



Manchester Community Safety Partnership

DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW

'Dottie King'

January 2016

Panel Chair: David Hunter

Report Author: Paul Cheeseman

CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
1. Introduction	3
2. Establishing the Domestic Homicide Review	4-8
3. Background: Adult James, Dottie & Adult Female A	9-17
4. The Facts by Agency	18-26
5. Analysis Terms against the Terms of Reference	27-40
6. Lessons identified	41-42
7. Conclusions	43-45
8. Predictability/Preventability	46
9. Recommendations	47

Appendix A

Definitions

Appendix B

Domestic Abuse Services

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The principal people referred to in this report are:

Dottie King	Victim	Black British Caribbean
James	Offender	Black Caribbean
Child 1 (C1)	Child of Dottie King/James	Black British Caribbean
Child 2 (C2)	Child of Dottie King/James	Black British Caribbean
Adult Female A (AFA)	Partner of James	
Address 1	Victims Home	
Address 2	Offender's Home	

1.2 This report concerns the homicide of Dottie King. She was the former partner of James. They had been in a relationship for about twelve years. James was the father of her two children C1 and C2. Dottie King was separated from James who at the time of the homicide was in a relationship with AFA.

1.3 During an afternoon in Autumn 2014, AFA and Dottie King were involved in a confrontation near to address 2. Shortly afterwards James arrived. After trying to intervene he went into address 2 and came out with a weapon which he used to strike Dottie King to the front of her head. She fell to the ground and James left the scene. He was arrested a short distance away. Dottie King was taken to hospital and died two days later of head injuries. No traces of alcohol or drugs were found in Dottie King. At the time of his arrest James had slight traces of a drug in his blood that is believed to be Viagra. There were no traces of alcohol in his blood.

1.4 James claimed he had been acting in self-defence when he struck Dottie King. He said she had been carrying a knife at the time. This account was not supported by witnesses and no knife was found. James was charged with the murder of Dottie King and in early spring 2015 he appeared before a Crown Court. Following a trial he was found guilty of the murder; he received a life sentence and must serve a minimum of 20 years in prison.

2. ESTABLISHING THE DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW [DHR]

2.1 Decision Making

2.1.1 Manchester Community Safety Partnership [MCSP] decided on 21.10.2014 that the death of Dottie King 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 Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) should be taken within one month of the homicide coming to the attention of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and says it should be completed within a further six months. Because delays occurred in obtaining material and the views of the family the Chair of the CSP was briefed and approved an extension to the review with a new completion date of 25.08.2015 when the report was presented to the CSP.

2.2 DHR Panel

2.2.1 David Hunter was appointed as the Independent Chair and Author. He is an independent practitioner who has chaired and written previous DHRs, Child Serious Case Reviews and Multi Agency Public Protection Reviews. He has never been employed by any of the agencies involved with this DHR and was judged to have the experience and skills for the task. The first of seven panel meetings was held on 18.11.2014. 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 It was felt important that, as well as having an independent chair, the panel should have access to independent advice from a local organisation that had not had involvement in the case. Manchester Women's Aid confirmed they had not been involved and kindly provided a representative to sit on the panel. The panel was also assisted by two representatives from the Chrysalis Centre who were able to provide cultural advice. The panel comprised:

Name	Job Title	Organisation
➤ Julie Asumu	Project Manager	Chrysalis Family Centre
➤ Georgina Agoglia	Minute Taker Business Support	Manchester City Council
➤ Erinma Bell	Chair	Chrysalis Family Centre
➤ Paul Cheeseman	Independent Author	
➤ Martin Clements	Non-Detained Asylum	UK Visas and

	Casework Lead	Immigration
➤ Paul Copplestone	Detective Inspector	Serious Case Review Team, Greater Manchester Police
➤ Louise Davison	Designated Nurse	Safeguarding Adults Manchester Clinical Commissioning Group
➤ Delia Edwards	Domestic Abuse Coordinator	Manchester City Council
➤ Jacky Ellison	Neighbourhood Manager	Mosscares Housing
➤ Michelle Hulme	Senior Policy Officer Crime & Disorder	Manchester City Council
➤ David Hunter	Independent Chair	
➤ Anne Kubiak	Head of Safeguarding	Central Clinical Commissioning Group
➤ Philippa Ladd	Strategic Manager	Manchester Women's Aid
➤ Maria Mallen	Named Nurse Safeguarding Children Team	Central Manchester Foundation Trust
➤ Kerry Mehta*	Strategic Lead Children	Manchester City Council

*Attended meetings up to 16th April

2.3 Agencies Submitting Individual Management Reviews (IMRs)

2.3.1 The following agencies submitted IMRs.

- Greater Manchester Police
- UK Visas and Immigration
- Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
- Manchester City Council Anti-Social Behaviour Action Team (ASBAT)
- Mosscares Housing Ltd

- Manchester City Council Children and Families (Children's Services)

2.3.2 The following agencies and organisations helpfully provided information when requested by the panel;

- North West Ambulance Service (NWAS)
- Manchester City Council Children and Families Directorate (Education)
- Trafford Council

2.4 Notifications and Involvement of Families

2.4.1 The Chair of the Panel wrote to the parents of Dottie King and the sister of James to explain the DHR process and determine whether they and the family wished to contribute. Through the support of community intermediaries the Chair spoke by telephone to the father of Dottie King. He has provided the following written submission that he has requested the panel include within the report.

2.4.2 *'...on reflection, I do not think that I would be able to contribute much to your report. I was never aware of, or alerted to any serious issues leading up to the event, nor of any inputs or lack of it by the governmental services, including the police. It would therefore be difficult for me to speak about any failures of any branch of the services. On speaking to [Dottie King's] mother whom she lived with, and with various other individuals within the community, I was made aware of the murderer's violent nature, and of the injuries he has inflicted on numerous females over the years, and leading up to the time of the event. I believe that if these females had found the courage to come forward, that action might have been taken against him, which would have prevented further violence towards females, and ultimately murder. If anything, a campaign needs to be supported by government to reassure females who are on the receiving end of violent behaviour by men, or who have experienced violent behaviour at the hands of men, whether it be domestic or social. Women need to feel that they can come forward freely and without fear of intimidation or ridicule, so that action can be taken against the perpetrators.'*

2.4.3 The Chair wrote to James, via his solicitor, inviting him to contribute to the report. At this time this report was written James had not responded to this invitation.

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 13.11.2012 to the date of the homicide.

2.5.3 Case Specific Terms

1. What knowledge or indicators of domestic abuse did your agency have relating to Dottie King, James and AFA as victims and/or perpetrators of domestic abuse and what risk assessments were done?
2. What was the level of risk and was there an appropriate risk management plan in place
3. What services did your agency provided for the victim[s] and offender and were they timely, proportionate and 'fit for purpose' in relation to the identified levels of risk?
4. What did your agency do to safeguard any children exposed to domestic abuse?
5. What did your agency do to establish the reasons for the offender's abusive behaviour and how did it address them?
6. How effective was inter-agency information sharing and cooperation in response to the victim[s] and offender and was information shared with those agencies who needed it?
7. How did your agency take account of any racial, cultural, linguistic, faith or other diversity issues, when completing assessments and providing services to the victim and perpetrator?
8. Did your agency identify any barriers that may have prevented Dottie King from disclosing domestic abuse between 2006 and her death?
9. Were single and multi-agency policies and procedures followed, including where applicable the Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) and Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) protocols.
10. How effective was your agency's supervision and management of practitioners involved with the response to the needs of the victim and offender 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 the victim and perpetrator or to work with other agencies?

12. Are there any lessons from previous DHRs that your agency has been involved in that have relevance to the lessons learned in this case? If so, how did the learning from previous case reviews impact on the provision of services to Dottie King and James?

3. BACKGROUND & EVENTS PRIOR TO 13.11.2012

3.1 The information in this section is drawn from the IMRs and family members. There are a significant number of events involving the principal parties prior to the timescale of this review. Those events felt to be particularly relevant are summarised in Table 1 below. Each event is numbered and further comment about them is made in the following paragraphs.

Event Number	Date	Event	Comment
1	30.10.2001	James arrested for threatening to shoot mother & brother of then girlfriend.	NFA due to lack of victim cooperation.
2	21.03.2002	James assaulted Dottie King after kicking her in the legs and stomach. She was pregnant at the time. The assault occurred after a confrontation with another female James was living with.	James denied the offence and Dottie King requested NFA. This event was also reported to the Specialist Diabetes Midwife on 25.03.15 there was self-reporting of punch to back, abdomen and legs and cuts to her hand. This information was not requested from the midwife by Greater Manchester Police or shared with Greater Manchester Police by the MW.
3	29.03.2002	James arrested and charged with common assault after slapping a female across the face.	Convicted of common assault. This is James only conviction.
4	20.05.2003	Complaint from former partner that James had subjected her to 2 years of domestic abuse including verbal threats and physical beatings. He had also threatened to shoot her.	No complaint made and advised re civil remedies options
5	20.06.2003	Allegation of common assault by James who hit a male friend in the face.	NFA due to lack of victim cooperation.
6	18.10.2003	James interviewed for common assault on female ex-partner. Allegedly threw video cassette at her and punched her in head.	NFA due to lack of victim cooperation.
7	24.12.2003	Dottie King reported James had assaulted her with a weapon. Dottie King admitted smashing	NFA. No physical injuries to support assault claim & James did not want to prosecute for

Event Number	Date	Event	Comment
		James car window.	damage. Dottie King attended A and E on two occasions on that day. The first examination revealed a bruise to her right buttock and left arm and no head injury. The second attendance slight tenderness, no haematoma/lacerations to the left side of her face.
8	26.12.2003	Dottie King stated James had pointed firearm at her and threatened to shoot her after they ended their relationship.	NFA due to lack of victim cooperation. Firearms warrant executed at address 2 nothing found.
9	27.2.2004	James reported Dottie King was causing harassment outside his solicitor's offices while he was inside discussing their relationship.	NFA
10	28.2.2004	Dottie King arrested for racially aggravated damage after female seen running from James vehicle that was scratched by a brick.	NFA
11	9.10.2004	Dottie King and James involved in disturbance in car park. Dottie King claims he attacked her with a weapon.	NFA on advice of CPS. Belief that Dottie King had contributed to events by approaching James while she was subject of an injunction. No injuries. James not willing to support prosecution. UK Visas and Immigration advised James was about to be deported.
12	10.10.2004	James claims two male friends of Dottie King threatened to kill him.	NFA
13	19.10.2004	James obtained injunction order against Dottie King.	
14	04.11.2004	Dottie King arrested for child cruelty after leaving her 2 year old alone in house while she went shopping.	Given police caution.
15	29.12.2005	Firearms warrant executed at address 2 and BB gun recovered.	

Event Number	Date	Event	Comment
16	12.05.2006	James arrested for punching tenant in face and threatening to kill him.	Arrested 16.07.2006 and denied the offence. NFA.
17	13.07.2006	James arrested for dangerous driving after driving car into path of another vehicle and threatening the female driver (partner of male at event 16) saying she owed him rent money.	James denied this offence and assault 12.05.2006. NFA although he was detained by UK Visas and Immigration
18	16.10.2006	Incident between Dottie King & James when she reported he had taken her phone. It was found in a friend's pocket.	NFA
19	8.11.2006	James arrested for rape of 17 year old female neighbour.	Arrested, remanded in custody. Found not guilty at court and claimed consensual intercourse.
20	11.07.2007	James remanded in Immigration detention centre.	Released 13.09.2007
21	15.09.2007	Concerns for safety of C1 and C2 after they were left alone at the home of Dottie King's mother. At this time they were in the care of Dottie King's mother as Dottie King was in hospital.	Dottie King's mother cautioned for neglect.
22	21.02.2009	James punched male person to head after demanding money from them.	NFA due to lack of victim cooperation.
23	12.10.2009	James arrested for assaulting his sister. He grabbed her throat and pressed her face against a wall during an argument.	NFA due to lack of victim cooperation.
24	17.11.2009	Neighbour reports James had threatened to burn their house down.	NFA due to lack of victim cooperation.
25	27.03.2010	James arrested for assaulting one of his daughters from a previous relationship then aged 15 by hitting her across cheek. Incident reported during school meeting. She also said that on 14.04.2010 James threatened	NFA due to lack of victim cooperation

Event Number	Date	Event	Comment
		to shoot her as she had reported the assault to her school.	
26	10.05.2010	Chief Immigration Officer signs deportation order against James	Not served as James failed to attend.
27	19.07.2011	After dispute with another male a firearm is discharged at address 2 in an attempt to kill James	Offender charged with attempted murder of James and acquitted.
28	30.04.2011	Offender from above incident threatens James. At the time James was with AFA and her children.	NFA against offender after James refused to speak to police officers.
29	29.06.2012	Misuse of Drugs warrant executed at address 2.	James present one person admitted possession of cannabis.

Table 1 Significant Events involving Principal Parties prior to 13.11.12

3.2 Dottie King [Victim]

- 3.2.1 Dottie King was born in Manchester. She was diagnosed with diabetes in 1995 and had significant involvement with Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust in relation to her condition. She frequently presented at hospital very sick with diabetes and related health needs and required admission to the Intensive Therapy and High Dependency Units. Her behaviour could be unpredictable.
- 3.2.2 On 26.06.2011 Dottie King became hysterical after arguing with her mother. The police were called and she barricaded herself, C1 and C2 in the house. The police forced entry and found the children safe and well. Dottie King blamed her behaviour on her diabetes. Greater Manchester Police made a referral to Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust although she was not accepted for assessment or services. Contemporary practice has changed and in 2015, should the same circumstances occur, Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust would make contact to discuss the needs of someone like Dottie King. She spent a lot of time in hospital for her condition and would absent herself from the grounds or discharge herself from the hospital without any discussions with staff. She was also described as being hostile towards school staff when challenged about late collection of her children. There are a number of references to her living in poor conditions.
- 3.2.3 On 25.03.2002 Dottie King disclosed to the specialist diabetes midwife (SDM) at Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust that she had been assaulted by the father of the unborn baby and his girlfriend. This information was passed to Dottie King's GP and is recorded in her notes. Although Dottie King did not name him it was James who was the father of her child. At this time Dottie King

was five months pregnant with his child (C1). She said she had been punched in the lower back, abdomen and legs and she had cuts to her hands. The police had been involved and Dottie King said she felt safe with her parents. This is believed to relate to event 2 Table 1.

- 3.2.4 On 07.05.2002 Dottie King was seen in the ante-natal clinic and reported that two weeks previously she had attended the emergency department after being assaulted by the father of her baby. She said she had been punched in the back, legs and abdomen and said a weapon had been used. It is not clear whether the report she made on this occasion related to the same incident referred to in Table 1, Event 2 or a separate one. Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust staff discussed domestic abuse and the impact on children and made a referral to Children's Social Care for an assessment. However no record could be found of Dottie King recently attending the emergency department.
- 3.2.5 On 27.09.2002 Dottie King told the health visitor that she was no longer in a relationship with James. On 24.12.2003 Dottie King attended the emergency department of the hospital and alleged she had been assaulted by her partner and that he had hit her on the face, arm and buttock. She was examined and had a bruise to her right buttock. This is believed to relate to event 7 in Table 1. Later that day she returned to the emergency department saying she had been hit on the left side of the face with a weapon. While there was some tenderness there was no sign of an injury. It is not clear whether her attendance related to the same or another assault committed that day. While there is no record Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust staff completed a domestic abuse risk assessment it is acknowledged that current practice in relation to such issues has changed significantly and a DASH risk assessment should now be completed.
- 3.2.6 On 05.11.2004 police protection powers were invoked to ensure Child 1's safety after Dottie King left him alone at home while she went to the shops. Dottie King subsequently received a caution for this offence. On 14.10.2005 a neighbour reported concerns for Child 1 after they were heard crying continuously and Dottie King was heard shouting and screaming. An initial assessment disclosed no child protection concerns and it was noted that Dottie King struggled with behaviour management. She was given advice and support.
- 3.2.7 On 26.05.2011 Dottie King was seen by a practice nurse at her GP surgery and "low mood" was noted. When seen by her GP Dottie King denied this and said it was due to "physical complications and overcrowding at home". On 29.06.2011 the Diabetes Centre noted that Dottie King was "depressed and having panic attacks" and persuaded her to have anti-depressants. She later told her GP that she was worried about flying when due to visit Jamaica. She was prescribed anti-depressants to assess the benefit, but some weeks later had still not taken them. There were attempts made by the practice to follow her up and provide continuity of care for her.
- 3.2.8 On 06.10.2011 Dottie King attended her GP surgery with carpet burns along her spine and dressings were required. She also consulted the Out of Hours service, complaining of pain in relation to these injuries. The GP IMR author believes these could have been as a result of force or coercion and notes these injuries were not clarified further and the mechanism for causing them was not.

3.2.9 Comorbidity of health and social care issues increased Dottie King's vulnerability and susceptibility to abuse and this meant she was a person James found easy to prey on.

3.3 Adult Female A

3.3.1 AFA was born in Manchester and has no recorded criminal cautions or convictions. She has three children and told Greater Manchester Police officers during the homicide investigation that James is the father of her two younger children.

3.3.2 In the period before the review starts on 13.11.2012 there is very little information held by agencies in relation to AFA. There are 2 GP records that indicate there may have been periods where AFA was particularly vulnerable. For example, in 2009, she was referred to the specialist midwife as she felt isolated and had a "depressive episode".

3.3.3 On 04.05.2012 Trafford Multi-Agency Referral and Assessment Team visited AFA at home following concerns that had been raised about threats made to James (see event 28). The council officer was accompanied by a member of the Public Protection Investigation Unit (PPIU) from Greater Manchester Police. Although she did not feel her children were at risk she did accept advice regarding the threats. At that time she stated she was no longer in a relationship with James although he did visit her house to see the children.

3.4 James (Perpetrator)

3.4.1 James was born in Jamaica. He entered the UK on 30.12.1998. He was granted permission to enter for six months that expired on 29.06.1999. He is known to have used several aliases. He has worked as a casual chef and had other periods of unemployment. As well as having children to Dottie King and AFA he is also believed to be the father of other children to various ex-partners. One account suggests he may be the father of up to eleven children.

3.4.2 On 26.06.1999 UK Visas and Immigration records show that he married a British Citizen (this was not Dottie King or AFA). On 06.08.1999 he submitted an application to remain in the UK on the basis of his marriage. This was refused on 13.06.2000 as the relationship was no longer subsisting. On 07.11.2002 UK Visas and Immigration records show he married again (this was not Dottie King or AFA) and he submitted a new application to remain in the UK. The application was refused as he had overstayed his permission to remain in the UK.

3.4.3 James only has one criminal conviction for common assault. This relates to an incident in 2002 when he slapped a female across the face during a domestic argument (event 3). UK Visas and Immigration became aware of the conviction when they conducted a PNC check on James on 11.10.2004. They were also made aware that he had been arrested on 10.10.2004 for threats to kill Dottie King with a weapon. This information was recorded on the special conditions screen of the Home Office database. These factors contributed to the risk assessment when UK Visas and Immigration planned encounters with James.

3.4.5 Between 13.10.2004 and 29.05.06 UK Visas and Immigration attempted to pursue removal action against James. On 17.10.2006 directions were set to remove James from the UK. This was not completed due to issues with detaining him and

problems with the airline taking him. The single conviction for common assault does not accurately portray the extent of his involvement with the police and criminal justice agencies. For the purpose of this DHR, the panel believes it is important to understand the background to this man who has had frequent contact with the police in connection with serious allegations of sexual assault, violence and threats including threats around the use of firearms as set out in Table 1.

- 3.4.6 On 08.11.2006 UK Visas and Immigration became aware of James' arrest for rape (event 18) and attempts to remove him were suspended pending the outcome of the prosecution. Plans to remove him re-commenced when he was acquitted of the rape charge and were suspended on 09.08.2007 when UK Visas and Immigration received information from Greater Manchester Police that James was a witness in a trial. On 22.02.2008 Greater Manchester Police passed information to UK Visas And Immigration that James had been harassing a neighbour and requested UK Visas And Immigration update their system.
- 3.4.7 Dottie King submitted a hand written statement in support of James's immigration application on 07.10.2009. C1 and C2 were named in this statement. The letter indicated that James was involved in bringing up the child. Birth certificates were submitted and James named as the parent of Dottie King's children C1 and C2.
- 3.4.8 On 10.05.2010 Greater Manchester Police told UK Visas And Immigration that they intended to interview James for assault on his daughter (event 24). On 21.07.2010 they confirmed to UK Visas and Immigration that no further action would be taken against James. On 21.04.2011 UK Visas And Immigration were informed that James had been arrested by Greater Manchester Police officers after a routine stop and he was then held in a detention centre as a person who had overstayed his leave in the UK. UK Visas and Immigration were also advised that James was cohabiting with AFA and they had two children living at their address.
- 3.4.9 On 20.05.2011 James claimed asylum in the UK. On 27.05.2011 representatives for James submitted typed statements from AFA in support of his immigration application. Copies of birth certificates provided with the statement named AFA and James as the parents of two children. On 23.06.2011 he was released from the detention centre and was requested to report to UK Visas and Immigration on a regular basis. UK Visas and Immigration report that, "*... James had lodged an asylum and human rights immigration application to remain in the United Kingdom on 20 May 2011 that was outstanding on 13 November 2012. A decision on this immigration application was made on 02 February 2014 to refuse asylum and grant humanitarian protection status. On 24 March 2014, James was issued a Biometric Resident Permit confirming he was allowed to remain in the United Kingdom until 02 February 2019*". There is no record of any further contact between UK Visas and Immigration and James. At the time of the homicide UK Visas and Immigration confirm that James was lawfully in the country.
- 3.4.10 Event 27 (19.07.2011) relates to an attempt to shoot James. As well as reporting this to Greater Manchester Police, James also told his GP about it in October 2011. He said it was causing him flashbacks and insomnia following being shot at. An appointment was made for counselling for him on 10.11.2011. Following this, a letter was received by James' GP from mental health services. This recorded that James had "massive life changes", poor sleep, hypervigilance and had post-traumatic stress syndrome. He was given advice about a relaxation workshop and

recommended to contact victim support. He was placed on the cognitive behavioural therapy waiting list. He was not considered to be a high risk to others.

- 3.4.11 On 17.02.2012 James was referred by a psychotherapist at Trafford Primary Care to the Crisis and Home Treatment Team of (Manchester Mental Health And Social Care Trust) suffering from post-traumatic stress and depression. He was described as having a lot of flash backs since he was shot at (see event 27). Although feeling suicidal he had no plans to harm himself and had no history of self-harm or suicidal ideas. He said he did not take drugs and drinks 4 cans of beer a day. A number of unsuccessful attempts were made to contact James by home visits, letter and telephone call and his case was eventually closed.
- 3.4.12 Although this incident fell outside the timeframe for the review the panel felt it was important to check whether any consideration had been made of the risks that James may have posed to others. A team manager has reviewed the information mental health services hold and identified an initial assessment document that was completed on 10.11.2011. James was not identified as posing a risk to others. The assessment identified James posed a risk to himself and also a concern that he was at risk from others.
- 3.4.13 As well as the principal persons in this report James also had relationships with other females. In 20.05.2003 a female, not Dottie King or AFA, reported to Greater Manchester Police that she had endured a history of domestic abuse at the hands of James. This abuse included threats, physical beatings when she was pregnant and a threat to shoot her.
- 3.4.14 During the homicide investigation another former partner of James described a relationship she had with him between 1999 and 2007. She says it was 'not good', that he sometimes assaulted her and that on one occasion he deliberately punctured the tyres on her car. She would not provide specific details of these events and says she only called the police on one occasion.
- 3.4.15 James was known to Manchester City Council Anti-Social Behaviour Action Team (ASBAT) and Mosscafe Housing in relation to complaints made about him engaging in playing loud music, egg throwing, dog fouling in his yard, problems with visitors, 'spliff' ends in the garden and the unsubstantiated stalking of a female complainant. He was also believed to be running a commercial cooking business from address 2. However ASBAT hold no information in relation to domestic abuse relevant to this DHR.
- 3.4.16 Enquiries with Manchester City Council Revenues and Benefits and the No Recourse to Public Funds team disclosed that James only claimed benefits once he had been granted leave to stay in the UK. He had minimal contact with the No Recourse to Public Funds Team. Prior to the granting of leave to stay in the UK James was receiving support from the National Asylum Support Service. There is also information to suggest he was financially exploiting his female partners.

3.5 Relationship between Principal Parties

- 3.5.1 James and Dottie King had been involved in a relationship for more than twelve years and had two children together, C1 and C2. AFA was also involved in a concurrent relationship with James and she had known him for about 10 years.

- 3.5.2 The relationship between James and Dottie King was punctuated by violence and abuse and the experiences of Dottie King at the hands of James fell within the definition of domestic abuse (see Appendix A). She was assaulted by him as early as 2002 (event 2) when he kicked her in the legs and stomach while she was pregnant and while he was engaged in a relationship with another female. Dottie King felt unable to support a prosecution and this is a recurring theme in their relationship.
- 3.5.3 Between 2003 and 2004 their relationship is described as being in crisis. There were also counter claims by James in respect of the behaviour of Dottie King (see events 9 and 10). On 19.10.2004 James took an injunction out against Dottie King (event 13). Despite the presence of this it seems the couple had intimate relations as Dottie King later gave birth to C2.
- 3.5.4 The relationship between AFA and James started around 2006 and AFA says she ended it in 2013 when she discovered James had maintained his relationship with Dottie King. However evidence that emerged during the homicide investigation indicates the relationship between AFA and James continued up to the date of the death of Dottie King. During the course of the homicide investigation AFA disclosed that James had been verbally and physically abusive to her. However she would not provide any detail or speak about these incidents.
- 3.5.5 The Greater Manchester Police IMR author's opinion is that, while there are shortcomings in the way that events were investigated prior to 13.11.2012, there are no fundamental learning opportunities in these events that have not already been identified by Greater Manchester Police. While the DHR panel accepted that learning opportunities had already been identified they asked Greater Manchester Police to identify these to the panel so they could be assured they addressed all of the shortcomings identified prior to 13.11.2012.
- 3.5.6 Greater Manchester Police identified the following improvements;
- i. All front lines officers are in the process of receiving updated training in relation to domestic abuse and risk assessments;
 - ii. All Public Protection Investigation (PPI) staff are to receive training in risk assessment and triage - this package has been created and will be rolled out later this year;
 - iii. There is a mandatory vulnerability training package for all front line supervisors;
 - iv. From 2016 all staff will have to attend a mandatory 2 day vulnerability course that will be refreshed every year.

4. THE FACTS BY AGENCY

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 The agencies that submitted IMRs and reports that contain relevant information are dealt with separately in the following narrative. This identifies the important points relative to the terms of reference. The main analysis of events appears in Section 5.

4.2 Greater Manchester Police

Incident One

- 4.2.1 On 09.11.2012 the mother of AFA contacted the police and said that her daughter, AFA, had told her that she had been assaulted by her ex-partner (James) and that her children were in the house at the time. On this occasion a Force Wide Incident Number (FWIN) was created and appropriately coded as a domestic incident with a child present.
- 4.2.2 Police officers attended AFA's address and spoke to her. She denied that she had been subjected to any abuse or an assault. The children were present and appeared safe and well. James was not at the address. A DASH report was submitted by the officer and risk assessed as medium (escalated because of the previous incident). AFA declined to provide any further information to the officers at the scene.
- 4.2.3 Because the incident had been coded as a domestic incident it was referred to the Public Protection Investigation Unit (PPIU). An officer from that team left a telephone message for AFA although there is nothing on the file to suggest that AFA ever returned this call. A standard letter offering support was generated and sent to AFA. The officer also referred the incident to the Trafford Multi Agency Referral and Assessment Team.
- 4.2.4 A supervisor from the PPIU checked the log on 21.11.2012 and spoke with a member of staff at Trafford Multi-Agency Referral and Assessment Team and shared information with them. They agreed that Greater Manchester Police would refer the incident to an Independent Domestic Abuse Advisor (IDVA) who could offer AFA support in putting a safety plan into effect. The IDVA recalls attempting to make contact with AFA by leaving messages but her calls were not returned. The manager of the Trafford Multi-Agency Referral and Assessment Team located a referral record although it appeared AFA chose not to engage with the IDVA service.
- 4.2.5 The supervisor from the PPIU did consider making a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) referral. He decided not to do this because the two reported incidents and the level of assessed risk did not fit the MARAC referral criteria. Whilst he had the authority to exercise professional judgement and refer anyway he decided it was not appropriate at that time. This was because he considered the IDVA referral a more appropriate course of action.
- 4.2.6 The IMR author states that the supervisor involved now acknowledges that when AFA chose not to engage with the IDVA further attempts to contact her could have been made by PPIU staff. This did not happen and neither was there any further

contact with AFA's mother which the supervisor also recognises would have been appropriate in terms of providing support to her.

Incident Two

- 4.2.7 Although Greater Manchester Police held significant amounts of information about the principal parties in this DHR, the start date for the review period was selected as 13.11.2012. This is because it is the first date on which there is evidence that James was in an abusive relationship with AFA. On that date the mother of AFA visited a police station and reported her daughter was being 'controlled and abused' by James and that AFA's children were witnessing this abuse. She asked the police not to go to AFA's address.
- 4.2.8 The complaint was recorded and allocated a FWIN. The log was forwarded to the Public Protection Unit (PPIU) for assessment. As the log was coded as a 'concern for safety' rather than as a domestic incident a DASH risk assessment was not completed. The IMR author believes the FWIN should have been more appropriately coded as a potential domestic incident. The FWIN report was checked and researched by a PPIU officer and a PPIU log was created. A supervisor in the PPIU recognised potential child protection concerns. He confirmed that James did not live at the address and then telephoned AFA to discuss her concerns.
- 4.2.9 AFA said she did not normally speak to the police and distrusted agencies. She declined to disclose abuse although she was receptive to advice. The officer who spoke to her directed her to a range of support services and arranged for a domestic violence marker to be placed on Greater Manchester Police systems as a way of flagging potential abuse at this address in the future.
- 4.2.10 The supervisor who dealt with AFA decided against informing partner agencies on the basis that he assessed the risk to her and the children as 'standard' and to have disclosed might have been a breach of trust with AFA. James was not contacted and there was no reference made to Dottie King being involved. The IMR author states the response on this occasion was proportionate and in line with Greater Manchester Police policy.

Incident Three

- 4.2.11 On 31.01.2013 Greater Manchester Police officers attended a dispute between Dottie King and her mother. Dottie King had locked her mother out of the house and left with her children. A FWIN was created and coded as a domestic dispute between adults and a 'standard' DASH risk assessment completed. Dottie King's mother could not offer any explanation as to why her daughter had done this and believed she would return later in the day with the key. There was no indication that James was involved and no evidence of any risks to Dottie King's children. The IMR author believes the police response for this one-off incident was proportionate and appropriate.

Incident Four

- 4.2.12 On 20.04.2013 AFA's mother rang Greater Manchester Police to report that her daughter had said James had been verbally and physically abusive towards her.

The incident was recorded, allocated a FWIN and correctly coded as a domestic dispute with a child present. Greater Manchester Police officers went to AFA's home and saw her children who appeared safe and well. James was not there. The officers reported that they were satisfied that AFA was uninjured. She answered questions so that a 'standard' DASH risk assessment could be completed.

- 4.2.13 AFA indicated that James had been verbally and physically abusive to her on previous occasions. She had attempted to end their relationship but James kept returning. She believed he was jealous of her work as a carer and she said he was constantly taking money from her.
- 4.2.14 On 22.04.2013 two officers from the PPIU visited AFA at her home. AFA's mother was also present. AFA said she did not want to make a complaint of abuse by James. The officers provided contact telephone numbers for support agencies and assisted AFA to obtain an application for a non-molestation order via the National Centre for Domestic Violence (NCDV). A domestic violence 'marker' was entered against her address on the Greater Manchester Police IT system and intelligence added outlining the nature of the abuse and requesting positive police action in the event of any future incidents between AFA and James. A referral was made to Trafford Multi-Agency Referral and Assessment Team and to Health partners.
- 4.2.15 Following the visit a request was made to Victim Support to contact AFA. However this did not happen and a message was left by a Victim Support employee saying that consent was required from AFA before a visit could be arranged. Unfortunately the PPIU log was closed for filing without anyone responding to this request. The IMR author believes that positive action was taken by both the first officer who attended the incident and then the PPIU team. However an opportunity to provide additional support to AFA, who was clearly vulnerable, was missed on this occasion.

Incident Five

- 4.2.16 AFA contacted Greater Manchester Police on 16.06.2013 as James would not return a set of keys to her home. A FWIN was created and the incident logged as a domestic incident with a child present. A police officer visited AFA and states there was no allegation of abuse. A DASH risk assessment was completed with the outcome recorded as 'standard', although the document shows all answers were refused by AFA. She told the officer she was seeking a non-molestation order against James.
- 4.2.17 The police officer contacted AFA's housing association to arrange for the locks to be changed and also attempted, unsuccessfully, to speak to James by telephone to request him to return the keys. The incident was automatically referred to the PPIU and arrangements were made for Victim Support to contact AFA.
- 4.2.18 The PPIU log shows that a Victim Support Officer did contact AFA and she chose to have door and window alarms fitted and arrangements were made to send these out to her. A support letter was sent from PPIU before the log was closed. The IMR author believes that the circumstances of this incident appear to indicate that, despite difficulties, AFA was attempting to end her relationship with James. The IMR author believes the police response to the incident was appropriate and proportionate.

Incident Six

- 4.2.19 On 15.02.2014 Dottie King reported to Greater Manchester Police that she was receiving abusive texts and telephone calls from AFA. After first being told that an officer would attend to see her she was then advised to attend an appointment at a police surgery to discuss her complaint with a local neighbourhood officer. She agreed to this and an appointment was made for her to attend a police station two days later. She told the call handler that she was also having 'issues' with her ex-partner James who had visited her address last week and caused her problems around access to the children. She did not expand on what she meant by this.
- 4.2.20 Dottie King failed to attend the appointment and Greater Manchester Police closed the log. The incident was not coded as a 'domestic' which meant that no DASH risk assessment was completed. The IMR author believes the decisions taken were justified under the circumstances and that with limited resources the police cannot follow up incidents where members of the public fail to attend planned appointments without explanation.
- 4.2.21 The IMR author believes that, with hindsight, this incident provided an opportunity to link the three principal persons together in an ongoing relationship. However this fact was not identified as particularly significant at that time. It would be a leap too far to say there was any connection between this incident and the homicide of Dottie King several months later.

Incident Seven

- 4.2.22 On 04.04.2014 AFA contacted Greater Manchester Police from address 2 to report that James was abusing her. A FWIN was created and coded as a domestic incident with children. A police officer attended and spoke to AFA. They found that AFA and James had fallen out. The circumstances were that Dottie King had sent AFA a text stating that she had been seeing James behind AFA's back. James had been to AFA's house earlier that day and en-route back to address 2 in AFA's car she brought up the issue with him of the text message. He tried to defend himself but AFA did not believe him and in protest she had thrown a large jar of sauce out of the car. James was upset and in retaliation took AFA's pencil case and a cooking tin and went into address 2. At this point AFA telephoned the police.
- 4.2.23 A DASH risk assessment was completed which identified James as the complainant and AFA as the potential aggressor. The officer who attended recorded that the cause of the incident was not AFA but James who was blaming Dottie King for all his problems. James did not express any concerns relating to harassment from AFA.
- 4.2.24 The officer spoke to AFA and, while she was angry with James and accused him of being a liar, she said she really had issues with Dottie King. She was given advice not to contact Dottie King and instead, if Dottie King contacted her and she felt it was harassment then she should contact the police rather than confronting James about it.
- 4.2.25 A police officer attended address 1 to advise Dottie King not to contact James or AFA. However she was not in. A DASH risk assessment was completed and in response to the question on the form 'Does the victim feel depressed or have suicidal thoughts?' James stated 'No-but the situation is making him feel stressed'.
- 4.2.26 While the DASH risk assessment was initially upgraded from standard to medium it was then returned to standard by an officer in the PPIU who reviewed the incident.

This was on the basis that all three of the principals lived at separate addresses and this had been a verbal argument. The log also recorded that there had been previous verbal incidents between James and AFA and that he had previously been arrested for domestic assaults although these had all resulted in no further action being taken.

- 4.2.27 The IMR author believes that, while the decision to classify James as the 'aggrieved party' at first may seem odd, when placed in context, the officer's interpretation of the circumstances as they were presented at the time was justifiable. The author also believes there is a clear indication from this incident that James is not only involved in a relationship with both Dottie King and AFA, but that these relationships are becoming strained to the point of break down. Based on an assessment of the circumstances of this incident and the recorded history the decision of the reviewing officer in the PPIU was to send a support letter to James and then close the file. There were no partner agency referrals made.
- 4.2.28 The IMR author who spoke to the reviewing officer says they were unaware of an incident involving AFA and Dottie King which occurred a couple of hours later the same day (see incident eight). The officer says that, had they been aware, their perspective on and response to this incident (seven) may have been different.

Incident Eight

- 4.2.29 About two hours after incident seven the sister of James telephoned Greater Manchester Police and reported that AFA and Dottie King had both coincidentally arrived at James's mothers address. There had been a confrontation in the street and the pair were fighting. Although she had separated them she requested police assistance. James was not present.
- 4.2.30 The police officers who attended separated the women and identified that the incident was linked to incident seven. The FWIN was endorsed however it was coded as 'rowdy behaviour in the street,' and did not contain an additional code that this was also a domestic dispute. Consequently this meant a DASH referral was not made and the incident was not automatically flagged to the PPIU.
- 4.2.31 Had the domestic dispute code been included PPIU officers would have been provided with significant and relevant information about the relationship between Dottie King, James and AFA. The Greater Manchester Police IMR author's view is that it would be;

'speculative to suggest that this in turn might have prompted further action by South Manchester PPIU staff to address what appeared to be an escalating situation, but it appears to be the case, in the view of the IMR author and with the benefit of hindsight, that the police at the very least missed an opportunity to finally "join up the dots" in the relationship triangle involving Dottie King, James and AFA'.

Incident Nine

- 4.2.32 On 04.06.2014 the sister of James reported to Greater Manchester Police that he had written a nasty letter to their mother. The letter made reference to family history and she believed it was James' way of venting his anger. She said he could not read or write therefore someone else must have been involved. The FWIN was

coded as a domestic incident involving adults and was referred to the PPIU. A standard DASH risk assessment was completed.

- 4.2.33 The police officer who attended recorded that James's mother was not fearful of him. He no longer came to her house as he did not like what she had to say to him with regards to how he leads his life and threatens people, especially the mothers of his children. James's mother wanted police advice on what to do with regards to her son. She said he did not care about anyone but himself and behaved like a teenager. He still asked her for money and for her to do as he said. The Greater Manchester Police log does not identify what is meant by 'do as he said'. When she refused he didn't come around to her house anymore.
- 4.2.34 Police officers from the PPIU visited James's mother and gave her advice about options for civil action. He had not committed any criminal offences and AFA and Dottie King were not involved. The IMR author therefore believes this incident was appropriately treated as a 'stand-alone' incident with no referrals to partner agencies. They also believe the incident provides a real insight into the mind-set and behaviour of James around this time.

Incident Ten

- 4.2.35 On 13.08.2014 AFA and her mother visited a police station in the Greater Manchester Police area requesting advice about unwanted text messages from Dottie King. No FWIN was created as a result of this visit and it would have been appropriate for the officer who dealt with the incident to have done so. An intelligence report was submitted which stated that AFA had received a series of 'gloating' text messages from Dottie King. These were to the effect that Dottie King was still seeing James whereas AFA and James' relationship had apparently ended three months ago.
- 4.2.36 The officer advised AFA about blocking incoming calls and messages. The matter was not referred to the PPIU. The IMR author is satisfied that the officer acted in good faith and actually assisted AFA with her immediate problem which was preventing the receipt of any more text messages from Dottie King. Greater Manchester Police had no further records of contact with the principal persons in this report until the homicide of Dottie King.

4.3 UK Visas and Immigration

- 4.3.1 As set out in section three James was known to UK Visas and Immigration since he entered the country and they held information about him prior to the start date of this review. As of 13.11.2012, there was an outstanding asylum and human rights application to remain in the UK lodged by James on 20.05.2011. He had been placed on immigration reporting which meant he was required to attend in person at UK Visas and Immigration offices every two months. There is nothing relevant to the DHR in respect of the visits James made to their offices.
- 4.3.2 On 20.02.2014 UK Visas and Immigration refused James's asylum application and granted him leave to remain in the UK for five years on humanitarian grounds, therefore at the time of the homicide he was lawfully in the country. The decision included a detailed written consideration of his application and refers to information on James and independent reports and what might happen if James returned to his home country.

4.3.3 The written consideration of James's immigration application refers to his criminal record and states that he had one spent conviction and did not receive a custodial sentence. Therefore the UK Visas and Immigration caseworker reviewing the matter felt there was no reason to suppose that he posed a threat to the community/public. The background checks carried out included a check on the Police National Computer (PNC). The UK Visas and Immigration IMR author believes a referral to social services may have been appropriate. However they state that even if that had been considered the caseworker who dealt with the application had assessed James as a low risk based on actual convictions.

4.4 Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

4.4.1 Although Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust has had significant contact with Dottie King prior to the timeframe of this review there is very little significant information relating directly to this DHR. On 17.03.2014 Dottie King took Child 1 to the emergency department of the hospital with breathing difficulties. She was treated and information shared with the children's community and school nurse.

4.4.2 Following this event, the children's community nurse initially made a no access visit on 19.03.2014, and then later that day a further home visit which was conducted in the hallway of address 1. Dottie King seemed nervous saying there were people in the back room and all the doors were shut. This reaction by Dottie King triggered the children's community nurse to liaise with the school nurse to highlight this specific information.

4.4.3 On 10.09.2014 a meeting was held at the school regarding Child 2's poor punctuality. Dottie King was reported to be suffering anxiety and finding it hard to leave the house. She was said to be experiencing palpitations, sweating and not sleeping. Dottie King said she had seen her GP who told her there was no cause for concern. Dottie King agreed to a further assessment, to see her GP again and a CAF was planned.

4.5 Manchester City Council Anti-Social Behaviour Action Team (ASBAT)

4.5.1 Although ASBAT hold information relating to James there is nothing in relation to events during the period under review.

4.6 Mosscares

4.6.1 Mosscares Housing Ltd is a Registered Provider of social housing in Manchester. James became a tenant of theirs from 04.12.2000. The only information relevant to the DHR held by Mosscares for the period under review relates to a complaint made on 15.07.2014 by a neighbour of James that he and another unnamed male had followed her on two occasions. The neighbour said they felt this was because they had made a complaint against a friend of James. The person who made the complaint did not wish to take the matter any further.

4.6.2 James made his original application for housing to Mosscares in 1999. The system used then to record this information has since changed. It is therefore not possible to say whether checks were carried out with UK Visas and Immigration in respect of James' immigration status. These checks are now conducted as a matter of routine.

4.7 Manchester City Council Children and Families (Children's Services)

- 4.7.1 There is only one relevant piece of information. On 23.01.2014 James contacted Children's Services saying C1 and 2 were growing up in a violent household and he was concerned for their welfare. He wanted to remain anonymous as he feared repercussions from Dottie King. He reported they were living in an overcrowded house and Dottie King and the two children were sharing a bedroom. Dottie King and her mother were said to be always fighting and Dottie King had threatened to stab her mother and had got C1 to throw water over her. James said he was concerned about what they were witnessing at home and he wanted a social worker to speak to C1 about family life.
- 4.7.2 Children's Services made enquiries at the respective schools of both children. There were concerns regarding the absence of C2 who did not attend when Dottie King was unwell. There had been concerns in the past from C1's school centred on Dottie King's health needs. However they were now said to have a 100% attendance rate at school and there were no behavioural problems. No imminent safeguarding concerns were identified and no further action was taken about James' complaint.

4.8 Education

- 4.8.1 Education found no information within their records relating to domestic abuse. C1 and C2's schools had no concerns that they may be exposed to domestic abuse as they lived with extended family. The main issues of concern related to lateness and absence for C1 and C2. In September 2013 Dottie King arrived at school over one hour late to collect C1. She presented as extremely weak and unable to move. A parent support advisor described her behaviour as hostile towards staff and parents and this became more evident when she was challenged about lateness. The parent support advisor worked closely with the family and feels that Dottie King would therefore have had the confidence to disclose abuse.

4.9 NHS England Greater Manchester Clinical Commissioning Group

Dottie King

- 4.9.1 Dottie King, and her children, C1 and C2, were registered to a different GP practice from AFA and James. She was seen frequently for diabetes monitoring and associated issues. During the period of the review Dottie King took C1 to the GP for matters unrelated to this DHR. The records from the GP indicate they were not aware that there was any contact with C1's father James. The GP was under the opinion that Dottie King was not in a relationship with James. They described Dottie King as "closed" and said she could be hostile with other health professionals although not towards her GP who believed there was a supportive doctor/patient relationship.

James

- 4.9.2 James registered with his GP practice in 2001. This was not the same practice as either AFA or Dottie King. In June and July 2013, James complained to his GP of pain in his upper back and shoulder following an assault. This may correlate to an incident he reported on 10.06.2013 to Greater Manchester Police when he alleged a male known to him attempted to strike James with a brick. In self-defence James

grabbed hold of the brick and hit the other person in the face. This person then swung a machete at James catching him on the neck causing a minor injury.

- 4.9.3 In September 2013 James complained to his GP about feelings of low mood and insomnia and being unable to settle. James felt that his pending immigration application was causing him stress. His GP noted that James had previously been treated with anti-depressants, sleeping tablets and cognitive behavioural therapy with minimal effect for post-traumatic stress syndrome following an assault in 2011. The GP noted James was hyper aroused, hyper-vigilant and avoided specific areas. He was said to suffer from feelings of helplessness and frustration as a witness in a case and felt unprotected by the police. The notes do not indicate what case this relates to. The immigration matter was felt to be exacerbating his symptoms. The GP said he was always polite and punctual and never rude or aggressive.
- 4.9.4 On 04.02.2014 James was referred to primary care mental health services as he was feeling low, isolated, not sleeping and not wanting to go out of the house. He failed to book an appointment and was discharged. On 10.04.2014, he was re-referred after seeing his GP as he was concerned about threats from the people who shot at him and he said he was having flashbacks. He was seen on seven other occasions during the review period for other non-relevant consultations.

5. ANALYSIS AGAINST THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Each term appears in **bold** 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 knowledge or indicators of domestic abuse did your agency have relating to Dottie King, James and AFA as victims and/or perpetrators of domestic abuse and what risk assessments were done?

- 5.1.1 The review period start date was set as 13.11.2012 as this was the first occasion on which any agency had information relating to James perpetrating abuse on AFA. Information they held prior to that date that was felt to be of significance is summarised in Table 1. In relation to Dottie King there were three occasions when she reported that she had been assaulted by James. These included being kicked when pregnant and hit with a weapon (events 2, 7 & 11). She also complained that James had pointed a gun at her and threatened to shoot her after their relationship ended (event 8).
- 5.1.2 James also perpetrated abuse on other females. This included threatening to shoot the mother and brother of his then girlfriend (event 1); slapping a female across the face (event 3); throwing a punch and a video cassette at an ex-partner (event 6); assaulting his sister by grabbing her throat (event 23) and striking his daughter across the cheek (event 25). He also drove his car into the path of a female and threatened her saying she owed him money (event 17). James was also arrested and charged with the rape of a 16 year old female albeit he was acquitted.
- 5.1.3 James also used abuse and violence towards males. He struck a male friend in the face (event 5); he punched a tenant in the face (event 16); he punched a male person in the head after demanding money (event 22) and threatened to burn down a neighbour's house (event 24).
- 5.1.4 The panel believe the events in Table 1 clearly show James was a man who was prepared to use violence and threats to get his own way. James seems to have tried to portray Dottie King as the guilty party on occasions, for example when he obtained an injunction against her (event 13). The panel are satisfied beyond any doubt that James was the bully and the experiences of Dottie King therefore fell within the Government definition of domestic abuse (Appendix A).
- 5.1.5 His repeated threats to shoot people, possession of a weapon and the fact that he was the victim of an attempt to kill him when a live round was discharged from a firearm indicates the level of criminality he was involved in. This perhaps helps explain, in part, the reluctance of both female and male victims to give evidence against him which is the primary reason why he was not convicted of many of these offences.
- 5.1.6 When the totality of events prior to 13.11.2012 are examined it raises concerns that there seems to have been a failure to understand the threat that James posed and the risks Dottie King and other victims faced during this period. It could be said there was a lack of 'grip' by the criminal justice system on James' abusive and criminal behaviour during this period. Certainly the quality of some of the

investigations is questionable. However the panel accept the Greater Manchester Police IMR author's assessment that policy and procedure in response to domestic abuse has developed considerably since then. As the IMR author stated;

'A typical police response ten years ago, judged against today's policy and procedural expectations, may appear inadequate whereas at the time not only was it in accordance with policy it was also considered reasonable and proportionate'

5.1.7 The panel therefore concur with the author's assessment that, while the incidents provide insight and context, examining those prior to 13.11.2012 on a case by case basis would not assist the overall objective of the review. None of the incidents during this period highlight any fundamental learning opportunities which have not already been identified by Greater Manchester Police.

5.1.8 Post 13.11.2012 there are a number of incidents that clearly demonstrate James continued to act in an abusive manner towards females. These demonstrate how policy has changed in respect of supporting the victims of domestic violence and how the assessment of risk improved. Table 2 below sets out the incidents reported to agencies during the period and shows the levels of risk identified.

Incident Number	Date	Incident Details	Level of Assessed Risk
1	9.11.2012	Mother of AFA reports James assaulted by James	DASH completed & graded as Medium
2	13.11.2012	Mother of AFA reports James is abusing AFA	No DASH but PPIU assess as Standard
3	31.01.2013	Dispute between Dottie King & mother	DASH completed & graded as Standard
4	20.04.2013	Mother of AFA reports James verbally & physically abusive to AFA	DASH completed & graded as Standard
5	16.06.2013	AFA reports James will not return house keys	DASH completed & graded as Standard
6	15.02.2014	Dottie King reports receiving abusive texts from AFA. She fails to attend appointment with Greater Manchester Police	Not risk assessed
7	14.04.2014	AFA reports James abusing her. Officer attending believes victim is James.	DASH completed & graded as Standard
8	14.04.2014	Confrontation in the street between Dottie King and AFA.	Not risk assessed
9	04.06.2014	Sister of James reported him writing 'nasty' letter.	DASH completed & graded as Standard
10	13.08.2014	AFA and mother request advice on unwanted text messages from Dottie King.	Not risk assessed

Table 2: Significant Incidents post 13.11.2012

- 5.1.9 On two occasions AFA's mother reported to the police that her daughter was being abused and assaulted by James. On both these occasions DASH risk assessments were correctly completed in accordance with Greater Manchester Police policy. On 20.04.2013 AFA's mother made a third referral to Greater Manchester Police reporting that her daughter had been verbally and physically abused by James. Again a DASH risk assessment was completed and attempts made, albeit not wholly successful, to provide AFA with some independent support. While the assessment of risk had improved in these cases, there continued to be a lack of trust shown by AFA who was still reluctant to cooperate.
- 5.1.10 Incident seven on 14.04.2014 is unusual in that, while AFA contacted the police to report abuse, it was actually AFA who was eventually recorded as the aggressor. The circumstances of this event have been fully outlined earlier in section 4 (paragraph 4.2.22). However, when placed in context, it is understandable why the officer formed the judgment they did. Again a risk assessment was correctly completed which triggered specialist involvement from PPIU.
- 5.1.11 The events a few hours later that day when AFA and Dottie King confronted each other and started fighting was a further example of how strained relationships had become between two of the women in James' life. While the incident was recorded on Greater Manchester Police FWIN it was not coded as a domestic dispute. Therefore no risk assessment was completed. This is perhaps understandable as, on the face of it, this probably one of many rowdy incidents in a busy policing area and did not fit the accepted profile of a domestic incident.
- 5.1.12 Had the incident been recorded as domestic then it would have been flagged to the PPIU. As the IMR author opines, this would have provided an opportunity to 'join up the dots'. However it would be a leap too far to suggest that, even had Greater Manchester Police been able to see the bigger picture in this complex and volatile relationship, they would have been able to take effective actions to prevent the subsequent death of Dottie King.
- 5.1.13 Certainly during the period of the review Greater Manchester Police had no information relating to incidents specifically involving the victim Dottie King and the perpetrator of her homicide James. Dottie King and AFA were involved in a number of incidents and counter-allegations during the latter part of this period and clearly James was a common denominator. However the police did not hold any information to suggest that James was directly responsible for abusing Dottie King during this time.
- 5.1.14 The police IMR author says that of the eight reported incidents involving AFA on or after 13.11.2012 on each occasion the police responded and there is evidence that attempts were made to support AFA. However the author expresses some concerns as follows;

'(a) whether the police ever holistically assessed the level of individual risk to both Dottie King and AFA from James based on the content of all the known reports received during the period of the review and (b) whether there was ever a holistic assessment of the 'relationship triangle' involving Dottie King, James and AFA and the risks posed to both females by the obvious breakdown in this relationship

arrangement in the period leading to the death of Dottie King. From research conducted into this IMR the evidence suggests that this did not occur.'

- 5.1.15 Much of the information agencies held about James and his behaviour was also known to Greater Manchester Police and pre-dates the review period. For example UK Visas and Immigration say they had a specific indicator that Dottie King had been a victim of domestic abuse. This related to a risk assessment the agency completed for an Immigration visit to James. The risk assessment recorded a domestic dispute between Dottie King and James on 16.10.2006. UK Visas and Immigration say the provenance of this information is not clear. Reference to event 17 in Table 1 shows this relates to an event Greater Manchester Police already knew about so it is probable they provided the information to UK Visas and Immigration.
- 5.1.16 Similarly a second indicator UK Visas and Immigration say they hold relates to a threat by James on 10.10.2004 to kill the mother of his children with a weapon. UK Visas and Immigration records do not state who this threat was specifically aimed at. Again reference to Table 1 shows that on 09.10.2004 (event 10) Dottie King made an allegation that James had attacked her with a weapon. This matter was considered by the CPS and a decision made not to prosecute. This was based on the available evidence and the fact that in their view Dottie King had partially contributed towards this incident because of her 'behaviour' in approaching James on the car park whilst subject of an injunction and the fact that she was apparently unwilling to support a prosecution.
- 5.1.17 The police IMR author believes the decision not to prosecute James on this occasion was taken because the CPS believed he was about to be deported. There is no record in the UK Visas and Immigration IMR that such a discussion took place. However the reference UK Visas And Immigration hold in respect of event 10, and the fact that it was logged the day following the incident, suggests there had been some discussion between UK Visas And Immigration and Greater Manchester Police.
- 5.1.18 While UK Visas and Immigration may have reasonably suspected James as the perpetrator of domestic abuse, most of what they knew came from Greater Manchester Police and formed part of an intelligence picture rather than being information on which they could take action. The only piece of information upon which they could potentially act related to his conviction for assault which was considered spent at the time a decision was made about his immigration status on 02.02.2014. A number of risk assessments were conducted by the agency. However these were completed on the basis of the risks posed to an immigration officer, or those acting on behalf of UK Visas and Immigration when dealing with James, rather than the risks he presented to Dottie King or AFA.
- 5.1.19 Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust also held information about James perpetrating domestic abuse on Dottie King. This information related to event 2 in Table 1 and was given by Dottie King to the specialist diabetes nurse. Again this was information already known to Greater Manchester Police. She again made a disclosure to staff at her ante-natal clinic on 07.05.2002 about an incident in which she says James punched and kicked her. It is not clear whether she was referring to the same or a different event or whether a risk assessment was completed by Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust.

However referrals were made for assessment and support to Children's Social Care and the Vulnerable Baby Service.

- 5.1.20 On 24.12.2003 Dottie King attended hospital saying she had been hit in the face, arm and buttock. She returned later the same day and said she had been hit with a weapon. While there is no record that Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust completed a risk assessment or that the matter was referred it was already known to Greater Manchester Police (event 6 Table 1). As with Greater Manchester Police practice and procedure the Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust author acknowledges that much has changed and that in 2015, if these events were repeated, a DASH risk assessment should be completed and a MARAC referral considered. Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust do not hold any information that is relevant to the review period start date of 13.11.2012.

5.2 What was the level of risk and was there an appropriate risk management plan in place?

- 5.2.1 In relation to incidents prior to 13.11.2012 (Table 1) it is not clear how many of these resulted in a formal assessment of risk being completed by Greater Manchester Police. Many of the incidents involved James using force that was both verbal, physical and/or involved weapons. In one event this included a firearm. As well as Dottie King the victims included other females he had been in relationships with, males and members of his own family. As has already been discussed at paragraph 5.1.6 the Greater Manchester Police IMR author's assessment is that policy and procedure in response to domestic abuse has developed considerably since then. As such, in 2015, DASH risk assessments would now be completed for most of these events.
- 5.2.2 In relation to events after 13.11.2012, which is the period under review, there were no direct threats or abusive incidents by James in relation to Dottie King and therefore no opportunity to develop a plan. There were however incidents involving abusive conduct by James towards AFA during this period and when these were logged by Greater Manchester Police risk assessments were completed on some occasions and these are outlined in Table 2. As AFA was not cooperative and the risks were mostly 'standard' the plan in these cases was to provide advice and guidance. This action was considered appropriate under the circumstances.
- 5.2.3 There were also incidents recorded between Dottie King and AFA. In one of these (15.02.2014) Dottie King claimed to be receiving abusive texts and messages from AFA. As Dottie King failed to attend an appointment with the police this was not risk assessed.
- 5.2.4 In another incident on 04.04.2014, which AFA reported, the attending officer came to a view that it was in fact AFA who was the perpetrator on this occasion and not James. This event did result in a DASH risk assessment being completed. This incident also provided a picture of the tensions that were building between AFA and Dottie King. It also highlighted the confused nature of some of the events and the claim and counter claims that were being made. This must have made it difficult to develop a clear picture of who was at risk from who and then put in place a robust plan.

- 5.2.5 The following extract taken from the DASH assessment completed by a Greater Manchester Police officer on 04.04.2012 illustrates this well;

'The main issue and cause of this domestic is not [AFA] but the ex-partner of [James]. [James] blames [Dottie King] for all the problems. It was difficult to keep him on track in relation to [AFA] as he constantly referred to [Dottie King] as the problem. [James] is in the process of applying for a civil injunction against [Dottie King] through his solicitor. In relation to [AFA], [James] did not express any concerns about harassment from her. We met and spoke with [AFA]. Whilst she was angry with [James] and said he was a liar she also stated she had issues with [Dottie King]. She was advised not to contact [Dottie King]. Harassment was explained to [AFA] in relation to contact from [Dottie King] and she was advised if the contact continued and she felt it amounted to harassment then she should contact the police rather than confronting [Dottie King] about it. We attended [Dottie King's address] out of courtesy to update her on the issues and concerns raised by [AFA] and [to] advise her not to contact [James] or [AFA] however she was not in.'

- 5.2.6 UK Visas and Immigration assessed the level of risk posed by James as high. However these were not DASH risk assessments and were for proposed immigration encounters by UK Visas and Immigration staff with James, as opposed to protecting victims such as Dottie King. Notes held on James's case file state he has a history of violence against women and that immigration detention should be completed by an all-male team as the presence of a female officer may make the situation worse.

5.3 What services did your agency provide for the victim[s] and offender and were they timely, proportionate and 'fit for purpose' in relation to the identified levels of risk?

- 5.3.1 There were a range of incidents prior to 13.11.2012 during which Dottie King, AFA and James accessed the services of Greater Manchester Police. For the reasons stated earlier in this report contemporary practice was very different then and the victims of domestic abuse now receive a much improved service in 2015. This section of the report therefore only considers the service provided after 13.11.2012.
- 5.3.2 During this period Greater Manchester Police provided a range of services to AFA. These are described in some detail in respect of incidents 1,2,4,7 and 10 which appear at paragraphs 4.2.1 post. These included face to face meetings with both front line and specialist staff from the PPIU and referrals onto other agencies that might be able to provide support. Some of these offers seem to have been accepted by AFA although she also declined some. The Greater Manchester Police IMR author believes the police responses were timely and generally proportionate in terms of each incident individually. However it is accepted there were some deficiencies, for example the lack of follow up when Victim Support replied to Greater Manchester Police saying they needed AFA consent (incident 4 on 20.04.2013).
- 5.3.3 During the period under review Dottie King only accessed Greater Manchester Police services on one occasion (event 6) when she claimed to be receiving abusive texts from AFA and had 'issues' with James. Practice in these instances is to refer the victim for an appointment with a police neighbourhood officer. This

happened and Dottie King failed to attend the appointment. No further appointments were scheduled and based on the reported facts this was in accordance with Greater Manchester Police policy.

- 5.3.4 UK Visas and Immigration did not provide any specific service to Dottie King or AFA. They did provide services to James however these were in respect of applications for leave to remain in the UK rather than in respect of domestic abuse. The UK Visas and Immigration IMR author states the immigration caseworker dealing with James acknowledged he had one previous conviction, that it was considered spent and concluded *'there is no reason to suppose that James poses any threat to the community/public'*. Background checks had been completed on James within the previous 90 days prior to the immigration decision being taken.
- 5.3.5 The DHR panel raised concerns with the UK Visas And Immigration member regarding the disparity between how James was assessed as a high risk to UK Visas And Immigration staff and yet a low risk to the public & community. The UK Visas and Immigration member pointed out that his agency have to work within the legal framework. Under the UK Borders Act 2009, a foreign national offender has to have been sentenced to imprisonment for more than 12 months if they are to be considered for automatic deportation. James did not meet this threshold and so was not classed as a high risk offender.
- 5.3.6 The panel discussed the implications of this; it is known that although James only received one conviction, he was a serial perpetrator of violent offences. It was felt that there should be some recognition of the fact that currently legislation does not take the issue of intelligence into account, and only convictions are considered. The UK Visas And Immigration representative also stated that, in his experience, UK Visas And Immigration were often not considered for attending multi agency meetings, such as MARAC. He felt that, along with other agencies, UK Visas and Immigration could make a contribution to such meetings by considering the immigration history of perpetrators.
- 5.3.7 While other agencies provided services to all of the principal parties in this report prior to 13.11.2012, they had no relevant contact with them as victims or the perpetrator of domestic abuse during the period under review.

5.4 What did your agency do to safeguard any children exposed to domestic abuse?

- 5.4.1 AFA's mother had concerns about the safety of her grandchildren and expressed these when she contacted Greater Manchester Police officers on 13.11.2012 (Incident One). On that occasion she asked them not to visit address 1. She told police officers when she reported incident two that the children had witnessed the abuse of their mother. In relation to incident four (20.04.2013) AFA's mother again reported that James had been abusive verbally and physically to her daughter.
- 5.4.2 In relation to the incident on 13.11.2012 the PPIU supervisor who was involved made a conscious decision against a referral to Children's Services because they believed it would be perceived as a breach of trust by AFA. The officer was satisfied that AFA's mother was providing a measure of safeguarding oversight by monitoring her daughter's involvement with James. The officer involved has

acknowledged to the IMR author that, with hindsight, they would probably now re-assess that decision.

- 5.4.3 Police officers who visited AFA at her home address as a result of reported incidents did make a point of checking on the welfare of her children and noted that they appeared safe and well. In addition referrals were made to Health and Trafford Multi-Agency Referral and Assessment Team partners. On 19.11.2012 there was a verbal exchange of information between a Greater Manchester Police officer and a social worker from Trafford Multi-Agency Referral and Assessment Team following this referral. An incident involving AFA on 16.06.2013 when James refused to return some keys (incident 5) also prompted a similar referral to both Trafford Multi-Agency Referral and Assessment Team and Health agency partners although there is no record that this referral led to any further inter-agency discussion.
- 5.4.4 During the period under review other agencies were involved in respect of C1 and C2 mainly in connection with concerns about school attendance. However, with one exception, those contacts did not directly involve domestic abuse. The exception was Children's Services who received information from James who made allegations that C1 and C2 were being brought up in a violent household by Dottie King. Enquiries were made with the schools and no safeguarding concerns were identified.
- 5.4.5 C1 provided a statement to Greater Manchester Police regarding the death of her mother and gave evidence at the trial of James although she was not asked about historic domestic abuse. Professional advice indicated that C2, who is younger, should not be spoken to as a witness in the criminal proceedings.

5.5 What did your agency do to establish the reasons for the offender's abusive behaviour and how did it address them?

- 5.5.1 Prior to the review period starting Greater Manchester Police had considerable contact with James as set out in Table 1. There were many opportunities to establish the reason for his abusive behaviour towards Dottie King and other victims. These opportunities included police officers speaking to him face to face and also when they arrested and interviewed him under caution as a suspect. However, with one exception, none of these resulted in James being prosecuted. Consequently he never underwent any formal assessments such as for example a pre-sentence report undertaken by the Probation Service that would have analysed in depth the reasons for his behaviour.
- 5.5.2 There was less police contact with James after 13.11.2012 and during the period under review. However complaints were made on a number of occasions about his behaviour. These are outlined in detail at paragraph 4.2.1 post and include incidents 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 9. Again there was a reluctance by AFA to make formal complaints against James in respect of incidents 1, 2 and 4 and consequently police officers were denied the opportunity to arrest and interview James for criminal matters.
- 5.5.3 In the other cases (incidents 5, 7 & 9) the evidence that James had committed offences was less clear as the complaints involved, respectively, failing to return keys, an incident in which he and AFA had argued over Dottie King sending text messages and the writing of a 'nasty' letter to James's mother. Despite this fact the

officers who dealt with James were generally aware of his history and tendency towards violence and abuse. PPIU officers were also able to give both AFA and James's mother and sister information about civil remedies and the option of taking an injunction out.

- 5.5.4 While no disclosures of domestic abuse were made to Dottie King's GP, the IMR author notes there was no selective enquiry. The author also states that Dottie King's GP practice has not received any training relating to domestic abuse which would have been able to help them identify possible risk factors and given them the confidence to ask the right questions. While the GP who saw Dottie King felt that she had a supportive relationship with her, in hindsight, she feels there was an opportunity to enquire regarding domestic abuse.
- 5.5.5 AFA disclosed a history of domestic abuse by James after Dottie King was killed and also told her GP that her children were "living in fear". While this history did not come to light until after James was arrested, and Dottie King had not disclosed any indicators of abuse at presentations to her GP, the IMR author believes there is a lesson here about selective versus routine enquiry. The author says that, even if no indicators are present, safe routine enquiry as part of assessment and review processes may maximise the opportunities to identify domestic abuse and signpost a patient to relevant services.

5.6 How effective was inter-agency information sharing and cooperation in response to the victim[s] and offender and was information shared with those agencies who needed it?

- 5.6.1 Greater Manchester Police engaged with both Trafford Multi-Agency Referral and Assessment Team (verbally and following referral) and also made referrals to Health partners following incidents involving AFA and Dottie King. They also involved an IDVA in an attempt to support AFA, although it appears that AFA declined to respond to this offer. Victim Support was also involved on two occasions. The first attempt to involve Victim Support was unsuccessful although the second occasion, when AFA was offered security measures for her home, does appear to have been well received by AFA.
- 5.6.2 From an examination of the UK Visas and Immigration chronology it is also clear they were provided by Greater Manchester Police with a significant amount of information about James and his status although much of this falls before the review period commences. As highlighted earlier in this report a distinction needs to be drawn between what might be regarded as intelligence and that which was actionable information. Only one piece of information held by UK Visas and Immigration could have resulted in them taking action and that was the conviction James held for common assault and, by the time that was considered as part of his application to remain in the UK, it was a spent conviction.
- 5.6.3 In terms of Dottie King as the victim of this homicide, in the period under review there was no information held by agencies to indicate that she was at risk from James. Dottie King did not make any complaints about the behaviour of James and therefore nothing valuable that should have been shared was lost.
- 5.6.4 As the Greater Manchester Police IMR author highlights, what was lacking in the Greater Manchester Police and agency response to incidents, was a structured

multi-agency discussion around the risks associated with the relationship breakdown between Dottie King, AFA and James. The IMR author believes that had this information sharing forum been held the outcome in terms of obtaining a fuller picture and assessing risk might have been much clearer. The DHR panel discussed this issue and came to a view that a multi agency meeting may have been beneficial to assist with an untangling of James' relationships and producing a more holistic safety plan for Dottie King.

- 5.6.5 The panel also considered that presently only systems within the criminal justice system (CJS) agencies (i.e. police, probation) are configured to capture information and trigger a risk assessment on someone like James. However, because the conduct of some perpetrators (like James) may not always be reported to or come to the attention of a CJS agency, opportunities to gather intelligence and assess risk are lost. The panel felt that a model needs to be developed across the partnership, that would include agencies such as children's services, health etc., which captures intelligence from none CJS sources. This model should lead to the identification of perpetrators such as James. The model should then allow for the development of a risk assessment on a potential perpetrator. The panel were reassured that a work stream is already in place within the MCSP to develop such a model.

5.7 How did your agency take account of any racial, cultural, linguistic, faith or other diversity issues, when completing assessments and providing services to the victim and perpetrator?

- 5.7.1 James was born in Jamaica and both Dottie King and AFA were believed to be born in the UK to families from African-Caribbean origin. The DHR panel was assisted with cultural advice by two members of the Chrysalis family centre. The centre helps all family members especially those in young and poorly resourced families and offers support to families and individuals from Black and Ethnic Minority, refugees and asylum seekers and other immigrant communities based in the area.
- 5.7.2 The advice provided to the panel was that it is not unusual for some men to have more than one partner. This practice sometimes continues when the male leaves his country of birth and settles elsewhere, such as happened in this case with James. Both partners may accept the situation and the man will spend time with one partner and then the other. However it is unusual for these different partners to meet. In this particular case Dottie King had gone round to James's property. A confrontation with AFA in front of James and their children could have led to James feeling that he had to retaliate so as not to lose face or appear weak in front of AFA.
- 5.7.3 The experience of one of the members from the Chrysalis centre is that there are sometimes differences of opinion in a relationship which involves a Black British female and a Caribbean male. In the UK, culture has changed and now women have equality which is accepted and enshrined both in legislation and in most relationships between men and women who live within the same household (although there are exceptions and sometimes these differences manifest themselves in behaviour that is regarded in the UK as domestic abuse-appendix 'A').
- 5.7.4 The culture in some homes in the Caribbean is different and here the male is predominantly the head of the house. This culture can also be reflected in some

homes and relationships in the UK involving a Black British female and a Caribbean male. In these circumstances, and in some relationships, if a male and female argue the female may know that the male will escalate his behaviour beyond verbal aggression to the use of physical force. In these circumstances, if the female knows the male is likely to behave in this way, she may decide to back down. However if she is not aware of these possible consequences then it is less likely she will do this.

- 5.7.5 Such behaviour is not acceptable in any household or relationship in the UK irrespective of the race or cultural background men or women come from. However members from the Chrysalis centre have experience of this happening within the communities they support. They try to encourage women to leave abusive relationships. However this can be more difficult in the Black Caribbean community. This is because of norms and beliefs amongst some men and women from Caribbean cultures that there should not be separation even when the behaviour of a man would be unacceptable within the UK.
- 5.7.6 Panel members who work in domestic abuse felt that these comments were relevant. Often there is no information available from the police, as the incidents have not been reported. It was also noted that a great deal depends of the perception of people in a situation; victims in abusive relationships will often believe that they are safe as they put their own safety plan in place as they know better than anyone else what the triggers are.
- 5.7.7 The Greater Manchester Police IMR author believes that James decided to live an 'absent' father lifestyle and engaged in relationships with different female partners often at the same time. This then led to problems within those relationships. James's own mother held a poor view about the way he behaved towards women. She expressed these to police officers when she discussed the 'nasty' letter he wrote (incident 9). On 16.08.2006, Dottie King explained to a member of Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust staff that James was not allowed into her parents' home and therefore Dottie King had little support from James.
- 5.7.8 Those problems manifested themselves in his relationships with Dottie King and AFA. The Greater Manchester Police IMR author says that police officers and staff working in the area where the principals lived were aware of the lifestyle choices made by Dottie King, AFA and James. Consequently he believes they took account of those factors when trying to provide support to the victims.
- 5.7.9 There are also indications of distrust of the police (for example AFA's comment that she would not normally speak to the police when she was given advice about security following the shot being discharged at James). The IMR author believes that police officers who dealt with the principal parties recognized these factors and responded appropriately.
- 5.7.10 Other agencies, such as for example UK Visas and Immigration took clear account of James' race when assessing his application to remain in the UK. This included carrying thorough assessments as to the threat he faced if he returned to his country of birth. The panel did not know what James' literacy and numeracy levels were.

5.8 Did your agency identify any barriers that may have prevented Dottie King from disclosing domestic abuse between 2006 and her death?

- 5.8.1 Dottie King did disclose domestic abuse prior to 13.11.2012 and the events when she was a victim and reported it to the police have been fully explored earlier in section 3 of the report and are detailed in Table 1. The most significant barrier seemed to be that she would not cooperate in giving evidence against James. Why that was the case is unclear.
- 5.8.2 One potential barrier may well have been James himself. He was clearly a bully, capable of issuing and then carrying out threats of violence that included the use of weapons. It may well be that Dottie King was simply too frightened of him to pluck up the courage to testify against him. When Dottie King did complain about his behaviour James obtained an injunction against her in October 2014 and this is likely to have created a barrier to her making further complaints.
- 5.8.3 There may also have been other complexities that caused her not to cooperate with criminal justice agencies. For example she was in poor health, she was the sole carer for C1 and C2 and she also found herself in conflict with her parents. Her erratic behaviour may have meant that she was not always understood or believed. It is not known whether Dottie King had a support network available to her. It is also important to stress that the way in which agencies dealt with domestic abuse has changed significantly. What was acceptable policy 10 years ago would not be acceptable now.
- 5.8.4 As the Greater Manchester Police author has pointed out some of the police investigations were of questionable quality and there was not the same emphasis then on positive police action as there is in 2015. If Dottie King believed that positive action was not taken when she did report abuse, then she was unlikely to put herself at risk of coming forward again. There were undoubtedly missed opportunities to grip James and his abusive behaviour. Despite the presence of some barriers it is difficult to comprehend when reading the events in table 1 how James only ever attracted one conviction and then for the lowest level of assault.

5.9 Were single and multi-agency policies and procedures followed, including where applicable the MARAC and MAPPA protocols.

- 5.9.1 It appears that multi-agency policies were followed in this case. However, as stated earlier, many of those that were in place before 13.11.2012 would no longer be considered fit for purpose in 2015. For this reason an in depth analysis has not been made of events outside the timescale of this DHR.
- 5.9.2 MAPPA was not an issue in this case as James' convictions and pattern of offending did not meet the criteria for him to be considered. Similarly as the risk against Dottie King from James was not assessed as high her case did not qualify for automatic referral to MARAC. There was discretion to refer the case to MARAC and on one occasion (incident 1) consideration was given to this by a supervisor from PPIU.
- 5.9.3 The GP IMR author has identified some issues in respect of domestic abuse policies, training and the awareness amongst GPs of the risk factors relating to domestic abuse. They believe work needs to be undertaken to audit and, if necessary

improve these. The recommendations in the GP single agency action plan reflects these findings*.

*Note: The GP surgery involved is on the list of those practices that are to receive IRIS training although at the date of this report training had not yet been delivered.

- 5.9.4 The panel heard from the UK Visas and Immigration panel member that his agency have a domestic abuse policy in place. This policy allows victims of domestic abuse to put their case and circumstances to an asylum interviewing officer who will consider each individual on a case by case basis. UK Visas and Immigration also hope to comply with requests for gender specific interview officers to support victims through this process. Agencies can also raise issues locally with the North West Office of UK Visas and Immigration and share information in respect of none UK nationals by use of a safeguarding 'in box'. Information can be sent to a single point of contact (SPOC) 'in box'. E mails can be sent to nwaccsafeguarding@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk. The UK Visas and Immigration panel member felt it would be helpful to promote this facility to partner agencies.

5.10 How effective was your agency's supervision and management of practitioners involved with the response to needs of the victim and offender and did managers have effective oversight and control of the case?

- 5.10.1 In general the supervision and management of practitioners was effective during the period under review. The Greater Manchester Police IMR author has identified that supervisory attendance and decision making is evident on the FWIN and PPIU logs. When cases were identified as being of a domestic nature, which the majority were after 13.11.2012, they were flagged to the PPIU. This meant they received the specialist advice of trained staff from the PPIU. There were some shortcomings in relation to PPIU reports being closed prior to all actions being completed and these issues have attracted actions in the single agency action plan for Greater Manchester Police.

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 the victim and perpetrator or to work with other agencies?

- 5.11.1 Although some agencies have commented upon the demands placed upon them by an increase in safeguarding issues in recent years there is no evidence that capacity or resource issues affected the ability of partners in Manchester to provide services to the victim and perpetrator in this case. Agencies have commented positively upon the strong working relationship and cooperation that exists within their area. This spirit of cooperation and a willingness to learn lessons when necessary has been very clear through the way in which panel members have acquitted themselves during this review.

5.12 Are there any lessons from previous DHRs that your agency has been involved in that have relevance to the lessons learned in this case? If so, how did the learning from previous case reviews impact on the provision of services to Dottie King and James?

- 5.12.1 The Greater Manchester Police IMR author has commented upon the similarities between this case and that of another person in 2013 in the Greater Manchester area. Both cases concern issues of the police failing to holistically assess/risk assess a large number of reported abusive incidents over a prolonged period of time. In the earlier case the IMR author made several recommendations which were adopted by the DHR Overview Author.
- 5.12.2 The Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust author has identified that lessons from previous DHR's highlight the importance of single and multi-agency training and regular updates with staff. They say that Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust will continue to build on good practice already in place and continuously learn from and re-evaluate practice, policy, training and procedures to ensure that the needs of victims and children who are suffering as a result of domestic abuse are prioritised.
- 5.12.3 The panel felt that it was also important to reiterate the lessons learned in previous DHRs about the need to ensure that training for GPs includes the need to make both routine and selective enquiry with patients in relation to the presence of domestic abuse and are aware of the guidance published by the RCPG, IRIS and CAADA on responding to domestic violence.*

* Home Office 2013: Domestic Homicide Reviews Common Themes Identified as Lessons to be Learned-P4 Awareness and Training for Healthcare Professionals.

6. LESSONS IDENTIFIED

6.1 The IMR agencies lessons are not repeated here because they appear as actions in the Action Plan at Appendix 'B'.

6.2 The DHR Lessons identified are listed below. Each lesson is preceded by a narrative.

1. Narrative:

Since his arrival in the UK and prior to the period of this review James was involved in at least 29 incidents that were documented by Greater Manchester Police and other agencies. These incidents included domestic abuse towards Dottie King and other females and incidents involving serious violence both against others and towards James. During the period of the review James was directly or indirectly involved in 10 incidents some of which involved domestic abuse towards AFA. During the review period none of these incidents resulted in James, AFA or Dottie King being the subject of multi-agency consideration. Only one incident resulted in James being convicted of a crime.

Lesson:

There were a number of incidents of both domestic abuse against AFA and Dottie King and assaults against other victims that amounted to crimes for which James could have been prosecuted. These opportunities were lost because AFA, Dottie King and other victims felt unable to cooperate in giving statements or evidence against him. The quantum of these incidents and the lack of grip by the criminal justice system on James may have led to a perception that he was untouchable.

2. Narrative:

One of the reasons why the bigger picture was not produced is that no single incident of domestic abuse was assessed with a risk higher than 'standard'. At the time of some of the incidents DASH (Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Harassment and Honour based violence) was not in place. Consequently, on their own, no single incident triggered an automatic referral to a MARAC. Had a MARAC been triggered then agencies would have been required to research what was known about James, AFA and Dottie King and this would have helped inform a bigger picture about James and the threats he posed to victims.

Lesson:

There is no multi-agency forum for cases that do not reach the level for automatic consideration at a MARAC or MAPPA. There is also no central information system within the Greater Manchester area that could collate information from agencies and automatically generate an exception list of people/properties that have been subjected to multiple incidents of domestic that have been reported to different agencies none of which, on their own, would have led to a MARAC being held. Had a risk assessment of the perpetrators behaviour been conducted this would have linked the three adults and given a clearer picture of his behaviour and the risk he posed in general rather than relying on the DASH completed only from the victim perspective. This may not, however, have had any impact on encouraging the victims to support a prosecution.

3. Narrative

A cultural issue that emerged following advice from an independent panel member, and is their opinion, is that Dottie King may not have understood the consequences of her actions when she confronted AFA and taunted her with text messages. This may have increased the risk to her as James possibly felt he had to retaliate so as not to 'lose face' or appear weak in front of AFA.

Lesson:

A community leader who works in the area where James and Dottie King lived has advised there are significant differences between the behaviour of British Born West Indians and those that are indigenous to Jamaica. These cultural differences, particularly among minority communities, may mean that the risk of and trigger points for domestic abuse are different from those in the indigenous population. While no blame can be attached to a victim, if they do not understand these cultural differences their actions may unknowingly increase the risk they face from domestic abuse. Similarly those who provide support to victims may also not fully understand the way cultural differences increase risk and therefore they may not be able to identify risk and be able to put protective measures in place. Awareness of this needs to be developed within domestic abuse training and services and within the IRIS programme.

4. Narrative

When Dottie King did make a report of domestic abuse by James on her (events 6, 7 and 8) he then visited a solicitor's office and obtained an injunction against her. James also made a report to children's services that they were living in overcrowded conditions and in a violent household.

Lesson:

While the panel cannot be certain, these may be examples of James trying to manipulate agencies as a form of exercising control over Dottie King. If this was correct it could have put Dottie King off making any further reports of domestic abuse and impacted upon her confidence in agencies.

7. CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 James entered the UK as a visitor in 1998, after 6 months and at the point at which he should have left the country he married a UK national. He used this marriage to support an application to remain here which failed. Shortly afterwards he reportedly separated from his wife. It is not known whether this marriage was genuine or arranged for the purpose of securing citizenship in the UK. It was the first of a number of relationships James had with women.
- 7.2 James remained in the UK settling in the Manchester area where he had family. He was known to have lived with at least three other female partners between his entry to the UK and the point at which he met Dottie King in 2002. These women gave birth to a number of children for whom James is the father. It has not been possible to identify all of these children or their ages.
- 7.3 Although Dottie King is the victim of this DHR review there is evidence that James perpetrated domestic abuse on other women both before he met Dottie King and also during the time he was her partner. AFA disclosed to her GP after Dottie King's death that she had been the subject of significant abuse and that her children lived in fear. Table 1 sets out all the occasions on which agencies have information to suspect that James abused women. The earliest record is from October 2001 when James threatened to shoot the mother and brother of his then girlfriend.
- 7.4 In the period before 13.11.2012 there are eleven known occasions on which James has used or threatened violence towards women who were partners, former partners or relatives. The force ranged from threats to shoot them, driving a car into the path of their vehicle, slapping them and using weapons to assault them. The most serious by far was an allegation of rape involving a girl of 16 years for which he was acquitted. There were also at least four other occasions on which he assaulted or threatened males.
- 7.5 Four of the eleven cases in respect of women relate to the victim Dottie King. These occurred on 21.03.2002 when she was kicked in the legs and stomach; 24.12.2003 when she says James assaulted her with a weapon; 26.12.2003 when she says he pointed a gun at her and threatened to shoot her and 9.10.2004 when Dottie King claims he again attacked her with a weapon.
- 7.6 There may be a number of reasons why there is only one criminal conviction recorded against James and then for the lowest category of common assault. These include, amongst others, fear of James, cultural attitudes towards the police and criminal justice agencies and a consistent pattern of victims failing to cooperate with them. Again there may be a number of reasons why that was the case. That may include the poor quality of some investigations, a lack of confidence in the agencies and the fact that policies, procedures and evidential thresholds in respect of domestic abuse were then very different.
- 7.7 Much has now changed and it is much more likely that, if these circumstances were replicated in 2015, a concerted effort would have been made to bring James within the net of the criminal justice system as a bully and serial abuser of both men and women. What is clear is that prior to 13.11.2012 Dottie King and a number of other

women experienced domestic abuse at the hands of James that fell within the Government definition (Appendix A).

- 7.8 During the period prior to 13.11.2012 UK Visas and Immigration also had significant engagement with James and his legal representatives as he sought to secure the right to remain in the UK. James and his representatives presented a number of pieces of evidence to UK Visas and Immigration in support of his application that included statements of support from Dottie King. His application failed in 2004 and there were then a number of attempts to remove James from the UK which were not successful. James eventually lodged an asylum application in 2011 and in February 2014 was granted leave to remain in the UK for five years.
- 7.9 A detailed analysis of immigration law, and the policies and processes of UK Visas and Immigration is beyond the scope of this DHR. However the panel has considered whether there were any missed opportunities to remove James from the UK and thereby avoid the homicide of Dottie King. The panel is satisfied UK Visas and Immigration attempted to pursue removal action against James between 2004 and 2006 and to try and remove him from the UK. The fact these were not successful were due to reasons such as issues with detaining him and problems with the airline taking him rather than a failure by UK Visas and Immigration to recognise the need to remove James from the UK.
- 7.10 The panel are also satisfied that when the decision to grant James leave to remain in the UK was made in February 2014 there was detailed written consideration of his application and all the background information about him and his home country. He had only one conviction for common assault that by then was spent. The UK Visas and Immigration caseworker therefore assessed his risk as low based on this fact. That appears to the panel to have been a reasonable and proportionate decision.
- 7.11 From 13.11.2012 to the date of the homicide there were a number of reports received from AFA and her mother relating to James having perpetrated domestic abuse upon her. In contrast to the way earlier instances of domestic abuse were handled the response by Greater Manchester Police to these events was very different. They were properly recorded as domestic abuse and thereby flagged for specialist support by PPIU officers. They were risk assessed using the DASH model and the panel are satisfied the levels of risk these reports attracted were appropriate.
- 7.12 Unfortunately, like Dottie King earlier, AFA did not wish to cooperate and therefore opportunities were not presented to arrest and interview James as a perpetrator of domestic abuse. During the period under review Dottie King did not make any allegations against AFA. However what does appear to emerge during this period is that James was engaged in relationships with both women at the same time.
- 7.13 For reasons the panel does not know, Dottie King appears to have taunted AFA by sending her text messages 'gloating' about her continued relationship with James. This then led to the confrontation between AFA and James on 04.04.2014 (incident seven). This was the first real opportunity to 'join the dots' about the deteriorating relationship between James, AFA and Dottie King.
- 7.14 The second opportunity was a few hours later (incident eight) when AFA and Dottie King had to be separated in the street as they were fighting and the police were

called. This matter was not coded as a domestic incident and therefore did not attract the specialist attention of the PPIU. This meant it was not connected to incident seven.

- 7.15 The final opportunity to solve the puzzle was incident ten when AFA and her mother sought advice at a Greater Manchester Police station regarding 'gloating' text messages from Dottie King. Again while the advice that was given was correct and their attendance was recorded the matter was not considered to be a domestic incident. Consequently it did not attract PPIU attention and therefore no connection was made to incidents seven and eight.
- 7.16 While other agencies had some contact with Dottie King and her children Greater Manchester Police undoubtedly held the most information and had the most contact with the principal parties during this period. Therefore they had the most opportunity to influence the outcome. The panel has carefully considered whether Greater Manchester Police could have done anything differently.
- 7.17 The panel have come to the conclusion that, in almost all respects from 13.11.2012 to the date of the homicide, Greater Manchester Police dealt professionally and appropriately with the incidents they were presented with. There were no opportunities to identify Dottie King as a victim of domestic abuse during this period. While AFA made reports either directly or via her mother she was unwilling to cooperate in pursuing these. Although there was a missed opportunity to refer her to victim support.
- 7.18 What does appear to have been missed by Greater Manchester Police was the opportunity to link the triangle of deteriorating relationships between James, Dottie King and AFA together. One of the reasons may have been that two of the relevant incidents (eight and ten) were not recorded as domestic in nature which would have triggered referrals to PPIU. While in hindsight that is unfortunate, it seems the decision as to whether to code them as domestic or not was marginal anyway. The officers involved appeared to have acted correctly when recording them and simply did not recognise the significance of the domestic element.

8. PREDICTABILITY/PREVENTABILITY

- 8.1 There is no doubt that James was a violent person who had a long and largely hidden history of assaulting female partners. He was also violent in other situations. As stated, his convictions do not reflect the degree and longevity of his behaviour.
- 8.2 Even if the correct linkages in the domestic triangle between James, Dottie King and AFA had been made, it is not clear what immediate actions could have been taken to deal with any risks. Those in respect of James' behaviour towards AFA had been correctly identified as 'standard' and specialist support and advice given and they did not attract escalation to a MARAC. In the period after 13.11.2012 there were no reported incidents of domestic abuse from James towards Dottie King and therefore apparently no risk.
- 8.3 On the face of it, the immediate risks appear to have related to the behaviour of AFA and Dottie King towards each other. They had confronted and fought once in the street and Dottie King appeared to be continuing to taunt AFA by text. If a plan had been developed to deal with these risks they would probably have involved fairly low level remedies such as, for example, mediation, or some sort of preventative order. The panel believe it was impossible to predict that these events would lead to another confrontation in the street between Dottie King and AFA. This time one which would be the immediate catalyst for James to arm himself with a weapon and kill Dottie King.
- 8.4 The use of a hockey stick as a weapon when James killed Dottie King was consistent with his behaviour on previous occasions when he escalated the level of violence or retaliation by his use of other items as weapons such as iron bars and a motor vehicle. However the panel believe there was no information in the possession of Greater Manchester Police or any other agency that would reasonably have allowed them to predict those events and nothing that could have been done to prevent the homicide of Dottie King.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 The Agencies recommendations appear below

- a. There is a need to ensure that GP practices are aware of risk factors relating to domestic violence and abuse and to know what to do if a concern arises. This has been a previous recommendation and an IRIS training plan is in place, therefore the recommendations will reflect this.
- b. There is a need for all GP practices to establish a domestic violence and abuse policy and procedure. This has been a previous recommendation and needs to be audited to assess compliance. This needs to include a system for recording health indicators for domestic abuse in line with the Guidance for responding to domestic abuse published by RCGP, IRIS, CAADA (2012)
- c. There is a need to ensure that the management and supervision processes of safeguarding and DVA issues within GP practices are effective.
- d. There is a need to raise awareness of domestic violence and abuse and help and support services available, within GP practices to their patients.
- e. Provide guidance to Public Protection Investigation Unit (PPIU) Detective Sergeants and PPIU safeguarding practitioners involved in researching and risk assessing domestic abuse referrals, of the need to apply holistic research and assessment principles into the background and circumstances of individuals involved in domestic abuse incidents in order to identify relevant issues. For example, issues such as repeat victimisation, serial offending behaviour, patterns of under reporting or lack of support for prosecutions are often revealed by this process. Identifying these and other historic issues can assist in informing enhanced risk assessments and the formulation of appropriate safety plans.
- f. Consider the introduction of training for all immigration casework staff in MAPPA (Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements) & MARAC (Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference) processes/procedures.

9.2 The DHR panel recommendations appear below:

- a. Manchester Community Safety Partnership (MSCP) request partner agencies review their domestic violence policies and programmes, and identify if they include reference to cultural differences. Agencies should consider including such reference where none exists and to ensuring existing references are updated to reflect the learning from this review. Agencies to report to MSCP the outcomes of their reviews;
- b. That MSCP ensures a member from domestic violence services works with agencies to review changes to their processes put in place since 2012. This review should ensure that processes are now in place to capture and evaluate

intelligence and information, identify risk and ensure the early identification of a perpetrator such as James.

- c. To notify the Delivering Differently Senior Project Team of the learning from this case. Particularly that there is currently no information system to identify people/properties that have been subjected to multiple incidents of domestic that have been reported to different agencies none of which, on their own, would have led to a MARAC being held. The project team to be asked to consider the problem and a potential solution as part of the new model of delivery they are developing.
- d. Contact the civil justice group in the Manchester area and request that they are made aware of the learning from this case.
- e. The Home Office are requested to consider the issue that the Borders Act 2009 only allows automatic consideration of deportation of a foreign national when they have been sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 12 months or more. The panel believe that some weight should be attached to cases such as this in which there was substantial intelligence that a perpetrator has been involved in multiple acts. While these did not result in imprisonment, nonetheless they presented a risk to other persons resident in the UK.
- f. MSCP takes steps to promote to all agencies the availability and capability of the UK Visas and Immigration Safeguarding 'in box' as a means of sharing information about any risks of domestic abuse involving none UK nationals either as victims or perpetrators.

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.

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

Appendix B - Domestic Abuse Services in Manchester

Name	Description	Telephone No.	Website / Email
Afruca	Prevention and Early intervention into promoting a life free from cruelty for African children at risk of Female Genital Mutilation	0161 205 9274	Info @afruca.org
Big Manchester	<p>Provide holistic packages of support for families with children aged 5-10yrs living in North Manchester who have experienced domestic abuse, poor mental health or substance misuse</p> <p>-Children's worker provides 1-1 therapeutic support</p> <p>-Group sessions with children, parents and families</p> <p>-Signposting and Advocacy support</p>	<p>0161 795 0795</p> <p>Woodville Resource Centre</p> <p>Shirley Road</p> <p>Cheetham Hill</p> <p>Manchester M8 ONE</p>	BigManchester@barnardos.org.UK
Broken Rainbow	<p>Offering advice, support and referral services to LGBT people experiencing homophobic, transphobic, biphobic and same sex domestic violence and abuse</p> <p>The National Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans* (LGBT) Domestic Violence Helpline provides confidential support to all members of the LGBT communities, their family, friends, and agencies supporting them. The helpline is run by trained LGBT people and provides a space to talk through what is going on, and explore options</p>	0300 999 5428	www.broken-rainbow.org.UK
End the Fear	End the Fear - Greater Manchester Against Domestic Abuse is website for anybody who is experiencing domestic abuse or sexual violence, where they can find help, support and advice. The website also provides support to people who know someone who may be experience domestic abuse.		www.endthefear.co.UK .

Name	Description	Telephone No.	Website / Email
	<p>This Greater Manchester resource has lots of practical advice on subjects such as forced marriage, help for children, immigration issues, No Recourse to Public Funds, housing options, legal help, money and keeping safe. The website provides a variety of up to date information to support practitioners and has a directory of regional and national services.</p>		
Family Directory Service	<p>The FSD has information on national and local organisations, services and activities for families, children and young people and for the practitioners supporting them.</p>		manchester.fsd.org.UK
FGM (Female Genital Mutilation)- FORWARD	<p>Forward is a charity assisting those affected by FGM and providing professionals with advice.</p>	020 8960 4000	www.forwardUK.org.UK
Forced Marriage Unit	<p>The FMU provides advice and support for those affected by forced marriage, runs training and consultation and can repatriate individuals in some circumstances.</p>	020 7008 0151	fmu@fco.gov.UK
Manchester Women's Domestic Abuse Helpline (Independent Choices)	<p>The Manchester Women's Domestic Abuse Helpline offers advice, Advocacy, counselling and support to women who are experiencing or have experienced domestic abuse. This includes practical information on legal remedies, housing options, and safety planning. The Helpline acts as a referral point to other specialist agencies, and can help access refuge provision for women across the UK.</p> <p>The Helpline offers telephone consultancy to a range of agencies on domestic abuse issues, and signposts them to services that are available within their area.</p> <p>Opening Hours: Monday – Friday 10am – 4 pm excluding bank holidays and 10am – 7pm on a Tuesday</p>	0161 636 7525	www.wdchoices.org.UK

Name	Description	Telephone No.	Website / Email
	<p>They also offer a Community Helpline Language Service for Urdu & Punjab speakers.</p> <p>Opening Hours: Monday and Tuesday 10am – 1pm, Wednesday 1pm – 4pm</p>		
The Heart programme	<p>Offers help and advice to young people on having healthy relationships with boy or girl friends, gang pressures.</p> <p>It runs a 24-hour, anonymous and confidential helpline, delivered by Childline.</p> <p>Phone, 1-1 chat or email</p>	Helpline 0800 1111	www.heartprogramme.org
<p>Hideout – Children</p> <p>Hideout – Young people</p>	<p>Website created by Women’s Aid with a range of interactive information and advice for cyp to promote understanding of domestic abuse and positive actions to maintain safety</p> <p>-Hideout Cards titled “It’s not your fault – you’re not alone”, contains brief information about domestic abuse, as well as the Childline number and hideout web address.</p>	Twitter / Facebook	www.thehideout.org.UK
<p>Hosla</p> <p>Support for South Asian women</p> <p>- Children’s Outreach Worker</p> <p>-New Horizons Girls group</p>	<p>Advice and support for South Asian women who have, or are, experiencing abuse.</p> <p>-Provide advocacy, confidential emotional support for cyp who have or are living with domestic abuse</p> <p>-Referrals can be made by yp, family member or agency</p> <p>Weekly girls group offers support and advice on Forced marriage and other domestic abuse related issues. Based in Longsight Wed 4-6pm, girls aged 11 – 18yrs</p>	0161 636 7560	<p>outreach@hosla.org.UK</p> <p>shaz@saheli.org.UK</p>
Independent Domestic Violence	Provide domestic abuse support for high risk survivors who have been referred to MARAC.	0161 234 5393	www.manchester.gov.UK

Name	Description	Telephone No.	Website / Email
Advisors (IDVAs)			
Karma Nirvana	<p>Karma Nirvana is a registered Charity that supports victims and survivors of forced marriage and honour based abuse. The team consists of survivors who have been through these issues. The helpline provide confidential listening support, options and guidance to all professionals, victims and survivors of honour based abuse.</p> <p>The charities aim is to raise public awareness on the issues of Honour Based Abuse and Forced Marriage.</p>	0800 5999247	www.karmanirvana.org.UK
Manchester Women's Aid	Provide advice, support and accommodation to women and children	<p>For info phone: 0161 660 7999</p> <p>Manchester Women's Aid Outreach Service hours are: 09.30 – 16.30</p>	<p>www.manchesterwomensaid.org</p> <p>Referrals can be sent via email to: referrals@manchesterwomensaid.org</p> <p>response by end of next working day</p>
Men's Advice Line	The Men's Advice Line is a confidential helpline for male victims of domestic violence and abuse. It welcomes calls from all men - in heterosexual or same-sex relationships	<p>0808 801 0327</p> <p>Monday-Friday 9am-5pm</p>	www.mensadviceline.org.UK
NESTAC (Support our Sisters)	Dedicated to engaging FGM practising communities to renounce the practice and prevent abuse	07862279289	info@nestac.org
Rape Crisis	Information and support for women and girls who have experienced sexual violence.	0161 273 4500	www.manchesterrapecrisis.co.UK
Relate	<p>Bridging to Change Programme is a self-referral programme for men who have been violent and/or abusive towards their intimate female partners and who wish to address and change their abusive behaviour.</p> <p>An integrated support service, with women workers, is also offered to partners or ex-</p>	<p>Bridging to Change Project, 346 Chester Rd, Manchester M16 9EZ.</p>	

Name	Description	Telephone No.	Website / Email
	<p>partners of men on the programme.</p> <p>The groups, and most of the individual sessions, take place in the Relate office in Trafford, Manchester.</p>	<p>0161 877 8264</p> <p>Please note that the office is only staffed part-time, predominantly on Wednesdays and Thursdays</p>	
Respect.	<p>Information for perpetrators or for those working with perpetrators. They hold a list of perpetrator programmes running in the UK.</p> <p>Respect Phonenumber: Confidential helpline offering advice, information and support to help you stop being violent and abusive to your partner</p>	<p>Freephone 0808 802 4040</p> <p>Monday-Friday 9am-5pm</p>	<p>www.respect.UK.net</p> <p>www.respectphonenumber.org.UK</p> <p>info@respectphonenumber.org.UK</p>
Resolve Children's Service – The Children's Society	<p>Counselling sessions for children and young people aged 4-19 who have experienced, or are currently exposed to, domestic abuse and sexual abuse.</p>	<p>Contact: 0161 633 5991</p> <p>Fax: 0161 628 8455</p> <p>13/21 Brownedge Road</p> <p>Holts Village</p> <p>Oldham</p> <p>OL4 5QQ</p>	<p>www.childrenssociety.org.UK</p>
Runaway Helpline	<p>A national, free, confidential service, for anyone who has run away from home or care, or been forced to leave home. Whether you have run away from home because of an argument, bullying, abuse or you're unhappy. Sometimes you just want to get some space.</p>	<p>Helpline no 0808 800 7070</p> <p>Text: 80234</p>	<p>www.runawayhelpline.org.UK</p> <p>Email: runaway@missingpeople.org.UK</p>
<u>Rights of Women</u>	<p>You can contact their free Legal Advice Line for women by women</p>	<p>020 7251 6577 (telephone) or 020 7490 2562 (textphone).</p> <p>Open Tues, Wed, & Thurs 2–4pm and 7–9pm.</p> <p>Also open Friday, 12–2pm</p>	

Name	Description	Telephone No.	Website / Email
	They also run a free Sexual Violence Legal Advice Line for women by women:	020 7251 8887 (telephone) or 020 7490 2562 (textphone) Open Mondays 11am-1pm and Tuesdays 10am-12pm	
Safety 4 Sisters Northwest	Group working to improve services for women affected by abuse who have no access to public funds or state benefits.		Email: safety4sisters@googlemail.com
Saheli Asian Women's Project	Provides refuge accommodation, and advice, information and support services to Asian women and their children fleeing domestic abuse and/or forced marriages.	0161 945 4187 Monday – Friday, 9.00am-5.00pm	www.saheli.org.UK
St Mary's Sexual Assault Referral Centre	On-going treatment, advice, counselling and follow up specialist and forensically trained doctors and nurses. The service is for both women and men. They aim to provide a one-stop-shop service to survivors of rape. Open 24 hours.	0161 276 6515	www.stmaryscentre.org
Sanctuary scheme	If a survivor is no longer in a relationship with the perpetrator but feels unsafe in their home security measures can be provided for free where funding is available.	Contact IDVA Team 0161 234 5393	www.manchester.gov.UK
Survivors UK	Help men who have experienced any form of sexual violence.	0845 1221201. 7-10pm	www.survivorsUK.org Email: info@survivorsUK.org.UK
Victim Support	Provides free and confidential support including information on police and court processes and information about compensation.	0845 456 8800	www.victimsupport.org.UK