

ROCHDALE SAFER COMMUNITIES PARTNERSHIP

DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW

OVERVIEW REPORT FOR PUBLICATION

MARCH 2017

Female A

Independent Panel Chair and Report Author: Paul Cheeseman

## **CONTENTS**

<b>SECTION</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
1. Introduction	3
2. Establishing the Domestic Homicide Review	5
3. Background	10
4. The Facts by Agency	16
5. Analysis Terms against the Terms of Reference	21
6. Lessons Learned	31
7. Conclusions	34
8. Predictability/Preventability	36
9. Recommendations	38

**Appendix A**

**Definitions**

**Appendix B**

**Action Plans**

**Appendix C**

**Letter from Home Office**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The principal people and places referred to in this report are:

Female A	Victim	Black Zimbabwean
Male Z	Perpetrator & former partner of victim	Black Zimbabwean
Male One	Former husband of Female A	Black Zimbabwean
Child one	Daughter of Female A & Male One	Black Zimbabwean
Male Two	Nephew of victim	Black Zimbabwean
Female One	Former wife of Male Z	Black Zimbabwean
Female Two	Former partner Male Z	Black Zimbabwean
Address One	Home of Victim	
Address Two	Work place of victim	

1.2 This report concerns the homicide of Female A. She was killed by Male Z on an evening in summer 2015. Female A had been in a relationship with Male Z. He lived in Sussex and travelled to the Manchester area to see Female A at her home (Address one). Two days before she died Female A ended the relationship with Male Z. She telephoned Greater Manchester Police (GMP) and asked officers to attend as she said Male Z had become angry with her. Police officers attended. Male Z was compliant and left the property. There was no agency history of abuse between Female A and Male Z although, following the homicide, GMP discovered Male Z was known to Sussex Constabulary as a perpetrator of domestic abuse on another woman.

1.3 At 21.49hrs two days after the attendance of GMP at address one a call was made to the police by a neighbour. They reported a male with a gun near address one. Male Two was seen running from address one. A short time later Male Z called the police and said he had killed Female A. Police officers attended and arrested Male Z and Male Two. Female A was found nearby. She was badly injured and police and paramedics gave first aid to her. She was taken to hospital where she sadly died shortly afterwards.

1.4 A post mortem examination revealed Female A died of stab wounds. Female A's immediate family all live in Zimbabwe and her closest family member is a cousin who resides in Hampshire. They attended and identified the body of Female A to the police. Male Z was interviewed by officers from GMP and charged with the murder of

Female A and possession of an imitation firearm with intent to cause fear and violence.

1.5 Male Z appeared before a Crown Court where he pleaded guilty to the manslaughter of Female A by reason of a loss of self-control. He claimed he thought he was still in a relationship with Female A and alleged she and Male Two attacked him. Male Z pleaded not guilty to Female A's murder. The jury rejected his claim of self-defence and found him guilty of Female A's murder. This review panel found no evidence at all to support Male Z's claim of self-defence. Male Z was sentenced to life imprisonment and must serve a minimum of 26 years in prison before he is considered for release on parole.

1.6 The sentencing judge said;

*"This was a sustained and brutal attack planned by you as you waited in Female A's house and you ambushed her and Male Two. I find in doing what you did to Female A you plainly intended to kill her and you had formed that intention, at the latest after she rebuffed you, after you begged her to give you another chance when you spoke to her over the phone during your taxi journey to her home. You twice phoned the police during this incident and you made fully clear that your reason for launching this attack was that, in your view, Female A had been cheating on you and was sleeping with another man. Those statements by you were, in my view, the simple truth behind this case."*

## **2. ESTABLISHING THE DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW [DHR]**

### **2.1 Decision Making**

- 2.1.1 Rochdale Safer Communities Partnership [RSCP] decided that the death of Female A met the criteria for a DHR as defined in the Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance for the Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews August 2013 (the Guidance).
- 2.1.2 The Guidance states that a decision to hold a DHR should be taken within one month of the homicide coming to the attention of the Community Safety Partnership and says it should be completed within a further six months. The completion date was set as 25.02.2016.
- 2.1.3 This date could not be met as the trial of Male Z, which was due to be heard in January 2016, was delayed and was not concluded until the end of May 2016. The senior investigating officer from Greater Manchester Police requested that the DHR panel did not approach family and witnesses until the trial was concluded. The DHR panel therefore decided to suspend its work until the trial was concluded and the chair of the Community Safety Partnership approved this request and the completion date was changed to 01.09.2016.
- 2.1.4 There were no parallel reviews by other organisations or bodies.

### **2.2 DHR Panel**

- 2.2.1 Paul Cheeseman was appointed as the Independent Chair and Author on 25.08.2015. He is an independent practitioner who has chaired and written previous DHRs. He was supported by David Hunter who has also chaired and written previous DHRs, child serious case reviews and multi-agency public protection reviews. Neither has been employed by any of the agencies involved with this DHR and they were judged to have the experience and skills for the task. The first of four panel meetings were held on 23.09.2015. Attendance was good and all members freely contributed to the analysis, thereby ensuring the issues were considered from several perspectives and disciplines. Between meetings additional work was undertaken via e-mail and telephone.
- 2.2.2 Except for her contact with GMP two days before she died, Female A had very little contact with any agencies. Although Male Z had some contact with Sussex Constabulary, and was known to be a perpetrator of domestic abuse there, he had no contact with agencies in the Manchester area. Despite the very limited information, the panel gave very careful consideration to this case. They focussed upon whether the information held about Male Z in another area could have been available to agencies in Manchester. If it was, the panel wanted to ascertain whether it could have assisted in identifying that Female A was at risk from Male Z. The panel looked at contemporary policy and practice and considered several 'what if' scenarios to test their effectiveness.
- 2.2.3 The panel also considered in some detail the cultural issues in this case. Female A, Male Z and Male Two were all from Zimbabwe and Male Two was the nephew of Female A. The panel considered whether the homicide of Female A contained any

elements of a so-called honour killing<sup>1</sup>. Because of the difficulty of speaking face to face with family in Zimbabwe the panel felt it was important to receive independent advice. Dr Bell kindly agreed to support the panel with specialist knowledge about cultural issues in Black African communities.

The Panel comprised of:

- |                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| ➤ Dr Erinma Bell            | Independent Advisor<br>Chrysalis Project                         |
| ➤ Paul Cheeseman            | Independent Chair and<br>author                                  |
| ➤ Ian Halliday              | Rochdale Safer<br>Communities Partnership<br>(RSCP)              |
| ➤ Carol Hobson              | Detective Inspector<br>Greater Manchester Police                 |
| ➤ David Hunter              | Support for Independent<br>Chair                                 |
| ➤ Karen McCormick           | Heywood, Middleton &<br>Rochdale Clinical<br>Commissioning Group |
| ➤ Claire Ousey              | Pennine Care NHS<br>Foundation Trust                             |
| ➤ Glenn Parkes <sup>2</sup> | Independent Advisor<br>National Probation Service<br>(NPS)       |
| ➤ Hamaira Younus            | Victim Support   |

## **2.3 Agencies Submitting Individual Management Reviews (IMRs)**

2.3.1 The following agencies submitted IMRs;

- Greater Manchester Police;

---

<sup>1</sup> The Crown Prosecution Service and the Association of Chief Police Officers have a common definition of so called Honour Based Violence [HBV]: "Honour Based Violence" is a crime or incident, which has or may have been committed to protect or defend the honour of the family and/or community'.

<sup>2</sup> Although none of the principals in this DHR were known to NPS in the Greater Manchester area Glenn Parkes kindly offered to remain as a member of the panel for experiential learning and to provide further independence to the panel's work including any cultural aspects.

- Heywood, Middleton & Rochdale Clinical Commissioning Group (GPs);

2.3.2 The following agencies provided reports or other relevant information;

- Victim Support;
- UK Visas and Immigration;
- Sussex Constabulary;
- Pennine Acute Care NHS Foundation Trust.
- Greater Manchester Police-summary of significant witnesses in the case including Male Z's supervisor in the Territorial Army.

## **2.4 Notifications and Involvement of Families**

2.4.1 The DHR panel wish to record their condolences to Female A's family on their loss. Female A's parents and family live in Zimbabwe and they did not visit the UK for the trial of Male Z. The family appointed Female A's brother as a representative for the family. The family liaison officer from Greater Manchester Police contacted Female A's brother and obtained his consent for his details to be shared with the panel.

2.4.2 E mail was identified as the preferred means of communication with Zimbabwe. The Chair of the DHR panel wrote to Female A's brother after the trial expressing the panel's condolences, offering an opportunity to the family to contribute to the DHR process and requesting a family pen picture of Female A's life. Female A's brother wrote back to the Chair acknowledging receipt of the e mail and said he would seek the views of the family.

2.4.3 On 11.07.2016 Female A's father wrote back to the Chair of the DHR and provided a pen picture of Female A's life and other contributions the family wished to make to the DHR. These are included within section 3 of the report and credited accordingly.

2.4.4 The Chair of the DHR wrote to Male Z in prison and asked if he had any information he wished to contribute to the review. He indicated he did and on 02.08.2016 the Chair of the DHR and Male Z's Offender Supervisor from the National Probation Service visited him in the prison where he is serving his sentence. His contribution appears within section 3 and is credited accordingly.

## **2.5 Terms of Reference**

### **2.5.1 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;

- Prevent domestic violence, abuse and homicides and improve service responses for all domestic violence and abuse victims and their children through improved intra and inter-agency working.

(Multi-agency Statutory Guidance for the Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews [2013] Section 2 Paragraph 7)

## **2.5.2 Timeframe under Review**

The DHR covers the period 01.12.2010 to the date of death of Female A. The reason for this was because it represented the first occasion on which GMP recorded contact with Female A.

## **2.5.3 Definitions**

The Government definition of domestic violence can be found at Appendix A. (Hereinafter referred to as domestic abuse).

## **2.5.4 Case Specific Terms**

1. What indicators of domestic abuse did your agency identify, including any threats to kill or harm Female A and what risk assessment[s] were undertaken?
2. How did your agency manage those risks and how did it respond to any new information which may have impacted on the risks?
3. What services did your agency provide for Female A or Male Z in relation to the identified levels of risk and were they timely, proportionate and 'fit for purpose'?
4. Although Child 1 is recorded as residing in Zimbabwe is there any evidence she was exposed to domestic abuse and, if so, what did your agency do to protect her?
5. How effective was inter-agency information sharing and cooperation in response to Female A or Male Z and was information shared with those agencies who needed it?
6. How did your agency ascertain the wishes and feelings of Female A and Male Z about any domestic abuse and were their views taken into account when providing services or support? Did you seek the views of their families?
7. How did your agency take account of any racial, cultural, linguistic, faith or other diversity issues, including age and disabilities, when completing assessments and providing services to Female A and Male Z?
8. Is there any evidence the homicide of Female A by Male Z was 'Honour based violence'? i.e. a crime or incident which has or may have been committed to protect or defend the honour of the family and/or community.
9. Were single and multi-agency domestic abuse policies and procedures followed and were any gaps identified?



10. How effective was your agency's supervision and management of practitioners who were involved with supporting Female A or Male Z and did managers have effective oversight and control of the case?
11. Were there any issues in relation to capacity or resources within your agency or the Partnership that affected your ability to provide services to Female A or Male Z?

### **3. BACKGROUND**

3.1 The information in this section was obtained from witness statements provided to the DHR by GMP following the homicide enquiry and discussions and communication with Female A's friends and family.

#### **3.2 Female A**

3.2.1 Female A was born in Muntare Zimbabwe. Her mother is a retired teacher and her father is a retired Assistant Commissioner of Police. She is one of three children. Female A completed her primary education at a school in Harare before moving to Macheke where she completed form one to form four. Female A went to a Mission school to complete her upper six year. Female A then trained as a nurse in hospitals in Harare. After her course, she worked at Parirenyatwa in Zimbabwe for about three years before marrying her husband Male One.

3.2.2 Female A travelled to England to join her husband in 2002 and they had their first child in spring 2003. Sadly, the child died a few weeks later. The couple's second child was born in 2005 and Female A's parents in Zimbabwe looked after it. In 2010 Female A divorced Male One for an undisclosed reason. Male One is now re-married and lives in Zimbabwe.

3.2.3 Female A was the breadwinner even before her father's retirement in Zimbabwe. The family continue to support Female A's daughter there. Female A's father said he would like Female A to be remembered for the support she gave to her daughter who, her grandfather says, is quite bright and is staying with the family in Harare.

3.2.4 Female A moved into address one (a leasehold property) in 08.2010 or 09.2010. At the time of her death she worked as a nurse and ward manager for a private sector company at address two in the Greater Manchester area.

#### **3.3 Male Z**

3.3.1 Male Z grew up in Zimbabwe and came to the UK around 2001/2002. His sister describes him as being very quiet. He settled in Sussex. In 2008 Male Z was known to be in a relationship with Female One. Male Z was abusive to Female One and details of this are provided in paragraphs 4.2.3-4.2.6.

3.3.2 Male Z met Female Two in 2009 and in 04.2009 they moved in together. Male Z was in the Territorial Army and spent a couple of weekends every month away from home. Female Two says their relationship became strained during 2012 and she moved out of the home, although she continued to see Male Z. In 10.2013 Female Two gave birth to Male Z's child. In early 2013, after returning from a visit to relatives in Africa, Female Two suspected Male Z was seeing another woman. Female Two assaulted Male Z and this was reported to Sussex Police (see paragraph 4.3.1). She says Male Z was never violent towards her.

3.3.3 Male Z's visits to Female Two became less frequent and Male Z started to spend a lot of time in the Manchester area. In 05.2014 Female Two says she discovered Male Z was seeing another woman and this woman was pregnant with his child. It has not been possible to establish who this woman was or whether Male Z was referring to Female A. There is no information to suggest Female A was pregnant during this

time. Female Two found a telephone number for Female A and called her. Female A told Female One that her and Male Z were just good friends.

- 3.3.4 In 08.2003 Male Z was convicted of driving a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol and without a driving licence and insurance. He has no other recorded convictions although he has been arrested on several occasions for assaults committed against women that he has been in relationships with. At the time of his arrest for murder Greater Manchester Police recorded Male Z as of 'no fixed address'.

### **3.4 Female A, Male Z and Male Two Relationship**

- 3.4.1 In 09.2014 or 09.2014 Female A told a friend that Male Z was her boyfriend and that he was in the army living in barracks in Sussex. At the end of 09.2014 Female A found out that Male Z was married with children. Female A's friend said there were arguments between Female A and Male Z. Female A told her friend she wanted to end the relationship. Sometime after this Female A told her friend the relationship was at an end.
- 3.4.2 On 04.07.2015 Female A and Male Z were at a party and Female A told her friend Male Z was now based in Halifax. The DHR panel asked West Yorkshire Police if they held any information about Female A and Male Z and they replied that they had no record of either of them. Female A did not indicate whether she was in a relationship with Male Z. A second friend of Female A recalled being at a party around the same time. Female A and Male Z were there and the second friend said Male Z drank too much at the party and was argumentative.
- 3.4.3 Male Two told officers investigating the homicide that he lived in Zimbabwe. He said he visited Female A when in the UK and helped transfer monies home to Zimbabwe to assist with her daughter's upbringing. Male Two said there was no romantic relationship between him and Female A. Three days before the homicide, Male Two arrived in the UK for a visit and Female A collected him from the airport and he stayed at address 1.
- 3.4.4 In addition to the information provided within the IMRs and witness statements the panel felt it was important to consider what friends knew about the relationship between Female A and Male Z and whether there was any evidence of domestic abuse. Greater Manchester Police provided contact details for Female A's two closest friends. The Chair of the panel contacted one of these friends by telephone on 28.06.2016 and explained the DHR process to her. He asked her if she had any knowledge of domestic abuse by Male Z towards Female A. She said she had none. The second friend did not answer her telephone call and did not respond to a message left for her.
- 3.4.5 The Chair of the DHR panel, together with David Hunter, visited Female A's place of work by appointment on 12.07.2016. Here they met with the manager of the care home who knew Female A very well. The manager said that Female A had worked at the home for several years. She described Female A as an extremely effective and hard-working member of staff who filled a senior role in the care home. The manager said that Female A was highly regarded as a member of staff and as a friend by other staff members, residents and their families.

- 3.4.6 The manager said that staff who knew Female A had been deeply affected by her death and some were still struggling to come to terms with what had happened. The manager said that a mark of the esteem in which Female A was held was that a collection had been held at the care home to help with the repatriation of Female A to her mother country. A service of remembrance to celebrate Female A's life had also been held at the care home.
- 3.4.7 The manager said that neither she, nor any members of staff that she was aware of, had any information or knowledge that there was domestic abuse, or the indicators of abuse in Female A's relationship with Male Z. The manager said that Female A was a very private person who had not talked to her about her relationship.
- 3.4.8 The manager was aware of the indicators of domestic abuse and had good knowledge of safeguarding procedures in relation to adults because of her professional responsibilities. The care home did not have a separate policy on domestic abuse. However, the company that owns the care home does have a dedicated help line for staff that they can contact if they need support, for example, because they are suffering domestic abuse. The manager said staff could access this support directly without being referred<sup>3</sup>. There are posters advertising this service to staff. The manager can refer staff and would have considered doing so if Female A had disclosed indicators of abuse.

### **3.5 Events on the day of the homicide**

- 3.5.1 On the day of the homicide Male Z was seen in the locker room at the Eastbourne barracks putting items in a black holdall. He was acting strangely and appeared nervous. Male Z said he needed a few things and that he was going to catch a train.
- 3.5.2 Male Two says that on the day of the homicide Female A went to work a day shift at address 2. Male Two remained at address one and Female A telephoned him twice during the day to see how he was.
- 3.5.3 Female A told her first friend in a telephone call that she had a problem. Female A asked her first friend to telephone Male Z and tell him that if he went to Female A's house again Female A would contact the police. On receiving this call from the first friend Male Z told her he had been dumped; that he accepted this although the friend could tell from his voice that Male Z was not happy. He said he was going to get a train to Liverpool to see a friend. The first friend telephoned Female A and told her about the conversation with Male Z; Female A sounded relieved.
- 3.5.4 A work colleague who had known Female A for about six years had met Male Z when he visited address two on a previous occasion. This colleague believed Female A and Male Z were just good friends. About 2.30pm on the day of the homicide this

---

<sup>3</sup> The Chair of the DHR asked the company if Female A accessed this service independently. The company responded stating they could not supply this information and cited the Data Protection Act. The Chair therefore wrote to the company's Chief Information Officer requesting this information and asking for a response before the completion date of the review. No response was received and the Chair did not feel it appropriate to delay submission any further.

colleague recalled Male Z visiting address two and asking to speak to Female A. He was admitted and went to Female A's office where he remained alone with her.

- 3.5.5 About 7.45pm the same day the same work colleague answered the door to address 2 and says Male Z had returned and asked to speak to Female A. The colleague informed Female A that Male Z wanted to speak with her. This was the last time the colleague saw Female A.
- 3.5.6 At 8.17pm another work colleague was leaving address 2 at the end of her shift. She saw Male Z running very quickly and holding a mobile phone to his ear. This colleague described Male Z as in a panic, as though he was looking for someone. He approached this work colleague, he seemed agitated and said; "*she's gone, she left without me*". Male Z shouted at the work colleague to take him to address 1 and said he would give her money for petrol. She refused and Male Z ran off.
- 3.5.7 About 8.00 to 9.00pm Female A arrived home and told Male Two she could not cook for him and they needed to get out of the house straight away. Male Two asked why. Female A said she needed to pick something up and they needed to go straight away. They drove to a shop and Female A spoke on the telephone to someone during the journey. She told Male Two it was an enquiry from work.
- 3.5.8 Female A then drove Male Two back to address 1. As they reached the door of address 1 Male Z appeared and grabbed Female A. There was a struggle between the two. Male Two says Male Z produced a handgun when he challenged him. Male Two panicked, ran off and tried to get help from nearby houses.
- 3.5.9 GMP received a 999-call reporting a man running around near address 1 with a gun. Authorised Firearms Officers were deployed to the scene and the incident was handled in accordance with GMP's policy on incidents involving firearms. During the incident, Male Z rang GMP on two occasions and during one call stated he had stabbed Female A. Male Z and Male Two were arrested at the scene.
- 3.5.10 Male Two was eliminated from the homicide enquiry and provided a witness statement to GMP. Male Z was interviewed by officers from GMP and did not answer any questions that were put to him.

### **3.6 Male Z 's Contribution**

- 3.6.1 Male Z was seen in prison by the Chair of the DHR. He gave a description of his relationship with Female One (his wife) and several other women after he separated from her. He said he had four children by different relationships. He was asked several times whether he had ever been violent or verbally abusive to any woman. He denied he had. He said the only time there had ever been violence in a relationship was when he said he was assaulted by Female Two (see paragraph 4.2.3). He said that was the only time the police had been involved in attending any calls of a domestic nature involving him. He did not seek any help when this relationship became abusive. He said he did not know that such services existed.
- 3.6.2 Male Z described meeting Female A and his relationship with her. He said he had never abused her either verbally or physically. He claimed their relationship faltered

because of his military service and the fact he had to attend exercises abroad. Their disagreements had only ever amounted to arguing. Male Z said he did not routinely drink alcohol excessively, nor did he ever use illicit drugs or have any mental health issues. He said the only time he had consumed alcohol to excess was when a previous partner said he could not see his children.

- 3.6.3 On the day Female A died he claimed that, after seeing her at her place of work, he had gone to address two in the evening and found all his belongings had been put out of the way under a bed and that another man was staying there. He claimed there had then been an argument involving him, Female A and Male Two. Male Z claimed he was acting in self-defence, that Male Two had an axe and that he (Male Z) was defending himself when he picked up a knife in the kitchen and used it.
- 3.6.4 Male Z sought to minimise his part in Female A's death. He refuted the number of wounds he had inflicted upon her claiming he could only recall inflicting two and challenged the veracity of the post mortem report. The DHR Chair pointed out to him that his version of events was presented in court and was discounted by the jury who found him guilty of murder. Therefore, at least twelve strangers who heard the evidence rejected his recollection of the events. He accepted his actions represented a loss of control.
- 3.6.5 Male Z was asked if anything could have been done to prevent him carrying out this homicide. He was not able to identify anything that agencies could have done to prevent the homicide. However, another example of the minimisation of his own actions, was his claim that the events could have been prevented had other people who knew about Female A's relationship with Male Two told him (Male Z) about it. He claimed people who knew him well were hiding information from him.
- 3.6.6 The DHR Panel rejected Male Z's interpretation of events and his attempts to minimise his part in Female A's death and shift responsibility to other persons. They repeat the trial judge's comments that this was a sustained and brutal attack in which Male Z plainly intended to kill Female A.

### **3.7 Female A's Family's Views**

- 3.7.1 The following has been extracted from the letter Female A's father sent to the Chair of the DHR. It outlines his, and his family's thoughts and feelings, on Female A's death and the way agencies dealt with her.

*'The death of my daughter sent shocking waves to the whole family and to all those who grew up and knew Female A. I could not believe Female A could end up her life with a blade of a knife in her back; this was brutal and unheard of. Male Z is a coward to use a knife to murder my daughter (Sentence redacted). May I also take this opportunity to thank the investigating team and the Jury for the manner in which they handled my daughter's case. They did their job well and I have no complaint (Sentence redacted)<sup>4</sup>. It's now a year since Female A was brutally murdered by Male Z and not even one person from (his) family has been to see us to console the death*

---

<sup>4</sup> The letter referred to the penalty for murder in Zimbabwe. It was not felt appropriate this should appear in an official UK publication.

*of our daughter Female A. This is terrible and I wonder what kind of people they are.*

*Coming to your question as to whether Female A's death could have been prevented; yes this could have been predicted if the police details who persuaded Male Z to leave Female A's flat could have noticed his attitude and then call Female A to discuss with her the attitude of Male Z. The police should have called both parties to reconcile the problem and solve it amicably and that way death could have been prevented.*

*You don't solve a domestic problem by phone but to sit with both parties and hear each other's side of the story. The police again delayed to attend the scene when neighbours phoned them on hearing Female A screaming and they took their time. If they had attended the scene in time Female A could have probably survived; 30 minutes' delay was too much<sup>5</sup>.*

*The lesson to be learnt from this is that police should bring both parties to the table when trying to solve a problem and avoid using the phone like in the case of Female A and Male Z. The police should also be ordered to attend all serious crimes in time in order to prevent further damages. Scene attendance in an urban area in my little Zimbabwe is five minutes according to the police service charter'.*

(Female A's father then names a number of people including workmates and staff at the place where Female A worked, family and former students that studied with Female A and thanks them for the support they gave following Female A's death).

*'In conclusion I must say I am not pleased with the way police dealt with my daughter's case and the time they took to attend the scene. If the police had brought both parties to the table, they could have gauged the attitude of Male Z towards his unwanted stay at Female A's flat and take precautions so that Female A is safe'.*

- 3.7.2 Female A's father wrote a further letter to the Chair of the DHR stating that he felt very strongly that both his daughter and Male Z should be named in the DHR report. He said he would not accept publication of the report unless they were named. The Chair of the DHR wrote back to him explaining how anonymization is a requirement of the Guidance.

---

<sup>5</sup> The alleged delay in the attendance of police is commented upon further in the report at section 8 in which predictability and preventability is considered.

## **4. THE FACTS BY AGENCY**

### **4.1 Introduction**

- 4.1.1 The agencies who submitted IMRs and chronologies are dealt with separately in a narrative commentary which identifies the important points relative to the terms of reference. The main analysis of events appears in Section 5.

### **4.2 Events Pre 01.12.2010**

#### **UK Visas and Immigration (UKVI)**

- 4.2.1 UKVI provided information concerning Female A, Male Z and Male Two. Female A was granted several work permits in the UK between 2002 and 2008. She was granted indefinite leave to remain in the UK on 31.07.2007 and was naturalised on 16.12.2011.
- 4.2.2 Male Z claimed asylum in the UK on 17.10.2002. On 15.11.2002 this was granted and he was given indefinite leave to remain in the UK. Male Z applied for a spousal visa for Female One on 17.02.2005. Female One later applied for indefinite leave to remain on the basis of domestic violence. This was granted and the spousal application discontinued. Male Z applied for naturalisation on 10.01.2008 and this was rejected due to his unspent conviction for drinking and driving. It appears that Female One's domestic violence application was made before Male Z's naturalisation was refused. However, as it was only an allegation and had not resulted in a charge or conviction, it does not appear to have been taken into account when considering Male Z's naturalisation.

#### **Sussex Police**

- 4.2.3 Sussex Police had some contacts with Male Z. A number of these concerned his relationship with women. On 04.05.2006 a female visited Male Z and claimed he was the father of her one-week old child. He strongly denied this and an argument ensued. The police attended and the female agreed to leave. On 10.10.2007 a strategy meeting was held after information was shared by a social worker that Female One attended a refuge with her daughter reportedly saying she was suffering violence of a sexual nature from her husband Male Z.
- 4.2.4 A joint visit was made to her by Sussex Police and social services on 11.10.2007. It transpired Female One had not actually attended the refuge. She had only made enquiries regarding the refuge when she spoke to a housing officer. Female One said she did not experience violence from Male Z and there was no reason for her to attend a refuge as Male Z was now living with his new girlfriend in another part of Sussex.
- 4.2.5 Social Services shared information with Sussex Police on 13.11.2007 that Male Z and Female One were again in a relationship. On 30.03.2008 Male Z reported Female One and their daughter missing. They were located safe and well at a friend's house.
- 4.2.6 On 02.07.2008 Male Z was arrested after Female One said he had punched her to the neck. She also reported a previous history of domestic abuse. During interview Male Z alleged that Female One hit their daughter with a belt. Both matters were investigated. No evidence was found to support the allegation concerning their



daughter and no further action was taken in respect of the common assault by Male Z on Female One.

- 4.2.7 On 25.09.2008 Female One reported to social services that a week earlier Male Z returned home drunk and sexually assaulted her. She stated Male Z then committed a similar offence two days later. Female One was frightened to report the matter to the police as she believed her child would be taken from her. Male Z was arrested, interviewed and denied the offence and there was insufficient evidence to prosecute. A refuge was found for Female One.
- 4.2.8 On 02.01.2010 a call was received by Sussex Police from Female Two. She said she and her son had been living with Male Z for a year. Male Z had become angry with Female Two as he did not like her speaking to her ex-partner's family. He grabbed the telephone off her and damaged it and then punched her on the arm. Male Z was arrested and no further action was taken in respect of the matters.

### **4.3 Events Post 01.12.2010**

#### **Sussex Police**

- 4.3.1 There are several incidents involving Male Z recorded by Sussex Police during the relevant period. On 18.01.2013 Female Two reported that Male Z was harassing her. Police officers attended and spoke to the couple. Female Male Two was suspicious that Male Z was having an affair. She confronted him and found a text message on his telephone from a female stating she was pregnant with his child. Male Z alleged Female Two assaulted him. He said she used an electric cord to try and strangle him and hit him with a bottle and cut his training shoes with a knife. Female Two was arrested for assault and making threats to kill. A DASH risk assessment<sup>6</sup> was completed and Male Z was assessed as at high risk. This was later reviewed by the Adult Protection Team and reassessed as a medium risk. A referral was not made to MARAC<sup>7</sup> as the case was not assessed as high risk and the professional judgement threshold was not met.
- 4.3.2 During interview Female Two denied the offences and claimed that, after she confronted Male Z, he tried to have sex with her. She refused and he pinned her down. Female Two said she fought back and that is how Male Z became injured. No further action was taken on the advice of the Crown Prosecution Service. A notification was made to social services in respect of the children of Female Two and a strategy meeting was held.
- 4.3.3 On 30.01.2013 Female Two telephoned Sussex Police. She sounded out of breath and terminated the call. The call handler heard a male and a child crying in the

---

<sup>6</sup> Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Honour Based Violence (DASH 2009) Risk Identification, Assessment and Management Model provides a common checklist for identifying and assessing risk, which will save lives. The model was accredited in 2009 and has now been implemented by most police forces. Risk to victims is categorised as standard, medium or high and this triggers different responses commensurate with the risk by the police and other agencies.

<sup>7</sup> A MARAC, or multi-agency risk assessment conference, is a meeting where information is shared on the highest risk domestic abuse cases between representatives of local police, probation, health, child protection, housing practitioners, Independent Domestic Violence Advisors (IDVAs) and other specialists.

background. Police officers attended and Female Two said she believed Male Z was having an affair. An argument then developed between the couple over the use of property and a car. A DASH risk assessment of standard was recorded. A notification was made by Sussex Police to social services.

- 4.3.4 On 25.12.2013 at 23.37 Sussex Police received a call stating a male and female could be heard screaming next door. Police officers attended and spoke to Female Two and Male Z. The officers reported there was no sign of a disturbance and the family were just loud upon leaving. This was the last contact Sussex Police had with Male Z.
- 4.3.5 Sussex Police state that Male Z would meet their criteria for a serial perpetrator of domestic abuse. These are identified once a month from a report produced by their Force Intelligence Bureau. An intelligence log and warning marker is then put on the person's nominal record on Niche<sup>8</sup>. This information would then be viewable by police officers and staff working in Sussex and by those working in other police forces that had access to the Police National Database (PND)<sup>9</sup>. Because of an error in the spelling of Male Z's name two nominal records were created on Niche for him. This meant that not all incidents relating to his partners were picked up and no intelligence marker was placed on either of his nominal records.

#### **Greater Manchester Police**

- 4.3.6 At 21.57 on 21.04.2014 Male Z telephoned GMP and reported a concern for Female A. He said he spoke to Female A by telephone about 17.00hrs and she said she was feeling dizzy and that he should ring her back. Male Z had not been able to contact Female A since then. Police officers attended address 1 at 22.21hrs and found Female A safe and well. She said she had fallen asleep.
- 4.3.7 At 06.48hrs on 25.07.2015 Female A made a 999 call to GMP. The call taker recorded on the FWIN log that arguing could be heard in the background. Female A reported that she was in dispute with Male Z and that she feared him. She said he had a history of being short tempered and, although he had not been aggressive towards her, Female A said he was not speaking to her and breathing heavily which indicated he was angry with her. Female A said she had asked Male Z to leave that morning and he had refused. She said she was outside address 1 sat in her car.
- 4.3.8 Police officers from GMP arrived at address 1 at 07.36hrs. They spoke to Female A who got out of her car. She did not appear distressed, although she did seem in a hurry and wanted to leave for work. Female A told the officers she had ended her relationship with Male Z the evening before and she now wanted him to leave her house. Female A said she had concerns for the welfare of Male Z. One of the police officers who attended felt Female A wanted them to eject Male Z from address 1 rather than her having to ask him. The police officers spoke to Male Z. There were no concerns for his welfare and he seemed surprised the police had attended. He was asked to leave address 1 which he did and left his key for the property behind. Female A said she was going to work.

---

<sup>8</sup> Niche is a police records management and information sharing system used by several police forces.

<sup>9</sup> PND the Police National Database is available to all police forces and wider criminal justice agencies throughout the United Kingdom, allowing the police service to share local information and intelligence on a national basis.

- 4.3.9 The incident was recorded on the GMP FWIN<sup>10</sup> system as a domestic dispute. No offences were disclosed and therefore a crime report was not completed. Because of the nature of the incident a Public Protection Investigation (PPI) document was generated and this was populated with details obtained by the attending officer. A DASH risk assessment was also completed. Female A told the police officers she did not wish to answer a lot of the questions as she did not have time and wanted to go to work.
- 4.3.10 Female A became tearful when she described how she was living apart from her daughter who was in Zimbabwe. There was no suggestion that Child 1 had been exposed to any domestic incidents. The risk level was set at standard and Female A was given a leaflet containing advice entitled "End the Fear". The officers attending did not believe there was any indication the disagreement involved cultural, racial or so called honour based violence factors. A Police National Computer check (PNC) was not carried out on Male Z. There was information available on the PNC regarding Male Z having been arrested previously for domestic assaults on other partners in Sussex. However, there was no warning marker on his record to indicate that he was violent. Consequently, even if a PNC check had been carried out, it would not have been immediately evident that Male Z was a perpetrator of domestic abuse.
- 4.3.11 In 2015 training was given to response officers to enable them to finalise the PPI document in cases in which the risk was assessed as standard. This was because of the large number of standard risk incidents that occurred and the backlog this caused within PPIUs. Greater Manchester Police consequently changed their policy to empower trained response officers and their supervisors to close standard risk cases without a further assessment being completed by specialist officers. Consequently, because the officer that attended was trained, they could finalise the PPI document for Female A and there was no further assessment of risk. Greater Manchester Police then had no further contact with Female A or Male Z until the date of the homicide.

### **UK Visas and Immigration (UKVI)**

- 4.3.12 UKVI reported that Male Two applied for several family visit visas and made a number of visits to the UK. The most recent visa Male Two held was valid between 24.02.2015 and 24.08.2015.
- 4.3.13 Male Z applied for a spousal visa for a female with a name that does not appear in any of the records provided by Sussex Police. This visa was issued on 06.06.2014 and was valid until 06.12.2016. At this time, the address given was in Eastbourne. An application Male Z made for naturalisation on 01.07.2015 is outstanding due to the charge of murder he faced. The address used on this application was address 1.

### **Other Agencies**

- 4.3.14 As part of the domestic homicide review, enquiries were made in respect of Female A and Male Z with other agencies in the Greater Manchester area including GP Services, Acute Health, Housing and Children's Services. None of these agencies held any information of relevance to this domestic homicide review.

---

<sup>10</sup> FWINs (Force Wide Incident Numbers) – computerised and auditable chronological logs of all recorded incidents reported to GMP.



## 5. ANALYSIS AGAINST THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Each term appears in ***bold italics*** and is examined separately. Commentary is made using the material in the IMRs and the DHR Panel's debates. Some material would fit into more than one terms and where that happens a best fit approach has been taken.

### 5.1 ***What indicators of domestic abuse did your agency identify, including any threats to kill or harm Female A and what risk assessment[s] were undertaken?***

- 5.1.1 Sussex Police held several records relating to Male Z as a perpetrator of domestic abuse. These records dated back to 2007 and involved abuse against both his wife Female One and then a partner Female Two. None of the incidents involved Female A. On 10.10.2007 and again on 02.07.2008 Female One provided information that Male Z was violent towards her and committed a sexual assault. On the second occasion Male Z was arrested by Sussex Police although not charged with an offence because of insufficient evidence.
- 5.1.2 On 02.07.2008 Male Z was arrested for assaulting Female One by punching her to the neck. At that time, Female One disclosed a previous history of domestic abuse by Male Z. No further action was taken against him for that matter.
- 5.1.3 On 03.01.2010 Male Z was arrested after his partner Female Two complained that he had punched her on the arm. This followed a disagreement when Male Z became angry that Female Two was speaking to her former partner's family. On 18.01.2013 Male Z alleged he was the victim of an assault by Female Two. When she was arrested and interviewed, Female Two said she had been fighting back against Male Z. He pinned her down and tried to have sex with her. On 30.01.2013 Male Z was involved in another incident of domestic abuse in Sussex when he argued with Female Two although he did not use any violence towards her. While he was never convicted of any of these offences, the panel believe the pattern of behaviour by Male Z on these occasions indicates he was a perpetrator of domestic abuse.
- 5.1.4 As the DASH model was not introduced into Sussex until 2009 some of the above incidents were not risk assessed using that model. No risk assessment was recorded for the offence of assault against Female One on 03.01.2010. In relation to the incident on 18.01.2013 a risk assessment was recorded and this indicated that Male Z was the victim and was at high risk. In relation to the incident on 30.01.2013 a standard risk was recorded using the DASH model.
- 5.1.5 GMP recorded that Female A was the victim of domestic abuse on 25.07.2015 when Female A called GMP and wanted Male Z removing from address 1 after their relationship ended. This incident was assessed as standard. Male Z made a single telephone call to GMP on 21.04.2014 reporting a concern for Female A as he could not contact her. That was not recorded as a domestic incident nor risk assessed. The nature of the call meant there was no requirement to do so.
- 5.1.6 While that event contained no immediately obvious indicators of domestic abuse, the panel discussed that incident and the incident in Sussex on 30.03.2008 when Male Z reported Female One missing (see paragraph 4.2.5). Professionals on the panel involved in supporting victims said they had experience of perpetrators using different

methods to obtain information from agencies about the whereabouts of victims. The panel therefore considered the possibility that Female One and her daughter may have been fleeing domestic abuse and the police were unwittingly used by Male Z to locate them. The panel also wondered whether there was a pattern in this sort of behaviour by Male Z and therefore a link in relation to the call he made to Greater Manchester Police on 21.04.2014 when he reported a concern for Female A. While the panel could not establish with certainty that either or both occasions represented controlling behaviour by Male Z, they felt the possibility of this could not be excluded.

- 5.1.7 The most relevant of all the incidents is that which occurred on 25.07.2015 because it is the only recorded incident of domestic abuse involving Female A and Male Z. The panel therefore gave very careful consideration to the events of that day and the actions of the police officers that attended. The panel believe the officers correctly followed GMP policy in relation to the way in which this incident was handled. The officers appear to have spoken separately to both Female A and Male Z to gather as much information as possible. This was good practice.
- 5.1.8 The incident did not involve any use of force by Male Z nor had he made any threats towards Female A. He was described as polite, he did not argue and complied with the officer's request to leave. Female A did not describe any other history of domestic abuse by Male Z on her. The panel therefore agreed the risk assessment of standard was the correct one to apply on the information the officers had available to them. Section 5.5 of this report will consider what other information about Male Z may have been available and was not considered when assessing the risk.
- 5.1.9 Female A had very little contact with other agencies in the Greater Manchester area. Although she mentioned her relationship to friends and colleagues, except for GMP, no other agency in the Greater Manchester area had information that suggested Female A and Male Z were in a relationship.
- 5.1.10 Male Z was known to Sussex Police as someone who presented a risk of domestic abuse. However, they held no information that he was in a relationship with Female A. Her name did not feature in any of the contacts they had with him. Consequently, they could not identify that Female A was at risk from Male Z.
- 5.1.11 UKVI held information that Male Z had perpetrated domestic abuse on Female One. Although Female A was recorded by UKVI in connection with her entry to the UK and naturalisation they held no information that connected Male Z with her.

## **5.2 *How did your agency manage those risks and how did it respond to any new information which may have impacted on the risks?***

- 5.2.1 Only GMP identified that Female A was at risk from Male Z. That risk related to the call Female A made to them on 25.07.2015. As outlined at section 5.1, GMP correctly assessed the risk to Female A as standard. The DASH summary recorded the RARA<sup>11</sup> risk considerations as follows:

R – Remove - Risk removed as parties now separated;

---

<sup>11</sup> The Risk Management Framework within the DASH risk assessment used to compile safety plans for victims.

A – Avoid - It was not necessary to re house Female A in order to avoid Male Z as he had left the premises and the house key behind;

R- Reduce - Most of the DASH questions asked were met with a refusal by Female A to provide detail and therefore it was difficult for the officers to assist in reducing the risk to her. An "End the Fear" leaflet was left with Female A for her to read.

A – Accept - Again the DASH risk assessment was difficult to complete fully as Female A did not provide detail for most of the questions asked.

5.2.2 The officers dealing with the incident correctly recorded it as domestic, provided Female A with a leaflet that gave her useful victim information and remained for a time to ensure that Male Z left the area. It seemed that Female A was clear her relationship with Male Z was over. She provided no information that Male Z had assaulted or threatened her and she appeared to simply want him removing from her home. The panel believe the actions of GMP were proportionate to the event and the level of risk that was identified.

5.2.3 GMP were not aware of Male Z's visits to see Female A at address 2 as Female A did not report these to the police. Only her colleagues at work on the day of the homicide seem to have been aware of them. That information only came to light during the homicide enquiry. Section 5.5 considers what other information was held on police systems about Male Z and whether that might have impacted upon an assessment of the risk to Female A from Male Z.

**5.3 *What services did your agency provide for Female A or Male Z in relation to the identified levels of risk and were they timely, proportionate and 'fit for purpose'?***

5.3.1 The only agency that provided a service to Female A in relation to the risk she faced from Male Z was GMP. That related to the call she made on 25.07.2015. The details of her call were correctly recorded and graded and police officers attended promptly. The GMP IMR author has undertaken a detailed analysis of the service provided. The officers that attended appear to have followed GMP policies in respect of domestic abuse incidents.

5.3.2 Given the standard level of risk identified, the panel believe the actions of the officers in ensuring Male Z left the property, handed in his key and left the area were proportionate. While the officers tried to obtain as much information as possible to inform the DASH risk assessment, Female A was in a hurry and did not wish to spend time answering all the questions. Female A did not say anything to the officers that identified she was in fear of Male Z returning, threatening or harming her.

5.3.3 The panel recognised that the police undertake a risk assessment at the scene to identify any need for immediate action to protect the victim. The wishes of victims are important and a victim cannot be compelled to answer these questions if they do not wish to do so. However, just because a victim says they do not wish to answer questions because they are in a hurry, does not mean there are no risks. The panel recognise that police do not have the resources to re-visit every victim. However, the panel felt that undertaking risk assessments at different times may produce different

results and felt there was a lesson and recommendation to be drawn from this scenario. (see lesson 6).

5.3.4 The panel concluded that, based on what was known at the time, the standard of service provided by GMP to Female A on 25.07.2015 was fit for purpose. The only exception to this is the absence of a PNC check. This is discussed at paragraph 5.5 and would have been good practice.

**5.4 *Although Child 1 is recorded as residing in Zimbabwe is there any evidence she was exposed to domestic abuse and, if so, what did your agency do to protect her?***

5.4.1 Child 1 was not present at address 1 on either 25.07.2015 or on the day of the homicide. All the available information suggests she moved to live with her grandparents in Zimbabwe when she was about 15 months old. It does not appear that Female A had met Male Z at that time and she was still married to Male One. There is no evidence that Child 1 was recently in the UK nor that Male Z visited Zimbabwe and had contact with her there.

**5.5 *How effective was inter-agency information sharing and cooperation in response to Female A or Male Z and was information shared with those agencies who needed it?***

5.5.1 Sussex Police held information about Male Z and the domestic abuse incidents he had been involved in. It was clear that, had his name not been spelt incorrectly, he would have been identified as a serial perpetrator of domestic abuse. This would have meant that, within Sussex Police, an intelligence log and warning marker would have been put on his nominal record on Niche. Sussex Police has a data compliance team that check thousands of records each year within the force to ensure this sort of error does not occur. However, on this occasion they recognise that the link between the two records was missed. Sussex Police have identified and highlighted this error within the force.

5.5.2 This information would have been viewable by Sussex Police and by officers and staff in other forces that could access PND<sup>12</sup>. Sussex Police would not have routinely shared this information with GMP unless a request was made by that force, or, Sussex believed there was a need to share it with them. There is nothing within the information supplied by Sussex Police to this panel to suggest they had any knowledge that Male Z had formed a relationship with Female A and/or was travelling to the Manchester area. Consequently, there was no reason why Sussex Police would have passed information to GMP.

5.5.3 While it is unfortunate Male Z 's name was misspelt there was still some information available on both PND and PNC concerning Male Z's arrests for domestic abuse in Sussex. The officers from GMP that attended on 25.07.2015 did not carry out a PNC check on Male Z. Consequently, they were not aware of this information.

---

<sup>12</sup> Only a limited number of licenses are available for staff and officers to view PND. This means it is not routinely accessible by response officers. PNC is available to all response officers.



- 5.5.4 The GMP IMR author has considered the effect of not carrying out this check. The author states a PNC check would have been good practice. However, the IMR author is not able to say what information would have been passed to the officers at address 1 on 25.07.2015 by the PNC operator. Information passed usually includes whether a person is known to police, whether that person is "wanted" for an offence, if they have any warning markers and a brief description of any convictions.
- 5.5.5 The IMR author says information regarding Male Z's previous arrests, rather than convictions, would not necessarily have been checked by the PNC operator. However, if a check had been requested the IMR author cannot rule out that the information regarding previous domestic abuse arrests would not have been seen and passed to the officers.
- 5.5.6 The panel examined a print out from the PNC to test for themselves what was available. While the information relating to Male Z and domestic abuse could be found, the information in the print out was not easy to assimilate by the untrained eye. For it to have been found and the connection made, the panel felt it would probably have required the operator to have been asked to look for it, or, for the operator to have been aware of the nature of the incident and have used their initiative to find the information.
- 5.5.7 However, even though a check was not made, the panel felt that the information on the PNC about Male Z as a perpetrator of domestic abuse would have been helpful to the officers that attended. The panel therefore identified a lesson (see lesson 3) and recommended that Greater Manchester Police should consider how that sort of information should be made available in the future.
- 5.5.8 The IMR author is satisfied that even if the information had been passed regarding the previous arrests of Male Z, the action taken at the scene by the officers was correct in the given circumstances. The panel considered the views of the IMR author and gave careful thought to the 'what if?' in this scenario. While the panel agreed that the actions of the officers in ensuring Male Z left address one were correct, they felt there were other possibilities to consider.
- 5.5.9 The panel recognised that Female A chose not to provide all the information needed to complete the DASH form; there was more going on in respect of her relationship with Male Z that the police did not know and they could not have found out that day. The Panel felt Female A disclosed what she thought would be useful to the police in removing Male Z from the house. The officers who attended the incident could have discovered Male Z's background in Sussex and considered applying Claire's law.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> The scheme provides procedures for disclosing information to enable the partner of a previously violent individual to make informed choices about how and whether they take their relationship with that individual forward. There are two entry routes into the scheme, the first being 'The Right To Ask' which is initiated by an individual approaching the Police to ask for information they may hold about the subject. The second route is 'The Right To Know' where the Police are aware of a previously violent individual and the level of concern is such that disclosure of information needs to be considered. Either scenario should trigger the process.

5.5.10 Finally, the panel considered the questions on the DASH form. The panel felt an important question that was missing from the form is to ask the victim if they have been a victim of previous domestic abuse; in other words, at the hands of a previous partner. Such information, if it is available at the time, might assist police officers in considering risk factors. For example, the panel recognise that serial perpetrators of domestic abuse sometimes select victims who are vulnerable because they have previously been victims at the hands of another perpetrator. The panel has therefore made a recommendation about this issue (recommendation 7)

**5.6 *How did your agency ascertain the wishes and feelings of Female A and Male Z about any domestic abuse and were their views taken into account when providing services or support? Did you seek the views of their families?***

5.6.1 The only agency that had the opportunity to ascertain the wishes and feelings of Female A and Male Z in respect of their relationship were GMP when they responded to Female A's call to them on 25.07.2015. The IMR author for GMP has spoken personally to the police officers concerned. As outlined at section 5.3 both he and the panel are satisfied the service provided on that occasion met the standards of GMP in respect of the way domestic abuse is dealt with.

5.6.2 It appears to the panel that, from the analysis carried out by the IMR author, the staff and officers who spoke to Female A and Male Z were sensitive to their wishes and feelings. The call taker who answered the telephone and spoke to Female A explored whether there were any children involved and whether alcohol was an aggravating factor. They were not.

5.6.3 When the officers arrived and they spoke to Female A, she got out of her car and told the officers she wanted Male Z to leave the house and she needed to get to work. It appeared Female A was not distressed. The officers spoke to Female A and Male Z in separate rooms which is good practice. They obtained a history about Female A. They established she and Male Z had separated the day before as the relationship was no longer working for her and she had then gone to bed. She had been on her way to work and did not want to leave Male Z in the house as she had concerns for his welfare.

5.6.4 While the IMR author does not indicate what Female A meant by Male Z 's 'welfare', when she spoke to the call taker at Greater Manchester Police she told them she was scared of Male Z and that when she asked him to leave the address that morning he had become angry. She said he had a short temper and although he had not been physically aggressive towards her, she could tell that he was angry.

5.6.5 There was no indication the situation between the couple was anything other than a verbal disagreement. When the police officers attended at address one on 25.07.2015, Female A showed no indication that Male Z had been violent towards her or that she was in fear of him although she had said to the call taker a few minutes earlier that she was scared of him. The wishes of Female A were clearly followed, she wanted Male Z to leave the house and this was achieved by the police officers that attended. Ideally the DASH risk assessment should have been fully completed. Female A only specifically answered six out of the twenty-eight questions. However, it was Female A's wish to leave for work and she did not want to remain and answer all the questions. The officers therefore respected her wishes. They

should have considered returning to see her when she had more time before submitting an incomplete DASH.

5.6.6 The officers also appear to have dealt with Male Z appropriately. They obtained a history from him. He was polite and compliant. He told them about being in the army<sup>14</sup>. His explanation was that Female A wanted him to leave the house whilst she went to work. He said there had been no argument, he and Female A had been for a drink the night before and she was not speaking to him when they got back so he just went to bed. Male Z was happy to leave the house and he said he would go to see a friend. The officers conferred and confirmed there had been no argument or fight. Male Z knew the relationship was over and was allowed to leave after handing back his key to the house.

5.6.7 There were no family members present from whom the police officers could obtain information. The panel are satisfied that, although there was only one single incident at which GMP could ascertain Female A and Male Z 's wishes and feelings, the staff and officers that were involved dealt with them sympathetically and appropriately and achieved Female A's wishes of ensuring Male Z left address 1.

**5.7 *How did your agency take account of any racial, cultural, linguistic, faith or other diversity issues, including age and disabilities, when completing assessments and providing services to Female A and Male Z?***

5.7.1 As a minimum, services have a legal obligation to ensure they do not discriminate against people on the grounds of age, disability, gender, race, religion and belief, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership, sexual orientation and gender reassignment (Equality Act 2010). To ensure compliance with this act all police forces are required to have policies in place that relate to equality and diversity. There is also a requirement to ensure that all public body policies are subjected to an equality impact assessment to ensure they are compliant with the Equality Act. This would apply to all operational police policies such as domestic abuse. Equality Policies and Equality Impact Assessments are subjected to regular monitoring, reporting and inspection both internally and externally. The training of police forces contains specific modules on issues relating to equality and diversity.

5.7.2 Both Female A and Male Z were raised in Zimbabwe and entered and remained in the UK by virtue of properly acquired work permits and visas. Because these issues were not pertinent to the homicide of Female A the panel did not ask UKVI to provide an IMR. The panel has therefore not been able to analyse the service provided by UKVI. However, it is known that UKVI has domestic abuse policies which support victims and the policy was used in this case to allow Female One to remain in the UK.

5.7.3 The contact that Sussex Police had with Male Z related to domestic abuse perpetrated on his wife and partners before he met Female A. Much of this took place outside the timeframe of this DHR. Although he was raised in Zimbabwe Male Z spent many years in the UK and was a member of the Territorial Army. English is the official business

---

<sup>14</sup> The panel considered this point and whether, given that Male Z would have had access to firearms, that in future the armed forces should be made aware of the history of a perpetrator of domestic abuse. They have made a recommendation for the Home Office to consider this issue (Recommendation 2).

language of Zimbabwe and is spoken widely by citizens of that country. While the panel have not been able to assess Male Z's fluency in English they did not identify he had any difficulty communicating with either Sussex Police or GMP. The panel recognise that, as a member of UK Armed Forces Male Z would need to be fluent in English language and have a good understanding of the laws and customs of the UK. The panel has not identified that Male Z had any difficulty in understanding the law and custom in the UK relating to domestic abuse.

- 5.7.4 Female A was well educated and held 'A' levels and a diploma in nursing. She practiced as a nurse in the UK and would therefore have to demonstrate she met the necessary educational standards required in the UK. Female A had lived in the UK for several years and it is reasonable to assume she had a good understanding of UK laws and customs. From the contact she had with GMP on 07.2015 it appears she knew who to turn to for help and could articulate her needs to the police officers without any difficulty. When she spoke to GMP officers and staff on 25.07.2015, both on the phone and in person, she was clear as to what she wanted; that was Male Z removing from the house.
- 5.7.5 There is evidence that within Zimbabwe there are high levels of domestic abuse. The Minister for State in Bulawayo is reported to have said that almost half of all women in Zimbabwe suffer from gender based violence<sup>15</sup>. There is evidence that within Zimbabwe legislation has been passed to provide victims with much greater protection. According to a UNHCR report<sup>16</sup>, "[w]omen enjoy extensive legal protections, but societal discrimination and domestic violence persist". The same report states that 48 percent of Zimbabwean women believe that a husband "is justified to beat his wife". There is also evidence in the same report that female victims of domestic violence are commonly reprimanded by their families if they file a case with the authorities.
- 5.7.6 Both Female A and Male Z came from Zimbabwe. While accepting that beliefs and perceptions about domestic abuse are considerably different between the UK and Zimbabwe, it is not possible to say to what extent Male Z's abusive behaviour was shaped by his cultural background. However, the panel do not believe there were any aspects of their racial or cultural background that meant Female A or Male Z were discriminated against in respect of the services they received from the agencies involved in this review. The specific issue of so called honour killing and the possible links to race and culture are considered at section 5.8 post.

**5.8 *Is there any evidence the homicide of Female A by Male Z was 'So Called' Honour based violence'? i.e. a crime or incident which has or may have been committed to protect or defend the honour of the family and/or community.***

- 5.8.1 Both Female A and Male Z were from Zimbabwe a country that views so called honour killings as a *'blatant, indefensible breach of the Universal Declaration of Human*

---

<sup>15</sup> Zimbabwe Daily News: 'Half of Zim women abused' 7 March 2016.

<sup>16</sup> Zimbabwe: Domestic violence, including legislation; state protection and support services available to victims (June 2012- May 2015). Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada

*Rights*<sup>17</sup>. A United Nations Report in 2002 identified those countries in which so called honour based killings had taken place. Zimbabwe was not among those listed. 'Every year in the United Kingdom (UK), officials estimate that at least a dozen women are victims of honour [sic] killings'<sup>18</sup> The UK's Iranian and Kurdish Women's Rights Organisation is reported to have said: "about two-thirds are Muslim. Yet they can also be Hindu and Sikh"<sup>19</sup>. While so called honour killings could clearly occur within members of the Zimbabwe community settled in the UK it would seem that Zimbabwe is similar to the UK. In other words, it is not a country in which there is a cultural or religious basis nor a significant history within the indigenous population for, so called, honour based killing.

- 5.8.2 The panel used the expertise of independent panel member Dr Bell from the Chrysalis Centre to assist them in their discussions. Dr Bell is an Executive Director at Manchester Charity 'Chrysalis' which supports African & Migrant Families. Dr Bell was able to provide valuable insight into cultural issues. The panel concluded that Female A's homicide was not a so called 'Honour Killing'. All of the evidence that emerged during the trial, and the information and material considered by the DHR panel, indicated that Male Z killed Female A out of jealousy. The DHR panel concurred with the views of the senior investigating officer from Greater Manchester Police who said after the trial;

*"Male Z stabbed Female A seven times in a jealous rage, causing injuries that proved fatal"*.

- 5.8.3 The DHR panel feel it is important to reinforce that, just as the jury rejected Male Z's claims of self-defence, they also reject it and have found no information to support that claim. The DHR panel recognise that the perpetrators of domestic abuse will often minimise their actions<sup>20</sup> 'Provocation is an excuse offenders use to avoid responsibility for their behaviour'. The DHR panel believe that is exactly what Male Z did in putting forward a claim of self-defence.

## **5.9 Were single and multi-agency domestic abuse policies and procedures followed and were any gaps identified?**

- 5.9.1 In general this review did not identify any gaps in policies and procedures relating to domestic abuse. The issue of whether a PNC check should have been conducted and the impact it may have had on the outcome in this case is considered at section 5.5.

## **5.10 How effective was your agency's supervision and management of practitioners who were involved with supporting Female A or Male Z and did managers have effective oversight and control of the case?**

---

<sup>17</sup> UNHRC: Zimbabwe's position on honour killings

<sup>18</sup> "BBC: Honour killings in the UK". BBC 6 January 2009.

<sup>19</sup> James Button: "My family, my killers". The Sydney Morning Herald. 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2008

<sup>20</sup> Greater Manchester Against Domestic Abuse: [www.endthefear.co.uk](http://www.endthefear.co.uk)

- 5.10.1 The only agency that had relevant involvement in relation to domestic abuse between Female A and Male Z during the period of this review was GMP. The PPI document from 25.07.2015 contained information that showed that the supervisor of the police officer attending and completing the document had noted what had been written.
- 5.10.2 The GMP IMR author identified that, because of new training that has been given to response officers in 2015, the police officer who completed the PPI document was able to finalise it as a standard risk incident. This has happened because of the large numbers of standard risk incidents and the backlog this was causing within PPIUs when the staff in that unit also had to complete a risk assessment. Consequently, GMP made a policy decision that empowered trained response officers and their supervisors to close standard risk cases without a further assessment being completed by specialist officers.
- 5.10.3 The GMP IMR author did not identify any issues with the supervision and management of the police officers involved with Female A or Male Z. The panel gave careful consideration to the role officers from GMP played in these events. While the panel identified some learning this did not involve supervision and management issues.
- 5.11 *Were there any issues in relation to capacity or resources within your agency or the Partnership that affected your ability to provide services to Female A or Male Z***
- 5.11.1 None of the agencies identified any capacity or resource issues in relation to this DHR. The panel did not identify any either.

## 6. LESSONS IDENTIFIED

### **Lesson 1**

*Victims of domestic abuse are at greatest risk of harm at the point of separation or shortly thereafter. This is a lesson that has been repeated in a number of other DHRs locally and nationally.*

#### **Narrative:**

*Female A had been in a relationship with Male Z for some time. On or shortly before the morning of 25.07.2015 she decided their relationship was at an end. Male Z knew that. She telephoned GMP and asked for their help in removing Male Z from the house. Male Z left willingly when the police attended. He went to her work place on two occasions to speak to her and then returned to address 1 and killed her.*

### **Lesson 2**

*Agencies should be alert to the possibility they are unwittingly used by the perpetrators of domestic abuse in order to help locate their victims so they can perpetuate their abuse.*

#### **Narrative:**

*On 30.03.2008 Male Z reported to Sussex Police that Female One and their daughter were missing. They were located safe and well at a friend's house. There is evidence that Male Z perpetrated abuse on Female One. At 21.57 on 21.04.2014 Male Z telephoned GMP and reported a concern for Female A and that he had not been able to contact her. Police officers located Female A safe and well. In the light of what is now known about Male Z as a perpetrator of domestic abuse, on both of these occasions the possibility exists that both women may have been fleeing his abuse or trying to end their relationship with him.*

### **Lesson 3 Recommendation 1**

*When conducting assessments and identifying levels of risk it is important that all relevant background information is available to those carrying out the risk assessment.*

#### **Narrative:**

*Male Z was a serial perpetrator of domestic abuse and Sussex Police held information about him that would have been of value when conducting a risk assessment. Some of that information was available on PND and PNC. The officers that conducted the risk assessment on 25.07.2015 were not aware of that information as they did not conduct a PNC check. Even if they had carried out a check it is not clear that the information held on the PNC would have been passed to the officers.*

**Lesson 4**

*Perpetrators will often claim they have been assaulted or make other allegations against their victims to divert attention from their offending.*

**Narrative:**

*On 02.07.2008 Male Z was arrested after Female One said he had punched her to the neck. She also reported a previous history of domestic abuse. During interview Male Z made an allegation that Female One hit their daughter with a belt. Both matters were investigated. No evidence was found to support the allegation concerning their daughter and no further action was taken in respect of the common assault by Male Z on Female One. On 18.01.2013 Female Two reported that Male Z was harassing her. Police officers attended and spoke to the couple after Female Two confronted Male Z about an affair she suspected he was involved in. It is alleged Female Two then assaulted Male Z and she was arrested. During interview Female Two denied the offences and claimed that after she confronted Male Z he tried to have sex with her. She refused and he pinned her down. Female Two said she fought back and that is how Male Z became injured.*

**Lesson 5 Recommendation 2**

*Information that an individual who is serving or intends to serve in the armed forces is the perpetrator of domestic abuse may be important when assessing their suitability to possess or have access to a firearm.*

**Narrative:**

*Male Z was a serial perpetrator of domestic abuse and information about him was held on Sussex Police systems, PND and PNC. Male Z told police officers from Greater Manchester Police on 25.07.2015 that he was serving in the army. That information would not have been of significance to them as they were not aware that he was a serial perpetrator of domestic abuse. During the research for this DHR a check on the internet disclosed numerous pictures of him dressed in the uniform of HM Forces and carrying weapons including firearms and a knife.*

**Lesson 6 Recommendation 3**

*Undertaking risk assessments at different times may produce different results particularly if the victim is prepared to disclose further information. The 'Strive'<sup>21</sup> initiative will assist in achieving this in cases first assessed as 'standard' and in which there has been no report of crime. In other cases, consideration should be given to either the police or another agency re-visiting the victim to complete the risk assessment.*

---

<sup>21</sup> Strive is an initiative recently introduced by Greater Manchester Police that involves a new multi-agency approach. Early intervention teams re-visit standard risk victims without a crime, understand what the underlying issues are and try to resolve these in order to prevent further escalation or repeat calls for service.



***Narrative:***

*On 25.07.2015 Female A did not answer all the questions she was asked by the police officer when completing the DASH risk assessment. The reason she gave was that she needed to leave for work. Consequently, the assessment of risk was carried out with limited information. Female A was not seen again to complete the unanswered questions and it would have been unrealistic to expect Greater Manchester Police to have re-visited her given the nature of the call. Had she been seen again later to complete the DASH risk assessment either by the police or another agency then she may have disclosed further information about her relationship with Male Z that would have altered the assessment of risk.*

## **7. CONCLUSIONS**

- 7.1 Female A was described by people who knew her as very hard working. She was well educated and came to the UK several years ago to work as a nurse. Her first marriage ended when she left Male One for undisclosed reasons. Female A suffered the terrible tragedy of losing her first child through an accidental death. Her second child (Child 1) was brought up by her parents in Zimbabwe. She worked hard in order to send money back to Zimbabwe and visited Child 1 there when she could.
- 7.2 Male Z was also from Zimbabwe and settled in the UK where he formed relationships with a number of women. These were punctuated by domestic abuse in which he was the perpetrator. He committed assaults on his victims that included allegations of physical and sexual force. The panel are clear that his conduct fell within the government's definition of domestic abuse (Appendix A).
- 7.3. Male Z was arrested in Sussex on three occasions in connection with domestic abuse; on 02.07.2008 for common assault on Female One; on 16.10.2008 for sexual assault on Female One; on 02.01.2010 for assault on Female Two and damage to her telephone. No further action was taken against him on all three occasions.
- 7.4 On 18.01.2013 Male Z was recorded as the victim of domestic abuse and Female Two as the perpetrator. He claimed to have been assaulted by her. Female Two said she acted in defence after he tried to have sex with her against her will. Female Two was not prosecuted.
- 7.5 Because of an error in the spelling of his name, Male Z was not identified by Sussex Police as a serial perpetrator of domestic abuse. No intelligence log or warning marker was placed on either of his Niche nominal records. However, some information about his arrests was available on PND and PNC.
- 7.6 Female A entered into a relationship with Male Z around 18 months to two years before he killed her. According to a friend of Female A, she discovered he was married with children and this is when problems started and arguments took place between the couple. Friends or family of Female A appeared to have no information that the relationship was abusive. Nothing came to the attention of any agencies to suggest this either. It was only on 25.07.2015, when Female A called GMP, that the first and only domestic abuse incident was reported.
- 7.7 Officers from GMP acted correctly when they attended and dealt with this call. They followed the policy of GMP in respect of domestic abuse. The incident was risk assessed as standard using the DASH model. The panel conclude that on the information available this was the correct level to attribute. The officers also carried out Female A's wishes in ensuring Male Z left the house. The panel concludes the actions of the officers was appropriate to the level of risk. There was no evidence that a crime had been committed, nor did Female A give any information that she had been assaulted or was in fear of Male Z.
- 7.8 While the service the officers provided to Female A was fit for purpose, it would have been good practice to carry out a PNC check on Male Z. The PNC did not contain all information that was available about Male Z. However, it did contain some information about his arrests for domestic abuse. It is not possible to speculate whether or not the PNC operator would have given this information to the officers or

would only have given information about markers on his record, such as being disqualified from driving.

- 7.9 The panel recognise that friends and family can often hold important information. Sometimes this is direct knowledge that domestic abuse has occurred in a relationship or sometimes it is knowledge about the indicators of domestic abuse. The DHR panel did not find that the family or friends of Female A held any such information.
- 7.10 The DHR panel are satisfied that the homicide of Female A by Male Z was not a, so called, 'honour killing'. They are also satisfied there were no cultural issues as to why Male Z killed Female A. The panel reject any claim that Male Z acted in self-defence and believe Male Z killed Female A out of jealousy.

## **8. PREDICTABILITY/PREVENTABILITY**

- 8.1 Even if a PNC check had been made and the officers had received information about Male Z 's arrests in Sussex for domestic abuse the panel conclude it would not have made any difference to the actions they took that day. No offences had been reported to them and they had no evidence upon which to arrest or detain Male Z.
- 8.2 From conversations Female A had with a work colleague on 28.07.2015, when she asked them to telephone Male Z and ask him to leave, it appears Male Z must have returned to address 1 after the police left. Male Z also visited Female A at her place of work on two occasions on the day of the homicide. None of these events were reported to GMP and therefore they had no further information with which to review or amend the risk of harm to Female A.
- 8.3 When Male Z confronted Female A and Male Two at address 1 he was armed with a replica gun and a knife. There was no information available to agencies from which it could reasonably have been foreseen he would act in this way and then attack and kill Female A. Consequently, the panel conclude the homicide of Female A was neither predictable nor preventable.
- 8.4 Female A's father believes the death of his daughter was both predictable and preventable and cites his reasons in a letter he wrote to the Chair of the DHR panel (see paragraph 3.7.1). Specifically, he states;
- 'You don't solve a domestic problem by phone but to sit with both parties and hear each other's side of the story. The police again delayed to attend the scene when neighbours phoned them on hearing Female A screaming and they took their time. If they had attended the scene in time Female A could have probably survived; 30 minutes' delay was too much.*
- The lesson to be learnt from this is that police should bring both parties to the table when trying to solve a problem and avoid using the phone like in the case of Female A and Male Z. The police should also be ordered to attend all serious crimes in time in order to prevent further damages. Scene attendance in an urban area in my little Zimbabwe is five minutes according to the police service charter'.*
- 8.5 The DHR panel recognise Female A's father's concerns about the need to talk to both parties and establish what was going on in the relationship. The panel have taken particular care to ensure that at section 5.6 the actions of the police officers when they answered the call made by Female A have been thoroughly analysed.
- 8.6 In relation to Female A's father's concern that there was a delay in attending the scene when Male Z attacked Female A. The way in which Greater Manchester Police make an operational response to an incident like this involving a report of a firearm<sup>22</sup> is not within the terms of reference of this DHR. Issues in relation to operational

---

<sup>22</sup> As police officers in England and Wales do not routinely carry firearms, in order to protect them and the public, special policies apply when an incident is reported in which it is believed the public or police may be at risk from someone with a firearm. In such cases a vehicle containing police officers with access to firearms will be sent and unarmed police officers will await their arrival until they attend at the scene of the incident. These are known as Armed Response Vehicles (ARV). On occasions these vehicles may have to travel some distance before they reach the scene of an incident involving a firearm. Each police force will have their own policy on how such incidents are dealt with.

policy such as this are a matter for Greater Manchester Police to investigate and resolve.

- 8.7. In view of Female A's father's concern that there was a delay in responding, the Chair of the DHR requested the panel representative from Greater Manchester Police make enquiries into the matter. Greater Manchester Police state in their IMR that the way in which the incident in which Male Z stabbed Female A was dealt with was in line with their Incident Response Policy 2011 and the Command of Firearms Incidents procedure document. The Professional Standards Branch lead from Greater Manchester Police who reviewed this incident states the time taken for an Armed Response Vehicle to reach the scene was seventeen minutes. The call was graded as one requiring an emergency response and consequently the response time for such calls would have been set at 15 minutes (see Appendix A page 42).

## **9. RECOMMENDATIONS**

9.1 The DHR Recommendations appear below and in the Action Plan.

9.2 The DHR panel recommends:

- i. That Rochdale Safer Communities Partnership (RSCP) request Greater Manchester Police to consider how all relevant background information about a perpetrator can be made available to police officers when they attend reports of domestic abuse;
- ii. The Home Office consult with the Ministry of Defence and the College of Policing to consider whether there are satisfactory arrangements in place for sharing information about the suitability of individuals who are perpetrators of domestic abuse and are either members, or prospective members, of HM armed forces;
- iii. That Rochdale Safer Communities Partnership (RSCP) work with Greater Manchester Police and other partners to ensure that, when a victim is not able to fully complete a DASH risk assessment at the time of the initial call, arrangements are in place for this information to be obtained later.

## Definitions

### Domestic Violence

1. The Government definition of domestic violence against both men and women (agreed in 2004) is:

"Any incident of threatening behaviour, violence or abuse [psychological, physical, sexual, financial or emotional] between adults who are or have been intimate partners or family members, regardless of gender or sexuality"

2. The definition of domestic violence and abuse as amended by Home Office Circular 003/2013 came into force on 14.02.2013 is:

"Any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive or 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. This can encompass but is not limited to the following types of abuse:

- psychological
- physical
- sexual
- financial
- emotional

3. *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.
4. *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.

### **Vulnerable Adults No Secrets (Now superseded by Chapter 14 Care Act 2014)**

5. The broad definition of a 'vulnerable adult' referred to in the 1997 Consultation Paper Who decides?\* issued by the Lord Chancellor's Department, is a person:

*"Who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation".*

6. A consensus has emerged identifying the following main different forms of abuse:
  - physical abuse, including hitting, slapping, pushing, kicking, misuse of medication, restraint, or inappropriate sanctions;
  - sexual abuse, including rape and sexual assault or sexual acts to which the vulnerable adult has not consented, or could not consent or was pressured into consenting;

- psychological abuse, including emotional abuse, threats of harm or abandonment, deprivation of contact, humiliation, blaming, controlling, intimidation, coercion, harassment, verbal abuse, isolation or withdrawal from services or supportive networks;
- financial or material abuse, including theft, fraud, exploitation, pressure in connection with wills, property or inheritance or financial transactions, or the misuse or misappropriation of property, possessions or benefits;
- neglect and acts of omission, including ignoring medical or physical care needs, failure to provide access to appropriate health, social care or educational services, the withholding of the necessities of life, such as medication, adequate nutrition and heating; and discriminatory abuse, including racist, sexist, that based on a person's disability, and other forms of harassment, slurs or similar treatment.

7. Incidents of abuse may be multiple, either to one person in a continuing relationship or service context or to more than one person at a time. This makes it important to look beyond the single incident or breach in standards to underlying dynamics and patterns of harm. (Source: Section 2 No Secrets Department of Health 2000)

### **Risk Factors**

Individuals at risk for domestic violence could include those with the following risk factors:

- Planning to leave or has recently left an abusive relationship
- Previously in an abusive relationship
- Poverty or poor living situations
- Unemployed
- Physical or mental disability
- Recently separated or divorced
- Isolated socially from friends and family
- Abused as a child
- Witnessed domestic violence as a child
- Pregnancy, especially if unplanned
- Younger than 30 years
- Stalked by a partner

The following factors may indicate an increased likelihood that a person may choose violence:

- Abuses alcohol or drugs
- Witnessed abuse as a child
- Was a victim of abuse as a child
- Abused former partner
- Unemployed or under employed/financial worries
- Abuses pets
- Criminal history including weapons
- Mental health issues/suicide attempts



## **Greater Manchester Police Terms Used in the Report**

### **FWINS**

FWIN is an acronym for Force Wide Incident Numbering. This is a computerised system for recording and auditing all incidents reported to GMP requiring a police response. A FWIN is allocated a unique reference number on a daily basis. For example, FWIN 1112 of 30/03/15 refers to incident number 1112 on the 30<sup>th</sup> March 2015. Opening and closing codes are applied to FWINs in order to categorise them for statistical purposes and to ensure appropriate 'follow up' responses.

For example, a typical relevant closing code on a FWIN for a domestic related incident is D62; this indicates that an incident has been categorised as a domestic incident involving adults. A closing code such as D62 would generate an automatic referral to the Public Protection Investigation Unit (PPIU) on the relevant police division for an assessment / follow up response by a specialist PPIU officer. A similar process applies to a FWIN closed G16 (concern for safety of an adult), which would also generate an automatic referral to the PPIU (Public Protection Investigation Unit) for an assessment / follow up response by a specialist PPIU officer.

### **DASH risk assessment model (GMP Policy April 2013)**

Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Harassment and Honour Based Violence Risk Identification and Assessment form (DASH) is the risk assessment model currently used in GMP when reporting domestic incidents. DASH is an essential element to tackling domestic abuse and providing the information that could influence whether or not to refer the victim to a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC); it is designed to improve the process that would identify and manage risk to the victims of domestic abuse. There are three parts to the DASH risk assessment model as set out in the Tackling Domestic Abuse Policy and Operational Procedures 2013:

- Part 1: risk identification by first response police staff;
- Part 2: the full risk assessment review and enhanced risk assessment by specialist Public Protection Investigation domestic abuse staff; and
- Part 3: risk management and intervention plan by public protection investigation domestic abuse staff.

The DASH checklist must now be used for all domestic abuse and honour based violence incidents and it is imperative that all questions (and there are 28 in total) are asked and answers completed and recorded accurately by first response officers. Once an officer has asked the 28 questions and completed the risk assessment he / she must then use their professional judgement along with the risk indicators to identify and grade the risk posed to that individual or any other person who resides at the address.

A risk classification is required on the 1-28 form to be recorded as either standard, medium or high based on the following:

- Standard - Current evidence does not indicate likelihood of causing serious harm
- Medium - There are identifiable indicators of risk of serious harm. The offender has the potential to cause serious harm but is unlikely to do so unless there is a change in circumstances

- High - There are identifiable indicators of risk of serious harm. The potential event could happen at any time and the impact would be serious

On completion of this risk assessment, the reporting officer has a responsibility for the completion of the DASH on the GMP Operational Policing Unit System (OPUS); it is only once this has been completed that the risk assessment will be viewable by specialist domestic abuse staff within the PPIU who can then act accordingly on the information that has been provided.

The DASH risk assessment model places a responsibility on specialist public protection investigation domestic abuse staff to complete a full risk assessment review and enhanced risk assessment, which will enable specialist investigators to make a more informed analysis. This enhanced risk assessment requires specialist domestic abuse investigators to consider eleven further questions, including a requirement to obtain details of domestic violence history. The completion of this enhanced risk assessment should inform the specialist domestic abuse investigator as to whether the risk to the victim is standard, medium or high, and to consider what further action is necessary and whether a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) referral should be considered.

### **Triage Desk**

As reflected in PPIU Divisional Handbook of 2012 under roles and responsibilities, the Triage Desk is at the core of the PPIU and aims to provide, amongst other things:

- Consistency in identifying and flagging vulnerable people;
- Timely identification of safeguarding concerns, risk assessments and risk management;
- Ensure information regarding domestic abuse, child protection, adult protection/mental ill health is not assessed in isolation;
- Early identification of high risk cases that are then referred to PPIU investigation teams; and
- Recording and management of all referrals, both internal and external.

### **Graded Response**

Police call handlers have a responsibility to identify and mitigate risk, taking into account all the circumstances of the incident, including the vulnerability of the victim when making the incident grading decision. The incident grade will determine the level and timeliness of our response to incidents.

The overarching objective is to deliver a response to incidents, which meets the needs of the community, whilst identifying and mitigating risk and harm. The graded response will be subject of comment in sections of this IMR report; in summary the graded response policy is as follows:

Grade 1 : Emergency Response	Allocate within 2 mins and attendance within 15 mins;
Grade 2 : Priority Response	Allocate within 20 mins and attendance within 1 hour;
Grade 3 : Routine Response	Allocate within 2 hours and attendance within 4 hours;
Grade 4 : Scheduled Response	Attendance or other resolution within 48 hours; and
Grade 5 : Telephone Resolution	First-time telephone resolution of a call



## DHR Panel Action Plan

No.	Recommendation	Key Actions	Evidence	Key Outcomes	Lead Officer	Date
1	That Rochdale Safer Communities Partnership (RSCP) request Greater Manchester Police to consider how all relevant background information about a perpetrator can be made available to police officers when they attend reports of domestic abuse	i) Write to GMP Head of Public Protection to highlight recommendation and request their action  ii) GMP Public Protection Division to review systems and practice, and act on findings		Policing systems and practice are reviewed, and any identified scope for change is implemented and reported to the Domestic Abuse Working Group.	i) Mark Dalzell  ii) GMP Public Protection Division	August 2017
2	The Home Office consult with the Ministry of Defence and the College of Policing to consider whether there are satisfactory arrangements in place for sharing information about the suitability of individuals who are perpetrators of domestic abuse and are either members, or prospective members of HM armed forces;	Accompanying letter to be drafted and sent to Home Office to highlight recommendation and request their action	4/07/2017  Email received by Chair from Home Office who are in discussion with MOD. Chair to update when more information received.	Home Office are aware of recommendation and instigate consultation with MoD and College of Policing	Mark Dalzell/Paul Cheeseman	July 2014

3	That Rochdale Safer Communities Partnership (RSCP) work with Greater Manchester Police and other partners to ensure that when a victim is not able to fully complete a DASH risk assessment at the time of the initial call, arrangements are in place for this information to be obtained later	<p>i) Recommendation communicated to GMP staff and all other agencies responsible for completing DASH risk assessments</p> <p>ii) GMP and other partner agencies review and revise practice to account for recommendation</p>		Opportunities for the protection of vulnerable victims and reduction of risk are increased	Mark Dalzell GMP and other Partners	July 2016
---	--	---	--	--	--	-----------



Home Office

Public Protection Unit  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF

T: 020 7035 4848  
[www.gov.uk/homeoffice](http://www.gov.uk/homeoffice)

Ian Halliday  
Principal Community Safety Officer  
Neighbourhood Services  
Rochdale Borough Council  
Rochdale Police Station  
The Holme  
The Esplanade  
Rochdale OL16 1AG

15 February 2017

Dear Mr Halliday,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review report for Rochdale to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 24 January 2017.

The QA Panel would like to thank you for conducting this review and for providing them with the final report. The Panel concluded this was a good, meaningful review with helpful lessons identified despite the limited agency contact with the parties involved. The report has been enhanced with information from the family.

There were, however, some aspects of the report which the Panel felt could benefit from further analysis or be revised which you will wish to consider:

- The Panel concluded that requesting an IMR from the Territorial Army may have provided useful information to the review;
- It would be helpful if the report could explain why family representations have been redacted;



- The report makes reference to the use of an “expert” on the review but there is no narrative on what was the role of this person;
- The Panel suggested that the equality and diversity section of the review could be expanded to consider the context of domestic abuse within the cultural background of the victim and perpetrator;
- The housing status of the parties involved is missing from the report;
- Please proof read. For example, there is an error in the final sentence in paragraph 1.4.

The Panel does not need to review another version of the report, but I would be grateful if you could include our letter as an appendix to the report. I would be grateful if you could email us at [DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk) and provide us with the URL to the report when it is published.

The QA Panel felt it would be helpful to routinely sight Police and Crime Commissioners on DHRs in their local area. I am, accordingly, copying this letter to your PCC for information.

Yours sincerely

**Christian Papaleontiou**

Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel

End of report for publication