one aspect of a broader [climate of collaboration](#).

Operation Nexus, first piloted in 2012, is in theory designed to deal with people who have been arrested on suspicion of criminal activity. However, it appears that it is being relied on by some police forces to deal with people who are not suspected of criminal offending, such as [victims and witnesses](#) of crime.

Operation Nexus provides for immigration officers to be embedded in police custody suites to identify which people suspected of crime are from overseas, and refer them to the Home Office for removal if appropriate. It also facilitates police referral of “High Harm” cases to a team which then decides whether or not to refer a person for immigration enforcement action, based on whether or not removing them would be “conducive to the public good” – even if they do not have any convictions.

Beyond Operation Nexus, police forces also carry out joint raids with immigration enforcement officials and on occasion other [public authority staff](#), especially business [raids](#).

They may further find themselves taking on immigration enforcement functions when using mobile fingerprinting devices, which can check a person’s fingerprints against the Immigration and [Asylum Biometrics System](#) database, as well as policing and crime databases.

One further measure that leads to overlap between immigration and criminal justice processes is the UK Borders Act 2007. This law requires the Home Secretary to deport people who commit a crime who are not British citizens if they are sentenced to at least 12 months’ imprisonment – resulting in “double punishment”.



Why the police should remain independent from immigration enforcement

Many aspects of the lives of undocumented migrants, such as working or driving, or simply entering the UK without the requisite permission, are criminalised. The majority of these offences carry a punishment on conviction of a custodial sentence of two years or fewer, a fine, or both. Ultimately, we believe these offences should be repealed, but in the meantime the police should prioritise serious crimes such as rape and assault over minor immigration offences.

Involving the police in immigration enforcement does significant damage to police-community relations. It means that undocumented victims and witnesses of crime fear coming forward. As a result, perpetrators of serious crime can harm people with impunity, leaving undocumented migrants exposed to serious violence, and making all of us less safe.

Other important aims, such as the investigation and prevention of trafficking, modern slavery, and domestic violence also suffer. Not only do victims fear coming forward to the police, but perpetrators also use a person's immigration status to trap them in an abusive situation.

People who have committed a crime repay their debt to society by serving a prison sentence. Deporting them after they have done so is an unjust double punishment. It risks separating people from the support networks they need to be rehabilitated and reintegrated into society. It is also discriminatory, because people who are British citizens cannot be treated in this way.



What you can do

- » The Latin American Women's Rights Service is campaigning for safe reporting mechanisms for migrant women who are victims of domestic violence. Find out more and [support](#) the campaign.
- » The Racial Justice Network and Yorkshire Resists are campaigning for an end to police mobile fingerprint scanning. Sign their petition [here](#) and find out [more](#) about the campaign.
- » Liberty is campaigning for a firewall between policing and immigration enforcement. Sign our #CareDontShare pledge [here](#).

Part 5

BANKING



Liberty

A Guide to the Hostile Environment

Bank accounts are vital for storing savings and earnings securely, making regular payments for necessities such as housing, and accessing credit.

However, the Immigration Act 2014 bans banks and building societies from opening accounts for undocumented migrants.

As a result, banks and building societies now carry out ‘status checks’ on their customers. If a person is in the UK unlawfully (or believed to be), the bank or building society must refuse them a current account.

From October 2017, banks and building societies were forced to carry out quarterly immigration checks on everyone who holds personal current accounts with them. When these identify someone believed to be in the UK illegally, the banks and building societies must share the results with the Home Office.

Banks must also (if so requested) provide the Home Office with a wealth of information about the account holders they identify, such as the type and balance of each account held, details of certain payments made from the account and any other information the bank decides is relevant.

The Home Office may then apply for a court order freezing the account holder’s assets – or demand the account be closed down.

At least 17 bank accounts were [closed](#) in 2017-18 as a result of these measures.

In May 2018, the Home Secretary announced that checks on existing accounts will be [suspended](#). Two months later, the Home Office temporarily stopped sending the details of people it believes to be in the UK unlawfully to providers of certain goods and services, including banking, for people of all nationalities aged over 30, initially for three months. This sharing [does not](#) appear to have been reinstated.



A poor track record

Even if an individual suspects a mistake has been made in checking their status when they apply for a bank account – and provides the Home Office with evidence to prove it – the [Home Office has said](#) that updating the records should only be done “in exceptional circumstances” and states that there “is no requirement to make this check and the default position should be to refuse”.

Home Office data has proven inaccurate in the past. In fact, the Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration – in a [test sample](#) of 169 refusals under the 2014 rules – found almost 10 per cent had been incorrectly identified by the Home Office as people who should not have a current account opened for them. One person, originally from Jamaica, had first arrived in the UK more than a decade before their application for an account was refused.



Why we oppose immigration checks in banking

Banks may be put off opening accounts for migrants who have limited leave to remain, as the [Home Office itself has acknowledged](#). Ministers have [admitted that](#), where accounts are wrongly closed, it may take up to a year for banks to reopen them.

Denying people access to bank accounts leaves them with nowhere secure to put their cash. This in turn leaves them vulnerable to robbery, reliant on employers and landlords who work 'cash in hand' and at the mercy of payday lenders.

The Government is putting people on a secret list and using that list to deny them access to services and their own assets, with scarcely any chance of redress if there is an error – an exercise of power that should be chilling for all of us.



What you can do

- » Credit unions and friendly societies are not covered by this legislation. Ask your local credit union or friendly society what ID documents are required to open an account with them, and whether they can adapt requirements to accommodate people without leave to remain – by requiring a passport and proof of address rather than National Insurance number, for example.
- » Advocacy groups would like to hear from people affected by these checks. Contact [Liberty](#) at advice@libertyhumanrights.org.uk.



Part 6

HOUSING

Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI)

A Guide to the Hostile Environment

32

Housing is vital to ensuring that people can live a dignified life.

However, the Immigration Act 2014 requires private landlords and letting agents to check the immigration status of tenants before renting to them.

This is to make sure all tenants or occupiers have a 'right to rent' – that they are not disqualified from renting as a result of their immigration status.

A person is disqualified from renting if they don't have the necessary permission to enter or live in the UK. This includes undocumented migrants, as well as asylum seekers who have not yet received a decision on their case.

The Immigration Act 2016 made it a crime for a landlord to knowingly allow a disqualified person to occupy a rented property – punishable by up to five years in prison. Landlords were also given new powers to evict tenants if a property is occupied by anyone who is disqualified from renting because of their immigration status.

The scheme does not yet apply to Scotland, Northern Ireland or Wales – although the Government still wants to roll the scheme out further. Some places, including social housing, care homes, hospices, hospitals, hostels, refuges or student accommodation, are not covered by the checks.²

² Excluded living arrangements include: social housing arranged through a local authority, care homes, hospices, hospitals and accommodation provided by the NHS for the purpose of ongoing healthcare, student accommodation provided directly by universities and colleges, hostels and refuges, certain leases involving mobile homes and leases granted for a term of seven years or more.

If a landlord or agent doesn't perform the checks and rents a property to someone who does not have the 'right to rent', they could be fined up to £3,000 per person.



Why we oppose landlord immigration checks

By denying people access to housing on the grounds of their immigration status, the Government is likely to force many households out of the regular housing market and into overpriced, unsafe and unsuitable accommodation.

But landlord immigration checks also affect people with the correct papers – and even British citizens. They incentivise landlords to rent to British citizens and people who do not 'appear foreign'.

Since 2014, JCWI has monitored the scheme and its operation. Our latest [published research](#) found concerning evidence of discrimination.

The High Court has also declared the scheme unlawful – ruling that it causes [unacceptable racial discrimination](#).

Mr Justice Spencer found that:

- » Requiring landlords to check immigration status caused racial discrimination against anyone without a British passport and against ethnic minorities.
- » The Government had failed to show that the checks had any actual effect on encouraging undocumented migrants to leave the country.

On 12 April 2019, the Home Office amended the guidance on how to issue notices under the right to rent procedure. The Home Office

now has to tell tenants that they think they do not have the right to rent and to give them an opportunity to comment before serving them with a formal notice.³ The new guidance is available [here](#).



What you can do

- » Find out more: for a more detailed overview of the ‘right to rent’ check process, you [can read our guide](#) for tenants and advisors.

You can help oppose landlord immigration checks by joining or supporting an organisation for housing rights, or creating your own initiative. For example:

- » The [Radical Housing Network](#) is made up of groups based in London fighting for housing justice. If you’re based in London, why not join one of them?
- » Brighton Migrant Solidarity runs [a spare room network](#) matching people who are able to provide accommodation and people made destitute by the Home Office, as well as [Thousand 4 1000](#) – a crowdfunded community initiative – providing accommodation to destitute migrants. Could you set up a similar initiative in your local area?
- » Follow [@JCWI UK](#) for updates on the ongoing ‘right to rent’ legal challenge and to see how you can get involved.

³ The government amended its guidance as a result of a case brought by Ms Katuna Goloshvili, represented by Camden Law Centre. R (On the application of Khatuna Goloshvili) (Claimant) V Secretary of State for the Home Department (Defendant) & Liberty (Intervener) [2019] EWHC 614 (Admin)

Part 7

DRIVING



Liberty

The Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) and the UK Border Agency (and its successors) have collaborated for immigration purposes since 2005.

The 2014 and 2016 Immigration Acts have further embedded this partnership.

Now, anyone applying for a new licence must be lawfully resident in the UK – and the DVLA has powers to revoke licences held by people who are not. In 2017-18, over 4,000 driving licences were [revoked](#).

The legislation also includes a new offence of ‘driving when unlawfully in the UK’⁴. This would be committed if someone drives a vehicle on a road or in another public place with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe they are in the UK unlawfully. There are also related search powers⁵ – along with a power to seize driving licences.

These new powers are not yet in force across the UK – but once they are rolled out, immigration officers, police and others will be able to search people and vehicles for driving licences and it will become a criminal offence for undocumented people to drive a vehicle.

⁴ Section 44, Immigration Act 2016

⁵ Section 43, Immigration Act 2016



Discrimination in traffic stops

The police already have powers⁶ to stop drivers without any suspicion of wrongdoing and without having to make any record of the encounter – not even their reasons for stopping the person.

Studies show evidence of discrimination in the use of traffic stops by police, with disproportionate targeting of black and ethnic minority drivers. Seventy-three per cent of black drivers [surveyed by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary](#) in 2015 agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the police unfairly target people from ethnic minorities for traffic stops.



How will police decide who to stop?

In short, this is extremely unclear – and very worrying.

The Government claims the search powers outlined above will be used in conjunction with existing stop powers – which already disproportionately affect black and minority ethnic drivers.

The new offence of 'driving when unlawfully in the UK', and the search powers that go with it, may lead to people being stopped on the basis of unfounded and stereotyped assumptions about what an immigrant looks like – resulting in deeply discriminatory stops which do serious harm to police-community relations.



Poor data processing

Bulk data-sharing arrangements between the Home Office and DVLA allow them to check people's entitlement to a licence – and also cancel licences believed to be held by people without leave to remain in the UK.

⁶ Under section 163 of the Road Traffic Act 1988

But this data is not always accurate. Of a sample of 50 licence revocations, just over 20 per cent of people were found to have left the UK before their licence was revoked.

In 2015, the DVLA was [forced to reinstate](#) more than 250 wrongly revoked licences raising serious concerns about the accuracy of the data used in the matching process – and the impact on those whose licences are wrongly revoked.

In July 2018, after the Windrush Scandal broke, the Home Office temporarily stopped sending the details of people it believes to be in the UK unlawfully to providers of certain goods and services, including the DVLA, for people of all nationalities aged over 30, initially for three months. This sharing does [not appear](#) to have been reinstated.



Why we oppose these powers and practices

Denying people access to identity documents forces them into the shadow markets for housing, employment and other services, leaving them vulnerable to destitution and exploitation as they struggle to find alternative means to survive.

And, by embroiling police in frontline immigration enforcement on our roads, these new powers risk worsening discrimination and severely damaging police-community relations.



What you can do

- » [StopWatch](#) and [Liberty](#) are campaigning against these new powers. Read our report '[Driving While Black](#)', and if you're a member of the public or a public servant who is concerned about them, please contact advice@libertyhumanrights.org.uk or info@stop-watch.org.

Part 8

EMPLOYMENT

BYRON

LUNCH, DINNER &
EVERYTHING IN BETWEEN

PROPER HAMBURGERS



Migrants' Rights Network (MRN)

A Guide to the Hostile Environment

Like all of us, undocumented migrants must work to avoid destitution unless they have significant support from friends, families and other sources.

However, employing a person without permission to work in the UK is illegal – and employers commit a [civil offence](#) when they are found to “knowingly” employ an undocumented person or have “reasonable cause to believe that the employee is disqualified from employment by reason of the employee’s immigration status.”

Obligations on employers to check people’s documents have existed since the late 1990s, and the 2014 and 2016 Immigration Acts introduced:

- » a new criminal offence of illegal working
- » increased financial penalties for employers
- » a prison sentence of up to five years for employing undocumented people, and
- » new powers for immigration officials to seize property or earnings, or close down businesses.

Personal data on workers is routinely shared between Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs (HMRC), the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and the Home Office for immigration enforcement purposes. This helps the Home Office obtain address details for

people with whom it has lost contact and who it suspects of being in the UK unlawfully.

When details of a person sought by the Home Office are held by the DWP and/or HMRC, their employer may be notified. This means undocumented people – if they have not already been excluded from the workplace by ‘right to work’ checks – are highly likely to lose their job as a result of a Home Office notification.

As with driving and banking, the Home Office temporarily stopped sending the details of people it believes to be in the UK unlawfully to HMRC/DWP for people of all nationalities aged over 30, initially for three months. This sharing does [not appear](#) to have been reinstated.



Why we're opposed to immigration controls in the workplace

Criminalising work and penalising employers for taking on undocumented migrants doesn't prevent them from working – it simply pushes them into the shadow economy.

Additionally, many people in the UK have an immigration status that is dependent on their employer sponsoring their visa.

This means that – if they lose their job – after a short period of time they will have to leave the country, apply to change their immigration status to a non-work-related one, or become undocumented.

Making people's right to live here contingent on their employer gives those employers a disproportionate amount of power over them – leaving workers vulnerable to exploitation.

Workplace immigration raids can make all migrant workers feel precarious, putting them off raising issues related to terms and

conditions with their employer.

There have been instances of employers going above and beyond to support the Home Office by arranging fake meetings to enable stings on unsuspecting employees. Byron Burger is the [latest high profile culprit](#), but the practice has been recorded for years – including at SOAS, University of London in 2009.



What employers should do - and what workers can organise to demand

- » 'Right to work' checks must not be conducted in a discriminatory way: all employees must be checked, not just those that an employer believes to be foreign.
- » Home Office officials can only gain lawful entry to premises if they have a warrant, an Assistant Director letter or business owner consent. A business owner can refuse entry to immigration officials if they don't have a warrant or an Assistant Director letter.
- » Employers have no legal obligation to collaborate with the Home Office to help it target their employees. An employer who has correctly carried out a 'right to work' check has a statutory defence in court should they be accused of knowingly employing an undocumented person.
- » Employers should also consider how best they can support migrant workers to navigate the immigration system and retain their documented status.



What you can do

- » The [Trades Union Congress](#) is a federation of 49 member unions representing over five million workers to ensure fairness, equality and dignity in the workplace. If you'd like to talk about protecting labour rights in your workplace, they can be contacted at info@tuc.org.uk.
- » [Migrants' Rights Network](#) would like to hear from people affected by workplace immigration controls. Contact us at london@migrantsrights.org.uk.

Part 9

MIGRANT FAMILIES & SOCIAL SUPPORT

Project 17

A Guide to the Hostile Environment

45

Many migrants in the UK are prevented from accessing mainstream welfare benefits and social housing, because they have a status known as ‘no recourse to public funds’ (NRPF).

The Government’s use of this restriction began in the late 1990s.

It applies to people from outside the European Economic Area with a range of immigration statuses – from undocumented migrants, to people who are waiting for the outcome of an appeal.



When is help available for families with NRPF?

Local authorities have a duty to safeguard and promote the welfare of ‘children in need’ in their area under the Children Act 1989 – sometimes called a ‘Section 17 duty’.

If a family is homeless or does not have enough money to meet basic needs, their child will almost certainly be ‘in need’, and the local authority may be able to help.

Section 17 lets local authorities provide support, including accommodation and financial subsistence, to families with ‘children in need’, even if they have no recourse to public funds.

Local authorities can support the family as a whole and promote the upbringing of the child within the family unit.

On the face of it, the Government excludes some adults from support under section 17 because of their immigration status. These groups include people who need leave to remain but don't have it (e.g., those who are undocumented or have overstayed visas), and those who have stayed in the UK after being refused asylum.

However, lack of existing leave to remain should not exclude families from accessing Section 17 support when they are in need. Judgments in legal cases where families have challenged a local authority's lack of support have also found that Section 17 support should act as a safety net for families who are prevented by their immigration status from accessing welfare support that they may be otherwise entitled to.

Janet's story

Janet is from St Lucia. Janet has a ten-year-old son, Samuel.

When we met Janet and Samuel, they were homeless. They were sharing a sofa in a friend's flat. Samuel was suffering from back pain. Janet had tried to get support from social services three times. The first two times, she was wrongly told her child would be taken into care. The third time, she was told that social services could not help her with accommodation. Samuel was very disturbed by the way the social worker spoke to them and was unable to sleep.

Janet had Limited Leave to Remain with No Recourse to Public Funds. She had been looking for work, but was not able to find childcare to work the hours she had been offered.

Janet and Samuel were facing street homelessness. They had been asked to leave their friend's property. We referred the family to

the local authority, but they refused to provide accommodation. The family started sleeping in a church. We found the family a solicitor, who judicially reviewed the local authority's decision. After many months, the Court ordered the local authority to provide accommodation to Janet and Samuel.



Why we oppose the exclusion of families from social care

A local authority is supposed to assess whether a child is in need, and then decide what services to provide.

Assessments can be very intrusive and require people to provide extensive evidence of their circumstances. A family may have to meet with fraud and immigration officers – and some local authorities have embedded immigration officers from the Home Office working in their assessment teams.⁷ In 2018, after political pressure, Southwark Council stopped employing an embedded immigration officer, and in February 2019, Lewisham followed suit.

Local authorities often only offer accommodation to a child – effectively threatening to take them into care if their parent goes to social services to ask for support.

Local authorities often wrongly conclude that children and families are not eligible for support, leaving families with no option but to legally challenge the decision or remain destitute.

All of this is highly distressing for families, and has a significant negative impact on children's health, development and wellbeing.

⁷ Project 17 is aware of embedded immigration officers in the following London boroughs: London Borough of Barking and Dagenham, Bexley, Croydon, Enfield, Greenwich, Hackney and Kingston upon Thames

Many children in NRPF families are British citizens, or were born here and are entitled to British citizenship. Local authorities should support them to access their rights, rather than obstructing them.



What you can do

- » [North East London Migrant Action](#) runs a scheme pairing up families in London who are in need of support with people who can support them through the application process. You don't need any prior training as they will provide it – why not join their accompanying scheme, or talk to them about how to set one up in your local area? Contact nelondonmigrantaction@gmail.com.
- » Support Project 17's '[Seen and Heard](#)' campaign to make sure local authorities meet all children's essential needs, regardless of immigration status.
- » Support [Together with Migrant Children](#), a charity using a rights-based approach to work with migrant children and families.

Part 10

ROUGH SLEEPING



North East London Migrant Action (NELMA)

In May 2016 the Home Office declared rough sleeping an 'abuse' of EU citizens' right to freedom of movement.

This policy meant that immigration enforcement teams could arrest, detain and remove homeless EU nationals from the UK just for sleeping rough. This policy change was introduced without any new legislation being passed.

It particularly affected people from eastern and southern European countries. An increasing number of people from these countries are sleeping rough in the UK because of restrictions on their right to benefits and the rise in precarious employment. Many of those affected by the policy had been living in the UK for years.

To locate and take enforcement action against European rough sleepers, the Home Office worked with local authorities, the Greater London Authority (GLA) and some homelessness charities commissioned by the GLA, including Thames Reach and St Mungo's. They shared information with immigration enforcement teams and conducted "joint patrols".

Groups of migrants sleeping rough were targeted by immigration enforcement teams and told they had no right to sleep rough. Some were issued with letters telling them to leave the UK and had their ID documents confiscated, leaving them unable to work. Others were detained in immigration removal centres.

NELMA and the Public Interest Law Unit challenged this policy in court, and in December 2017 it was found to be unlawful.



Did this only happen to European migrants, or are others being treated similarly?

European migrants were specifically targeted in this case – partly for political reasons linked to the Brexit vote, but also because it is legally more difficult for the Home Office to remove refused asylum seekers and other migrants from outside the EU. But the policy sets a worrying precedent for all migrants who find themselves on the streets.

The story of Mihail and Teodora, two people from Bulgaria

We were sleeping rough outside Victoria station. We were working and had found a place to live – we were just waiting for two people to move out.

Immigration came at about one in the morning. There were about five of them, maybe more. They were polite but they didn't explain anything. They took our details and gave us papers saying we had to report to the Home Office. That was all. We weren't upset or worried at first. We had all our papers in order, so we would be fine.

But, three days later, when we went to the Home Office they were rude to us. They told us we had been served papers because we were sleeping on the streets.

We asked for an interpreter but didn't get one. One immigration officer said: "Shut up! Go back to Bulgaria." We signed something else but I don't know what it was.

Then they took our passports away and detained us.

They put us in Yarl's Wood. They took Teodora's medication away and kept it at reception. She's not well. She can't do anything without it. We were in there for three months and 15 days. It was a time of fear and stress. Teodora was crying. Her pulse was fast. She couldn't breathe. She was always in the hospital wing.

Our solicitor got us out. We don't know how or why. We could have been there forever. It felt like a prison. I would die before going back. I'm not a criminal.

They kept our passports after we got out. So we can't get an address, or a National Insurance number, or anything. Teodora has been offered a good job as a cleaner in a hotel. But she can't do it because she doesn't have her passport.



Why we oppose the Home Office's targeting of rough sleepers

Being homeless is neither a choice nor a crime. It does not constitute a 'misuse' of freedom of movement rights. What's more, the Home Office's rough sleeper removals policy was cruel and deeply discriminatory.

Homelessness is a complex social problem. It cannot be solved by scapegoating destitute migrants for the social problems caused by a decade of austerity. Instead of trying to hound homeless migrants off the street and out of the country at all costs, the Government and charities should be defending their rights, not to mention funding the workers' housing and employment support that could improve people's outcomes here in the UK.

What you can do

- » You can help by [distributing flyers](#) to raise awareness (available in nine languages).

Part 10

IMMIGRATION RAIDS



Anti-Raids Network

Successive governments have developed policies and perpetuated a rhetoric that increasingly criminalises immigration.

This has gradually trickled into public life, including immigration checks on the street or at transport stations, or immigration raids on homes, restaurants, at other businesses and even at registry office weddings.

Immigration enforcement (IE) officers do not have the same powers as the police to stop individuals in public places. However, over the years, immigration enforcement officers have been granted greater powers to search and detain people – more than the police in some respects. But their behaviour and misuse of their powers are often not appropriately scrutinised.

Immigration enforcement teams operate within the UK Visas and Immigration (UKVI) department of the Home Office, formerly known as the UK Border Agency. There are currently [19 such teams](#) in the UK. They often descend on premises in groups to question and detain any individuals who cannot prove at that moment that they are not undocumented migrants.



Why we oppose street stops and raids

The actions of immigration enforcement officers can go unchallenged in public.

This can allow them to behave with impunity, even though much of

their activity is predicated on [unlawful racial profiling](#), or entering premises and apprehending people without the correct legal permission to do so.

IE officers are required to apply for a permit, or secure ‘informed consent’ before they enter premises. Once they are inside, they should be looking for a specific person, or evidence relating to a specific [person](#). In reality, we know that officers will enter premises and attempt to apprehend anyone that they think may be in the UK unlawfully.

A 2015 report into immigration enforcement raids by the Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration found that IE officers had warrants to enter premises and conduct a raid in only 43 per cent of [cases](#). In spite of this, IE officers often enter premises, sometimes by force, knowing that those inside are unaware of their legal right to refuse entry.

Sometimes IE officers will conduct joint operations with police officers in public places. For these to take place lawfully, the IE officers need to possess some information to indicate that the individual they are stopping is in the UK unlawfully and they must seek consent before questioning them.

Any questioning must be consensual. IE officers do not have legal powers to compel someone to stop, or to require them to comply with questioning. If someone exercises their right not to answer questions and leave, IE officers [do not have powers](#) to arrest them on suspicion of ‘committing an immigration offence’. We know the reality is that IE officers often overstep the boundary of their legal powers, sometimes supported by police officers who do have more powers to stop individuals.

Immigration enforcement raids are often carried out to symbolically demonstrate force against vulnerable communities. The ‘intelligence’ that IE officers use to apprehend individuals is often based on racial

profiling. We believe that everyone deserves to live free from this racist state violence.



What you can do if you see an immigration raid

There are important limits on immigration enforcement officers' authority to stop and question people on the street. If you are stopped, or if you are with someone who is stopped, you may consider taking the following steps, if you feel able to do so without unlawfully obstructing the officer or jeopardising your safety:

- » Politely ask the officer whether you, or the person being stopped, are (i) required to answer questions, or (ii) are free to leave. Make clear to the officer that you do not consent to the stop or the questions and would like to leave, unless you are being ordered not to.
- » Film the incident. If you are not the one being stopped, ask the person being stopped if that's ok, or just film the officers involved. This may be useful in making a claim against the Home Office in the event of an unlawful stop or arrest
- » Record the names and lapel numbers of the officers involved.
- » Make other members of the public aware of what's happening.
- » Get witnesses' contact details if the stop leads to an arrest, or the person wants to pursue it afterwards.
- » Attempt to pass on a phone number to the individual if you think the stop will lead to arrest. Useful numbers include [SOAS Detainee Support](#) (07438407570) or [Bail for Immigration Detainees](#) (020 7456 9750).

- » Note that obstructing officers, including by use of verbal warnings meant to prevent officers from executing their duties, may put you at risk of arrest for the crime of obstruction of an officer.

If you want to refer to the Government's own rules on street stops as you take these steps, everything can be found in the Home Office Enforcement Visits guidance.

While not everyone may feel able to intervene when a street stop occurs, resistance can take many forms and we encourage communities to resist however they can.

- » Even if you do not feel able to intervene in a raid yourself, we have published online advice on [what to do if you see a raid](#) as well as [posters](#) and rights information in dozens of languages – why not download them and disseminate to people you know?

CONCLUSION

This guide to the hostile environment may make for difficult reading, but its purpose is to help us to know our enemy.

Internal border controls amount to state-sanctioned discrimination and are fundamentally incompatible with the human rights laws the UK is signed up to.

This country has become a place where parents fear sending their children to school, unwell people avoid seeking medical care for life-threatening conditions and victims of serious crime risk detention if they report to the police.

It's a country that hikes immigration and nationality fees to exorbitant rates, slashes access to legal aid, and leaves people at the mercy of destitution and exploitation when they can't retain their immigration status – including people who came here as citizens and have lived here for decades.

But this guide also highlights some of the opposition to the Government's toxic vision and explains how we can take positive action to stop it in its tracks.

Small groups of people have mobilised up and down the country, often without any funding or much campaigning experience, to stand in solidarity with the migrants forced into destitution by these measures. The Government believes that its hostile environment

enjoys the broad support of the public – but countless small acts every day show that this is not the case.

So take this guide and – if you feel able – think about what action you could take. Could you join one of the grassroots groups accompanying people to access support to which they're entitled?

Could you set up a spare room network or accompanying scheme in your local area?

Could you write to your MP to ask if their next party manifesto will oppose the hostile environment in its entirety? Will you intervene if you see an immigration raid? Will you organise your workplace to demand that migrant workers aren't discriminated against, and are supported to retain their immigration status?

The Government's attempt to create a hostile environment is dependent on the willing participation of people across society – but that will also be its downfall. For as long as we refuse to participate, we can fight the Government's attempts to turn us into border guards. We can fight for a country that guarantees people's human rights, whoever they are and wherever they come from.

That fight has already started. We hope you will join it.



Further reading

General

- » [The children of Windrush: 'I'm here legally, but they're asking me to prove I'm British'](#), Amelia Gentleman, The Guardian
- » [The Windrush Scandal Shows Why the Hostile Environment Must End](#), Gracie Mae Bradley, Vice
- » [The Home Office is Building a Massive Database of Migrants](#), Emily Dugan, BuzzFeed
- » [Know Your Rights: A Guide for Migrant](#), Migrants' Rights Network and partners
- » [Right to Remain Toolkit](#), a guide to the UK asylum and immigration system by Right to Remain
- » [How to destroy a life: On one deportation among many](#), Luke de Noronha, Ceasefire
- » [The hostile environment: what is it and who does it affect?](#), Colin Yeo, Free Movement
- » [The Hostile Environment: turning the UK into a nation of border cops](#), Corporate Watch

Health and education

- » [Care Don't Share](#), Liberty
- » [Hostile environment: how risk-averse universities penalise migrants](#), Harriet Swain, The Guardian

- » [Victims of serious crime face arrest over immigration status](#), Catrin Nye, Natalie Bloomer, Samir Jeraj, BBC News
- » [#PatientsNotPassports toolkit](#), Docs Not Cops, MedAct and Migrants Organise
- » [As a doctor, I can see that denying NHS care to immigrants is inhumane](#), Kitty Worthing, The Guardian

Employment stops and raids

- » [Papers please: the impact of the civil penalty regime on the employment rights of migrants in the UK](#), Migrants' Rights Network
- » [Immigration raids, employer collusion and the Immigration Act 2016](#), Dr Katie Bales, Industrial Law Journal
- » [Understanding the interpersonal and the structural context of domestic work](#), Bridget Anderson, openDemocracy
- » [Thousands of British citizens swept up in immigration spot checks](#), Charles Boutaud, Adam Cantwell-Corn, and Donato Paolo Mancini, The Bureau of Investigative Journalism

Housing, welfare and homelessness

- » [Austerity stories you won't hear about in today's budget](#), Rebecca Omonira-Oyekanmi, openDemocracy
- » [Passport Please](#), Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants
- » [VIDEO: 'We slept on the buses': Britain's homeless children](#), Simon Rawles, Kate Lyons, Matthew Bradley and Ken Macfarlane, The Guardian

- » [Not Seen, Not Heard: Children's Experiences of the Hostile Environment](#), Project 17,
- » [The Round-Up: rough sleeper immigration raids and charity collaboration](#), Corporate Watch



About the authors



Against Borders for Children is a coalition of parents, teachers, schools and campaigners aiming to reverse the policies of the hostile environment in schools. Their work focuses on overturning the Department of Education's policy of collecting children's country of birth and nationality information.

www.schoolsabc.net



The Anti-Raids Network

The Anti-Raids Network is a network of individuals and groups who are building resistance to immigration raids by sharing information and materials for people to take action themselves.

www.antiraid.net



Doctors of the World UK

Doctors of the World UK is an independent organisation working to empower those excluded from access to healthcare both nationally and globally.

www.doctorsoftheworld.org.uk



Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI)

Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI) is an independent charity promoting justice, fairness and equality for the UK's immigration and asylum law and policy. JCWI campaigns on immigration policy and offer legal advice and assistance on all aspects of immigration and asylum law.

www.jcwi.org.uk

I.LIBERTY

Liberty is an independent membership organisation. We challenge injustice, defend freedom and campaign to make sure everyone in the UK is treated fairly. We are campaigners, lawyers and policy experts who work together to protect rights and hold the powerful to account.

www.libertyhumanrights.org.uk



Migrants' Rights Network (MRN)

Migrants' Rights Network (MRN) is a migrant rights campaigning organisation. MRN brings together activists, support organisations, think tanks, academics, faith groups and public sector representatives to advocate for a rights-based approach to migration in the UK.

www.migrantsrights.org.uk



National Union of Students (NUS) is a student-led confederation of 95% of the UK's higher and further education unions, working to protect the rights of students.

www.nus.org.uk



North East London Migrant Action (NELMA)

North East London Migrant Action (NELMA) are a collaborative grassroots organisation who support migrants in vulnerable positions. They have campaigned against the injustices faced by families with no recourse to public funds, and the Home Office's policy of detaining and deporting EEA national rough sleepers.

www.nelmacampaigns.wordpress.com



Project 17

Project 17 works to end destitution among migrant children by providing advice and support for individuals, and campaigning for the improved implementation of statutory support for migrant children.

www.project17.org.uk

Contributors would also like to thank [StopWatch](#), [Right to Remain](#) and [Global Justice Now](#) for their comments and expertise.

