

# **DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW**

**London Borough of Haringey Safer  
Communities Partnership**

**Report into the murder of Eleena  
March 2018**

**Author: Davina James-Hanman OBE**

**July 2019**

## **Glossary**

AAFDA	Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse
CCG	Clinical Commissioning Group
CPS	Crown Prosecution Service
CSP	Community Safety Partnership
DHR	Domestic Homicide Review
IDVA	Independent Domestic Violence Adviser
IMR	Individual Management Review
IRIS	Identification and Referral to Increase Safety
LB	London Borough
MARAC	Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference

## Contents

Glossary.....	2
Preface .....	4
1. Introduction .....	4
2. Overview .....	5
3. Parallel reviews .....	6
4. Domestic Homicide Review Panel.....	6
5. Independence .....	7
6. Terms of Reference and Scope.....	7
7. Confidentiality and dissemination .....	8
8. Methodology.....	8
9. Equality and Diversity .....	9
10. Involvement of family and friends .....	10
11. Key events .....	10
12. Analysis.....	13
13. Good practice.....	16
14. Key findings and lessons learned.....	16
15. Recommendations .....	17
Appendix A: Terms of Reference .....	18
Appendix B: Cross-Government definition of domestic violence and abuse .....	21
Appendix C: Further information about the chair and report author .....	22

# DHR OVERVIEW REPORT INTO THE MURDER OF ELEENA, MARCH 2018

## Preface

The Independent Chair and the DHR Panel members offer their deepest sympathy to all who have been affected by the death of Eleena<sup>1</sup>, and thank them, together with the others who have contributed to the deliberations of the Review, for their participation, generosity of spirit and patience. We especially offer our sympathy to her surviving son and hope that his recovery continues.

The Review Chair thanks the Panel for the thoughtful and considered manner in which they have conducted the Review and their strenuous efforts to make this process meaningful.

## 1. Introduction

1.1 Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) were established on a statutory basis under Section 9 of the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act (2004) and were enacted in 2011. The Act states that a DHR should be a review of the circumstances in which the death of a person aged 16 or over has, or appears to have, resulted from violence, abuse or neglect by-

- (a) A person to whom she was related or with whom she was or had been in an intimate personal relationship or
- (b) A member of the same household as herself;

with a view to identifying the lessons to be learnt from the death.

Throughout the report the term 'domestic abuse' is used interchangeably with 'domestic violence', and the report uses the cross-Government definition as issued in March 2013. This can be found in full at Appendix B.

1.2 The purpose of a DHR is to:

- Establish what lessons are to be learned from the domestic homicide regarding the way in which local professionals and organisations work individually and together to safeguard victims.
- Identify clearly what those lessons are both within and between agencies, how and within what timescales they will be acted on, and what is expected to change as a result.
- Apply these lessons to service responses including changes to policies and procedures as appropriate.

---

<sup>1</sup> Not her real name

- Prevent domestic violence and homicide and improve service responses for all domestic violence and abuse victims and their children by developing a co-ordinated multi-agency approach to ensure that domestic abuse is identified and responded to effectively at the earliest opportunity.
- Contribute to a better understanding of the nature of domestic violence and abuse.
- Highlight good practice.

1.3. This Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) examines the circumstances leading up to the death of Eleena who was murdered in March 2018 by her husband.

The decision to undertake a DHR was made by Haringey Community Safety Partnership in April 2018 in consultation with local specialists. The Home Office was duly informed. An independent Chair was appointed in August 2018. The delay in beginning was to take account of other DHRs that were already underway but, in the meantime, local agencies were asked to check their records and secure their files in the event of having had any contact. The Panel met for the first time in September 2018.

In consultation with the Senior Investigating Officer, it was decided to delay some aspects of the DHR, such as meeting with family members, until the criminal investigation had concluded. This took place at the end of October 2018 and thereafter efforts were made to contact members of the family and the perpetrator with limited success (see section 9).

1.4. The London Borough of Haringey is the sixth most deprived borough in London and ranks as 30/326 in the deprivation index for all English local authorities. Within the Borough there are extreme contrasts: neighbourhoods in some of the western wards are among the most prosperous in the country; in the east of the borough, many neighbourhoods are classified as being among the most deprived in the country.<sup>2</sup>

According to the GLA's population projections for 2018, the current population of Haringey is 282,904 residents which is comprised of 33.6% White British, 25.9% "Other White", 8.2% Black African heritage and 5.8% Black Caribbean heritage. Haringey is also home to several smaller Asian communities.

## 2. Overview

### Persons involved in this DHR

Name	Gender	Age at the time of the murder	Relationship with victim	Ethnicity
Eleena	F	35	Victim	Tanzanian
Jonas <sup>3</sup>	M	39	Husband and perpetrator	Tanzanian

<sup>2</sup>Office for National Statistics

<sup>3</sup> Not his real name

Jayden <sup>4</sup>	M		Eleena's son from her first marriage	
---------------------	---	--	--------------------------------------	--

Address 1 is the home where all the above named people lived. It is a terraced house divided into three flats. The family lived in the ground floor flat.

## 2.1 Summary of the incident

In March 2018 at 6.59 am, the Police received a phone call from Jayden, who said, '*Dad has stabbed my Mum with a knife*'. Sounds of a disturbance could be heard in the background. He went on to say that he had been told to leave the house by his Dad and that he thought his Mum was dead. He explained that he was now outside the family address (Address 1).

A few minutes after the 999 call from Jayden, a man called the Police and stated that his wife had attacked him with a knife, and he had defended himself. He said he was at address 1. It would later be confirmed that the mobile phone number that made this call belonged to Jonas.

Two police officers responded to the call and on arrival were met at the main front door by a man (Jonas). He had blood on his hands and a small superficial cut on his left forearm. He was immediately handcuffed. The officer asked, '*Where is she?*' to which Jonas replied, '*She's down there, she's injured me*'.

One officer remained with Jonas while the other officer checked the ground floor flat. He found the lifeless body of Eleena lying face down in the doorway to the bedroom wearing just a small vest top. The most significant injury and cause of death was a slash to her neck of such severity that it had damaged the spinal bone. She had also been stabbed six times in the head and neck, 22 times in her arms and 21 times on her trunk. She was also covered in bruises and her eyes showed evidence of strangulation.

Jonas was arrested and charged with murder.

## 3. Parallel reviews

- 3.1. An inquest was opened by Her Majesty's Coroner and was adjourned pending the outcome of the criminal trial. There are no current plans for it to resume.
- 3.2. Jonas entered a very late guilty plea to murder having previously tried to claim self-defence. The evidence showed this to be patently untrue. Jonas was subsequently sentenced to life imprisonment with a minimum tariff of 23 years.
- 3.3. There were no other parallel reviews.

## 4. Domestic Homicide Review Panel

The DHR Panel was comprised of the following:

Davina James-Hanman	Independent DHR Chair and report author
---------------------	---

<sup>4</sup> Not his real name

Caroline Murphy	Director of Operations, Nia
Fiona Dwyer	Strategic Violence Against Women and Girls Lead, LB Haringey
Hazel Ashworth	Designated Professional for Safeguarding Adults NHS Haringey Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)
Jennifer Cirone	Senior Manager, Solace Women's Aid
Karen Miller	Head of Safeguarding, Whittington Health NHS Trust
Liz Gaunt	Specialist Crime Review Group, Metropolitan Police

## 5. Independence

5.1. The author of this report, Davina James-Hanman, is independent of all agencies involved and had no prior contact with any family members. She is an experienced DHR Chair and is also nationally recognised as an expert in domestic violence having been active in this area of work for over three decades. Further details are provided in Appendix C.

5.2. All Panel Members were independent of any direct contact with the subjects of this DHR and nor were they the immediate line managers of anyone who had had direct contact. This also applied to those agencies who provided chronologies, none of which prompted a request for a full Individual Management Review.

## 6. Terms of Reference and Scope

6.1 The full terms of reference can be found at appendix A. As information came to light, the key lines of enquiry were revised to focus less on agency contact as there was very little, and none of any relevance, to focus instead on what else might be learned from this tragic event.

6.2 The timeframe for the DHR was set as being from 2008 which is around the time Eleena and Jayden arrived in the UK. This also captures the period of Jonas's first marriage.

6.3 The key issues identified as needing exploration in this DHR were:

- Protected characteristics of Eleena and Jonas and whether there was any indication of either being a vulnerable adult.
- Whether Eleena knew about domestic abuse services and were there any barriers to her accessing these?
- Whether Jayden was adequately protected?
- Whether Jonas had a history of abuse and if so, could more have been done to ensure this was known?
- Were there any concerns amongst family / friends / colleagues or within the community and if so, how could such concerns have been harnessed to enable intervention and support?
- Whether local service provision is adequate and sufficiently prioritised in local planning arrangements?

- Whether local agencies are adequately engaging with the local African population?
- Whether local agencies have robust domestic abuse policies and procedures in place both individually and on a multi-agency basis?
- Whether training is available to, and accessed by, staff in relation to responding to the above issues?

## **7. Confidentiality and dissemination**

- 7.1 The findings of this Overview Report are restricted. Information is available only to participating officers/professionals and their line managers, until after the Review has been approved for publication by the Home Office Quality Assurance Panel. Members of the victim's family have also been provided with a copy of the report.
- 7.2 As recommended within the 'Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance for the Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews' to protect the identities of those involved, pseudonyms have been used and precise dates obscured.
- 7.3 The Executive Summary of this report has also been anonymised.
- 7.4 Subsequent to permission being granted by the Home Office to publish, this report will be widely disseminated including, but not limited to:
- Members of the Haringey Community Safety Partnership
  - Members of the Violence Against Women & Girls Strategic Group
  - Agencies represented on the Panel
- 7.5 The report will also be published on Haringey's dedicated DHR website: [www.haringey.gov.uk/dhr](http://www.haringey.gov.uk/dhr)

## **8. Methodology**

- 8.1 Only three agencies had contact with the subjects of this Review prior to the murder: two with Eleena and one with Jayden. No agencies had any record of contact with Jonas.
- 8.2 Chronologies were provided by Eleena's GP, the Metropolitan Police and Jayden's school.
- 8.3 Eleena had in the past been in contact with the Metropolitan Police both as a victim of theft and as a witness in another crime of a sensitive nature. Whilst these contacts were not relevant to the Review, they did at least demonstrate that Eleena was not reluctant to contact the Police and had some confidence that matters reported would be taken seriously. It cannot be assumed that she would have felt the same about reporting her own domestic abuse, but it is probably reasonable to conclude that she was not wholly unwilling.
- 8.4 Eleena also had contact with her GP. This was over an on-going health issue which predated her meeting the perpetrator and was unrelated to this Review.
- 8.5 Jayden's school had noted no concerns over his behaviour. This is perhaps to be expected given that Jayden would later give evidence that he had never witnessed so much as an argument between his mother and stepfather.



- 8.6 As a consequence of this minimal contact, no Individual Management Reviews were felt to be necessary.
- 8.7 In light of the minimal agency contact, checks were carried out on a number of areas of current service provision. This is covered in more detail in the analysis section.
- 8.8 A further 12 agencies advised they had not had any contact with the subjects of this Review.
- 8.9. This report is an anthology of information and facts gathered from:
- The chronologies and a short report from the Metropolitan Police summarising the witness statements taken during the course of the criminal investigation<sup>5</sup>
  - The Police Senior Investigating Officer and Family Liaison Officer
  - The criminal trial and associated press articles, including those in Tanzania where the trial was extensively covered
  - DHR Panel discussions
  - Information from family members.

## 9. Equality and Diversity

9.1. All nine protected characteristics in the 2010 Equality Act were considered by the DHR Panel. Several protected characteristics were found to have relevance to this DHR. These were:

**9.2. Marital status:** Eleena and Jonas were married for a total of 10 months but only lived together for 13 weeks. The Panel felt that it was likely that during this latter period, any concerning behaviour displayed by Jonas might have easily been framed by Eleena as part of the adjustment process all couples go through when living together for the first time. Nevertheless, Eleena did not make excuses for him and nor did she keep her concerns to herself albeit that she did not feel it necessary at that stage to involve professionals.

**9.3 Sex:** Sex is also relevant as there is extensive research to support that in the context of domestic violence, females are at a greater risk of being victimised, injured or killed.<sup>6</sup> Latest published figures show that 33% of female victims of homicide in the UK aged 16 or over had been killed by their partner, ex-partner or lover. In contrast, only 1% of male victims aged 16 or over were killed by their partner, ex-partner or lover<sup>7</sup>. Jonas had been abusive to his first wife and although it is unconfirmed, there are suggestions that there may have been other women victimised by him as well. As such, he was clearly a danger to women with whom he was in an intimate relationship, but this was not known to any agency in the UK. As the judge said in his sentencing remarks: *'Particularly around women with whom you are in a relationship, you have shown yourself to be an arrogant, controlling bully'*.

**9.4. Disability:** There were no indications of either Eleena or Jonas having a physical disability or any mental ill-health.

---

<sup>5</sup> This included Eleena's employer who had nothing substantive to add to the investigation. As a result, her employer was not contacted by the DHR Panel.

<sup>6</sup> Smith, K. et al. (2011) *Homicides, Firearm Offences and Intimate Violence 2009/10*. Home Office Statistical Bulletin 01/11. London: Home Office

<sup>7</sup> Office for National Statistics

- 9.5. Religion:** It is thought that both Eleena and Jonas were Muslim, but the Panel was unable to identify any religious activity such as attending a local Mosque on the part of either.
- 9.6. There was no information available that suggested either Eleena or Jonas might have any additional vulnerabilities.

## **10. Involvement of family and friends**

- 10.1 The family of the victim were informed by letter about the commencement of the DHR and invited to participate. The letter made clear that involvement in the DHR was voluntary and could happen in a way and at a time of their choosing. The Home Office leaflet on DHRs was provided, along with information about the service provided by Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse (AAFDA). The letter outlined the different ways in which they could be involved in the DHR, including a face-to-face meeting, telephone conversation, written statement or other ways that could be discussed. The letter invited contact directly from them, or through any service or person who may be supporting them. No reply was received.
- 10.2 Once the trial had concluded, a second attempt was made. Again, no replies were received. The Panel was subsequently informed that Jayden had gone to live in his father's country and had ceased all contact with other family members.
- 10.3 The Chair then tried to contact other family members and eventually made contact with Eleena's maternal Aunt who lives in the UK. Subsequent to this very helpful conversation, further attempts were made to speak with Eleena's mother who lives in Tanzania, but these were ultimately unsuccessful.
- 10.4 Post-conviction, the perpetrator was contacted in prison and invited to participate. No response was received.
- 10.5 A summary of witness statements taken by the police during the criminal investigation was provided to the Panel. This included a statement from Jonas's ex-wife and from two of Eleena's friends.

## **11. Key events**

### **11.1 Eleena's background**

- 11.1.1 Eleena met her first husband in mainland Europe around 2000. They were together for seven years and had one son together. Although they subsequently divorced, they remained on friendly terms and even after Eleena and her son moved to the UK, they would regularly travel back to mainland Europe so that Jayden could maintain a relationship with his father.
- 11.1.2 Eleena was a very sociable person, always happy and she loved to go out and party. She was studying hotel management and at the time of her death, was in her final year. She also worked part time as a Carer.
- 11.1.3 Her Aunt said that all Eleena wanted was to get married, settle down and enlarge her family. Eleena had grown up in a large extended family and wanted Jayden to have the same experience and not to be as isolated as they were.

11.1.4 Eleena was in daily contact with her mother, often exchanging dozens of text messages every day, keeping up a running commentary on her activities. Her mother suffers from insomnia so Eleena would often keep her company into the early hours of the morning whilst she was out socialising.

## **11.2 Jonas's background**

11.2.1 Jonas was married before in Tanzania in 2012. They were married for around three and a half years. His ex-wife gave a lengthy statement for the trial detailing Jonas's abuse of her which included him being jealous and controlling as well as physically violent. She stated that she was forbidden to talk with other men and would regularly have her messages checked. She described being slapped and punched, having her hands tied with a belt and being struck with an iron and the back of an axe. This occurred on an almost weekly basis. Unsurprisingly, she suffered injuries and on at least one occasion, had to go to hospital where Jonas forced her to lie about how she had sustained her injuries. She went to the Tanzanian police, but they did not take it seriously. Jonas threatened to chop her into pieces.

11.2.2 Two incidents were attested to by the sister of Jonas's first wife. In the first incident, Jonas and his wife went out dancing and Jonas became angry when his wife took a long time visiting the bathroom. They subsequently went for a pizza and Jonas hit his wife. When confronted by a male witness, he said 'She's my wife. I can do anything I want to her.' On a second occasion, Jonas punched and kicked his wife when she fell to the ground.

11.2.3 Jonas's first wife meticulously planned her escape from him over several weeks and eventually fled to another country, where she still lives, to feel safe.

11.2.4 At sentencing, the judge commented on the evidence provided by Jonas's first wife and her sister saying, 'I have no doubt whatsoever that the account given is true.'

11.2.5 Very little additional information is known about Jonas.

## **11.3 The relationship between Eleena and Jonas**

11.3.1 In February 2017, Eleena went to Tanzania for an Aunt's funeral. Whilst she was there, she met Jonas for the first time, and they had a whirlwind romance which continued via social media after she returned to the UK. Eleena told friends and family that she was madly in love.

11.3.2 In May 2017, they were married in Tanzania. Eleena returned to the UK alone whilst Jonas made an application to come to the UK. At the start of December 2017, the couple met again on a holiday in Dubai where Eleena introduced him to her son, Jayden.

11.3.3 One evening when they were in Dubai, Eleena and Jonas went out to a nightclub. Eleena's mobile rang and seeing it was Jayden, she answered whilst moving outside the club so that she could hear better. Jayden had rung to say goodnight to his Mum, and they spoke together for a few minutes. By this time, Jonas had noticed she was missing and followed her outside. He immediately accused her of speaking to an old boyfriend and slapped her across the face. A security guard intervened and Eleena left and went home. The following day she told her Mother about the incident. Her Mother

was alarmed and told Eleena that a man should not treat you like this, and you need to think carefully about taking him with you to the UK. Eleena reassured her mother that he wouldn't dare behave like that in the UK as there, the laws on domestic abuse were very strict. It should be noted at this point that a UK visitor's visa can take up to six weeks to process so it is likely at this point that Jonas already had his visa to the UK.

- 11.3.4 At the end of the holiday, Jonas came to the UK, arriving on a six-month visitor's visa in mid-December 2017. This immigration status meant he had no right to work in the UK and he became a house husband, looking after the home and Jayden when required.
- 11.3.5 One of Elena's friends said that once she married Jonas, she reduced the amount that she went out as he didn't like it. This was confirmed by her Aunt who didn't see her as often in the 13 weeks that Jonas was in the UK. At the time, however, it didn't raise any concerns for her as she thought that as newly-weds, they would want to be spending time alone together. Eleena and Jonas did spend a weekend at her Aunt's house around Christmas 2017 and efforts were made to welcome Jonas into the family. Her Aunt recalled Eleena making a throwaway comment about Jonas sometimes getting 'a bit funny' when drunk, becoming more possessive. This may have been a reference to the incident in Dubai which had taken place less than a month before and suggests that the incident may have been resolved between them with Jonas blaming the alcohol for 'making' him hit her. Eleena's Uncle invited Jonas to go out with him a couple of times, but he always declined. At the time, this too was understood in the context of the couple wanting to spend their time alone together.

#### **11.4. The incident**

*Author's note: The following account has disregarded much of the narrative provided by Jonas in interview as much of the detail he provided was subsequently shown to be wholly false. Instead it relies on the statements given by friends, a neighbour, Jayden and the physical evidence at the scene.*

- 11.4.1 Eleena had invited Jonas out one evening in March 2018. Jonas forgot about this and decided that he did not want to go as he was tired, and they didn't have anyone to look after Jayden. Eleena wasn't happy about this as she wanted them both to go out. She met up with her friend and they travelled together to the first bar in a taxi. At some point they went to a second bar and just before 4am, got a taxi home. Eleena's friend was dropped off first and Eleena was dropped off at address 1 shortly after.
- 11.4.2 Whilst Eleena was out, Jayden and Jonas watched TV together and Jayden later played games in his room going to sleep around 1am. Jonas claimed that he was chatting throughout the night with Eleena via whatsapp but records only showed a few exchanges, none of which were especially significant.
- 11.4.3 Jonas said that he was waiting up for Eleena when she got in. What followed between 4am and approximately 6:40am is unknown but it is clear that the account provided by Jonas is untrue.

- 11.4.4 A neighbour would later give a statement that he heard raised voices of both a man and a woman for around 15 minutes just before 7 am. He couldn't make out what was being said as they spoke in their language, but they were clearly arguing.
- 11.4.5 Jayden was woken up by the sound of his mother screaming for him to call the police. He went to Eleena's bedroom and saw Jonas strangling his mother on the bed. Jayden screamed at Jonas to stop, to which he responded by getting up off the bed and leaving the room. He returned almost immediately, only this time carrying a knife. By this time, Eleena had got up off the bed and was standing. Jonas pushed her to the floor and began stabbing her. Eleena was screaming and trying to protect herself and Jonas shouted at Jayden to get out. Jayden grabbed some clothes from his room and was on his way out when Jonas emerged from the bedroom, his hands covered in blood. He took the flat keys from Jayden who fled the flat and called the police.

## 12. Analysis

- 12.1 The gathered information has been carefully considered through the viewpoint of Eleena and Jayden to ascertain if the responses to them from agencies – both with and without contact – were appropriate and sufficiently robust.

The Review Panel is satisfied that all agencies have engaged fully and openly with the Review and have followed the terms of reference.

### 12.2 Protected characteristics of Eleena and Jonas and whether there was any indication of either being a vulnerable adult.

This is addressed in section 9 above.

### 12.3 Whether Eleena knew about domestic abuse services and were there any barriers to her accessing these?

The Panel was unable to establish whether Eleena specifically knew about domestic abuse services, but she had previously demonstrated a degree of confidence in the police (see paragraph 8.3) and on one occasion had expressed to her mother that the UK takes domestic abuse very seriously. She was also familiar with and used the internet on a regular basis. As such, it is reasonable to assume that had wanted to seek help, she would have been able to locate and use support. There were no obvious barriers to her seeking help.

- 12.3.1 The Panel did discuss whether there may have been any cultural barriers to reporting. A 2011 research study<sup>8</sup> concluded that *'prevailing gender norms in Tanzania accept women's subordination and justify male violence towards women'* but *'at the individual level, an increasing openness makes it possible for women to report, ask for help, and become proactive in suggesting preventive measures.'* See also 11.8 below.

---

<sup>8</sup> *'Community perceptions of intimate partner violence - a qualitative study from urban Tanzania'* R. Laisser et al, BMC Women's Health, April 2011. Eleena's family were from an urban district of Tanzania.

12.3.2 It should be noted that Eleena had been living in Europe since she became an adult.

12.3.3 The Panel further noted the ambitious ten year Violence Against Women strategy in Haringey (2016-26) which includes a raft of activities designed to raise awareness of domestic abuse (in all its forms) and where to go for help. It also aims to ensure that all services are equipped to recognise and address patterns of abuse and identify perpetrators of coercive and controlling behaviour as well as recognising the 'charm bias' of perpetrators.

#### **12.4 Whether Jayden was adequately protected?**

12.4.1 Jayden himself states that he had not even witnessed any arguments between Eleena and Jonas, let alone anything that constituted domestic abuse, and as such, his behaviour was unaffected. Consequently, no agency was aware that Jayden may be in need of protection.

12.4.2 It is also clear that Jayden enjoyed a close relationship with members of his mother's family as well as his biological father. Had Jayden had any concerns, there were trusted adults in his life to whom he could have spoken.

#### **12.5 Whether Jonas had a history of abuse and if so, could more have been done to ensure this was known?**

12.5.1 In the course of the criminal investigation, contact was made with Jonas's first wife. She described the abuse she had endured at the hands of Jonas and the judge ruled at trial that he believed her testimony to be truthful. She had at one point reported this abuse to the Tanzanian Police but was told to go home and think about whether she really wanted to report her husband. Records relating to this could not be found. Jonas's first wife also had reason to believe that Jonas may have been in trouble with the police in Zanzibar<sup>9</sup> but she had no further details of what this might entail. Again, no records were located which might have shed some light on this.

12.5.2 The Panel discussed at length what would have to change in order to make a difference, but it was difficult to conceive of anything that did not involve significant changes in countries abroad which is clearly beyond the authority of this DHR. Criminal record checks are done on persons entering the UK on a spousal visa, but Jonas entered the UK on a visitor's visa and even if the checks had been done, nothing would have been found due to poor record keeping in Tanzania.

#### **12.6 Were there any concerns amongst family / friends / colleagues or within the community and if so, how could such concerns have been harnessed to enable intervention and support?**

Jonas's first wife had considered making contact with Eleena to warn her about Jonas but felt that she had no independent evidence and that Eleena would simply dismiss her account as being the consequence of a jealous ex.

Eleena's mother was aware that the couple were arguing and had been told by Eleena of the incident in Dubai (see paragraph 10.3.3.). She had no reason to think that matters would escalate to murder but she had urged her daughter not to put up with

---

<sup>9</sup> Zanzibar is still part of Tanzania but is a small island off the coast from Dar-es-Salaam.

any abuse and had been reassured by Eleena's statement that Jonas would not be able to get away with such behaviour in the UK.

Eleena's Aunt had noticed that Eleena had less contact with her in the 13 weeks that Jonas was in the UK but, entirely reasonably, had thought that a newly married couple might want time alone. On one occasion, Eleena alluded to Jonas sometimes being a bit possessive. Similarly, Eleena's friend stated that Eleena went out less often as Jonas didn't like it. Neither had any reason to believe that this was a problem of such magnitude it would lead to her murder.

Eleena herself thought that she had time; when talking to her mother about the arguing, she had mentioned that his visa was for six months. He would not be able to return to the UK on a visitor's after this expired for a further six months; his only other option would be to return on a spousal visa and Eleena was clear with her mother that this would not happen if the relationship did not improve. Asked to describe Eleena, her Aunt said she was very strong, focused and determined.

## **12.7 Whether local service provision is adequate and sufficiently prioritised in local planning arrangements?**

Domestic violence is a key priority for Haringey Community Safety Partnership and is included in the Community Safety Strategy with the strategic aim of fostering a safe borough. *It seeks to do so by tackling specific community safety issues, including violent crime, domestic abuse, exploitation, low public confidence, repeat victimisation, and reoffending.* The key outcomes around domestic abuse are:

- Reduced domestic abuse: violence with injury
- Reduced number of sexual offences
- Reduced number of repeat female victims
- Increased number of professionals trained to recognise and respond to VAWG
- Increased number of women accessing support services

Domestic violence and abuse (as a strand of VAWG) is also a priority for LB Haringey and is a discrete outcome under the People theme of the Borough Plan (2019-2023). LB Haringey commissions a number of specialist domestic abuse services. This includes Hearthstone (Haringey Domestic Violence Advice and Support Centre) which provides emotional and practical support for anyone experiencing domestic abuse in Haringey, including legal advice, housing advice, access to refuge accommodation, access to counselling and safety planning. Solace Women's Aid also run a range of services in Haringey, including a phone line for immediate advice, counselling and floating support. Solace also run North London Rape Crisis Service, which is for women and girls over the age of 14 who have experienced any form of sexual violence at any time in their lives. The Nia Project provides the local IDVA<sup>10</sup> service for high risk victims and the Advocate-Educator for the IRIS<sup>11</sup> Project which aims to improve responses to domestic abuse from Primary Care providers. Finally, the Domestic Violence Intervention Programme (DVIP) run services for women who have experienced domestic violence and services for men who have been violent to their partner to learn how to end their abusive behaviour.

---

<sup>10</sup> The IDVA service works with domestic abuse survivors who are categorised as high risk.

<sup>11</sup> IRIS is a primary care model for responding to victim-survivors of domestic abuse

In common with all specialist domestic abuse services, demand for the above provision exceeds supply. However, on balance, LB Haringey has a good range of provision, meeting the needs of all categorisations of risk and compares favourably with other similar local authority areas.

### **12.8 Whether local agencies are adequately engaging with the local African population?**

Specialist domestic abuse services in Haringey have a strong record of reaching and engaging with underserved communities. Across the specialist provision in Haringey, the number of clients with a recorded ethnicity of Black African ranges from 6 - 6.5% which compares favourably with the 8.2% of Haringey's population who are Black African. It should also be noted that African women are amongst the lowest ethnic group for disclosing domestic abuse to professionals, often preferring to seek more informal interventions.<sup>12</sup>

### **12.9 Whether local agencies have robust domestic abuse policies and procedures in place both individually and on a multi-agency basis?**

The Review Panel has checked that the key agencies taking part in this Review have domestic violence policies and is satisfied that these are fit for purpose. There are also multi-agency procedures in place such as an information-sharing protocol which is reviewed annually.

### **12.10 Whether training is available to, and accessed by, staff in relation to responding to the above issues?**

Training and capacity building support for front line service professionals is commissioned under the local Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) Strategy. As part of this, a uniform set of minimum training standards has been developed to ensure that all professionals can identify and effectively signpost to specialist support. Awareness training is widely accessed across a range of professions as well as more specialist training being provided in some areas such as IRIS training for primary healthcare staff. The Review Panel did not identify any significant gaps.

## **13. Good practice**

No examples of good practice were noted.

## **14. Key findings and lessons learned**

The purpose of this review is to highlight the lessons that might be learned from cases of domestic homicide. Only two agencies had any contact with Eleena and in neither case was the contact relevant to this Review. Only one agency (school) had contact with Jayden and this too yielded no relevant information as no behaviour changes had been noticed. No agency had any contact with Jonas.

Having established that there was no organisational information, the Panel then explored whether there were any signs of abuse that Eleena felt unable or was unwilling to report.

---

<sup>12</sup> Siddiqui, H. (2018) 'Counting the cost: BME women and gender based violence in the UK', IPPR Progressive Review



It is clear that Jonas had a history of being violent and controlling to his previous wife and possibly other female partners. There is also evidence that he was – on at least one previous occasion – physically violent to Eleena and that he was also jealous and possessive. There is, however, a paucity of evidence of the impact of this behaviour on Eleena. Jayden reported that he never saw them argue, although this could have simply been the result of protective parenting by Eleena. Her friends and family did report that she socialised less often after Jonas arrived in the UK, but it is possible that this was, at least in part, of Eleena's choosing, wanting to spend time with her new husband. Even if she were affected by his attempts to control her, it didn't stop her going out drinking with a friend the night before the murder.

Nevertheless, Eleena had told her mother that they were often arguing and on one occasion made reference to the fact that he was only in the UK on a six month visitor's visa saying that he had six months to 'prove himself' otherwise he'd be gone.

Jonas was only in the UK for a short time, but comments made to others reveal that he was already unhappy with his situation. His exact expectations remain unknown, but he did not like having no money and being unable to work. Given his past behaviour in relationships, it is likely that he (wrongly) felt emasculated at not being in control.

Two dangerous cultural narratives contributed to this incident. Firstly, the myth of whirlwind love affairs being romantic rather than a cause for concern and secondly the myth that 'real' men control 'their' women. Unpicking and dispelling myths like these are fundamental to the work undertaken by specialist services in the Borough, including those working with perpetrators.

The Review Panel has critically reviewed this case to identify any potential lessons to improve the future. Despite the best efforts of the Panel, there were no lessons identified from this DHR. The services provided, policies and procedures will continue to be reviewed and improved within the auspices of Haringey Community Safety Partnership.

## **15. Recommendations**

- 15.1 Upon receiving permission to publish, Haringey Safer Communities Partnership should attach a full and unredacted copy of this report to Jayden's Social Care Records should he later wish to find out more information about his mother's death.

## **Appendix A: Terms of Reference**

### **DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW (DHR) into the death of Eleena**

#### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

##### **Overarching aim**

The over-arching intention of this review is to learn lessons from the homicide in order to change future practice that leads to increased safety for potential and actual victims. It will be conducted in an open and consultative fashion bearing in mind the need to retain confidentiality and not to apportion blame. Agencies will seek to discover what they could do differently in the future and how they can work more effectively with other partners.

##### **Principles of the Review**

1. Objective, independent & evidence-based
2. Guided by humanity, compassion and empathy with the victim's voice at the heart of the process.
3. Asking questions, to prevent future harm, learn lessons and not blame individuals or organisations
4. Respecting equality and diversity
5. Openness and transparency whilst safeguarding confidential information where possible.

##### **Key lines of inquiry<sup>13</sup>**

The Review Panel will consider the following:

- Protected characteristics of Eleena and Jonas and whether there was any indication of either of them being a vulnerable adult.
- Whether Eleena knew about domestic abuse services and were there any barriers to her accessing these?
- Whether Jayden was adequately protected?
- Whether Jonas had a history of abuse and if so, could more have been done to ensure this was known?
- Were there any concerns amongst family / friends / colleagues or within the community and if so, how could such concerns have been harnessed to enable intervention and support?
- Whether local service provision is adequate and sufficiently prioritised in local planning arrangements?
- Whether local agencies are adequately engaging with the local African population?
- Whether local agencies have robust domestic abuse policies and procedures in place both individually and on a multi-agency basis?
- Whether training is available to, and accessed by, staff in relation to responding to the above issues?

---

<sup>13</sup> These key lines of enquiry were radically revised after low agency contact was established

## **Family involvement and Confidentiality**

The review will seek to involve the family of both the victim and the perpetrator in the review process, taking account of who the family wish to have involved as lead members and to identify other people they think relevant to the review process.

We will seek to agree a communication strategy that keeps the families informed, if they so wish, throughout the process. We will be sensitive to their wishes, their need for support and any existing arrangements that are in place to do this.

We will identify the timescale and process and ensure that the family are able to respond to this review endeavouring to avoid duplication of effort and without undue pressure.

## **Disclosure & Confidentiality**

- Confidentiality should be maintained by organisations whilst undertaking their IMR. However, the achievement of confidentiality and transparency must be balanced against the legal requirements surrounding disclosure.
- The independent chair, on receipt of an Individual Management Review, may wish to review an organisation's case records and internal reports personally, or meet with review participants.
- A criminal investigation is running in parallel to this Domestic Homicide Review, therefore all material received by the Panel must be disclosed to the Senior Investigation Officer and the police disclosure officer
- The criminal investigation is likely to result in a court hearing. Home Office guidance instructs the Overview Report will be held until the conclusion of this case. Records will continue to be reviewed and any lessons learned will be taken forward immediately.
- Individuals will be granted anonymity within the Overview Report and Executive Summary and will be referred to by pseudonyms.
- Where consent to share information is not forthcoming, agencies should consider whether the information can be disclosed in the public interest.

## **Timescales**

All Domestic Homicide Reviews are to be submitted to the Home Office within 6 months of notification. If necessary, a revised timeline will be communicated to the Home Office.

The Review commenced in September 2018 and subject to the conclusion of the criminal trial and family involvement, will aim to conclude by March 2019.

All meetings will be held at Wood Green Civic Centre.

## **Media strategy**

Any media enquiries prior to the conclusion of the trial must be referred to the Metropolitan Police, who will liaise as appropriate with Haringey Community Safety Partnership. Post-trial, enquiries should be directed to the Chair, who will agree a media strategy with Haringey Community Safety Partnership.

It should be noted that Panel Members are representing their agency and as such, this media strategy applies to all staff members of participating agencies. Care should also be taken with self-generated publicity such as tweets and press releases so as not to compromise the independence and integrity of the DHR process.

### **Chairing & Governance**

An independent chair has been appointed to lead on all aspects of the review and will report to the Chairs of Haringey Community Safety Partnership.

A Panel has been convened specifically to overlook the review process. This is a mix of statutory and voluntary sector agencies and includes specialist domestic violence services.

Haringey Community Safety Partnership will sign off the final report and submit it to the Home Office Quality Assurance process.

### **Agency roles and responsibilities**

- Delegate a senior officer to lead on the review on behalf of their organisation
- Senior officers will attend all Panel meetings
- Complete Individual Management Reviews within agreed timeframes
- Contribute to the Review Report.

### **Information Sharing & Confidentiality**

The principles outlined in Haringey Community Safety Partnership information sharing protocol<sup>14</sup> will be applied at all times. In addition to this, further reference will be made to the Multi-agency Statutory Guidance for the Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.haringey.gov.uk/community/community-safety-and-engagement/crime-and-disorder-information-sharing-protocol>

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/revised-statutory-guidance-for-the-conduct-of-domestic-homicide-reviews>

## **Appendix B: Cross-Government definition of domestic violence and abuse**

The Cross-Government definition of domestic violence and abuse is:

any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive, threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are, or have been, intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexuality. The abuse can encompass, but is not limited to:

- psychological
- physical
- sexual
- financial
- emotional

### **Controlling behaviour**

Controlling behaviour is a range of acts designed to make a person subordinate and/or dependent by isolating them from sources of support, exploiting their resources and capacities for personal gain, depriving them of the means needed for independence, resistance and escape and regulating their everyday behaviour.

### **Coercive behaviour**

Coercive behaviour is an act or a pattern of acts of assault, threats, humiliation and intimidation or other abuse that is used to harm, punish, or frighten their victim.

## **Appendix C: Further information about the chair and report author**

Davina James-Hanman is an independent Violence Against Women Consultant. She was formerly the Director of AVA (Against Violence & Abuse) for 17 years (1997-20014), which she took up following five years at L.B. Islington as the first local authority Domestic Violence Co-ordinator in the UK (1992-97). From 2000-08, she had responsibility for developing and implementing the first London Domestic Violence Strategy for the Mayor of London. A key outcome of this was a reduction in domestic violence homicides of 57%.

She has worked in the field of violence against women for over three decades in a variety of capacities including advocate, campaigner, conference organiser, crisis counsellor, policy officer, project manager, refuge worker, researcher, trainer and writer. She has published innumerable articles and three book chapters and formerly acted as the Department of Health policy lead on domestic violence (2002-03). She was also a Lay Inspector for HM Crown Prosecution Service Inspectorate (2005-10). Davina has authored a wide variety of original resources for survivors and is particularly known for pioneering work on the intersections of domestic violence and alcohol/drugs, domestic violence and mental health, child to parent violence, developing the response from faith communities and primary prevention work.

She acted as the Specialist Adviser to the Home Affairs Select Committee Inquiry into domestic violence, forced marriage and 'honour' based violence (2007-08) and Chairs the Accreditation Panel for Respect, the national body for domestic violence perpetrator programmes. From 2008-09 she was seconded to the Home Office to assist with the development of the first national Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy. Davina was also a member of the National Institute of Health & Care Excellence group which developed the domestic violence recommendations and subsequent Quality Standards. She remains an Expert Adviser to NICE.

Davina is a Special Adviser to Women in Prison and a Trustee of the Centre for Women's Justice.