

# THE SAFER ROTHERHAM PARTNERSHIP

## DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW

### OVERVIEW REPORT

#### Victim 'Neil'

V0.1 22.10.2018 post HO QA letter of 04.09.2018

Changes from version submitted to the HO highlighted in yellow

### Died August 2016

Chair and Author    David Hunter  
Date                    5 October 2017

## CONTENTS

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
1. Introduction	3
2. Timescales	4
3. Confidentiality	5
4. Terms of reference	6
5. Methodology	8
6. Involvement of family, friends, work colleagues, neighbours and the wider community	9
7. Contributors to the review	10
8. The review panel members	11
9. Author of the overview report	13
10. Parallel reviews	14
11. Equality and diversity	15
12. Dissemination	16
13. Background information [The facts]	17
14. Chronology	18
15. Overview	24
16. Analysis using the terms of reference	32
17. Conclusions	43
18. Lesson to be learned	45
19. Recommendations	47
Appendix A Action Plan	

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This report of a domestic homicide review examines how agencies responded to and supported Neil a resident of Rotherham prior to his death in August 2016.
- 1.2 Neil had been in an intermittent relationship with Emma since about 2011. In February 2016 Emma formed a relationship with Tariq. From that time on Emma transited between Neil and Tariq, gravitating towards the latter. It appears the tension between the three people could not be sustained and resulted in a plot by Tariq and Emma to kill Neil.
- 1.3 'In addition to agency involvement the review will also examine the past to identify any relevant background or trail of abuse before the homicide, whether support was accessed within the community and whether there were any barriers to accessing support. By taking a holistic approach the review seeks to identify appropriate solutions to make the future safer'.<sup>1</sup>
- 1.4 'The key purpose for undertaking domestic homicide reviews is to enable lessons to be learned from homicides where a person is killed as a result of domestic violence and abuse. In order for these lessons to be learned as widely and thoroughly as possible, professionals need to be able to understand fully what happened in each homicide, and most importantly, what needs to change in order to reduce the risk of such tragedies happening in the future'.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Home Office Guidance Domestic Homicide Reviews December 2016

## 2. TIMESCALES

- 2.1 On the 6 October 2016 the Safer Rotherham Partnership Domestic Homicide Review Consideration Panel determined that the death of Neil met the criteria for a domestic homicide review. The delay in screening the case resulted from difficulties in finding a date because of diary pressure. Therefore the target date for completing the review was 6 April 2017.
- 2.2 Coordinating diaries of panel members was also problematic and the first meeting of the review took place on 24 November 2016.
- 2.3 At the third panel meeting on 3 April 2017 it was apparent additional time was needed to complete the review and permission was granted by the chair of Safer Rotherham Partnership to amend the completion date to 31 July 2017. The Home Office Domestic Violence Unit was then notified.
- 2.4 The reasons for amending the completion date were:

The difficulties in setting a date for the first panel meeting; additional time was needed by agencies to complete their individual management reviews<sup>2</sup>; the criminal trial was not completed until mid-May 2017, sentencing did not take place until mid-June 2017. The police requested that contact with Neil's family was not made until after sentencing. Initially the victim's sister indicated she wanted to
- 2.5 The Independent Police Complaints Commission investigated one aspect<sup>3</sup> of South Yorkshire Police's contacts between Neil and Tariq that may have had some bearing on the domestic homicide review. While early liaison, including information sharing arrangements were established, the Independent Police Complaints Commission investigation operated to a different timescale. The domestic homicide review panel felt it was prudent to understand issues in the Independent Police Complaints Commission before concluding its work.
- 2.6 The domestic homicide review was presented to The Safer Rotherham Partnership on 5 October 2017 and sent to the Home Office in April 2018.

---

<sup>2</sup> An individual management review is a written report detailing what contact each agency had with the subjects of the domestic homicide review. Its content and format are governed by Section 7 of the Home Office Domestic Homicide Review Guidance 2016.

<sup>3</sup> In August 2016 Tariq reported to South Yorkshire Police that Neil had threatened to kill him.

### 3. CONFIDENTIALITY

- 3.1 Until the report is published it is marked: Official Sensitive Government Security Classifications April 2014.
- 3.2 The chair notified the families of the review but did not receive any response to the invitations to contribute. The pseudonyms used in this report in order to protect the identity of the individuals involved were selected by the chair and notified to the families. Equally, the names of any key professionals involved are disguised by the use of an appropriate designation.
- 3.3 The panel was grateful to South Yorkshire Police for the assistance it provided with notifying the families of the review and their substantial attempts at encouraging them to take part.
- 3.4 This table shows the age and ethnicity of the victim and two of the perpetrators at the time of the homicide.

Name	Who	Age	Ethnicity
Neil	Victim	34	White British
Emma	Offender	23	White British
Tariq	Offender	41	British Pakistani
Juvenile 1	Offender	N/A <sup>4</sup>	N/A
Juvenile 2	Offender	N/A	N/A
Juvenile 3	Offender	N/A	N/A

- 3.5 The domestic homicide review explicitly excluded the three juveniles from the scope of the review as they were not involved in the relationship.

---

<sup>4</sup> Legal reasons prevent any identifying features being reported.

#### **4. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

4.1 The panel settled on the following terms of reference. They were shared with Neil's sister who was invited to comment on them.

##### **The purpose of a DHR is to:<sup>5</sup>**

- a) 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;
- b) 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;
- c) Apply these lessons to service responses including changes to inform national and local policies and procedures as appropriate;
- d) Prevent domestic violence and homicide and improve service responses for all domestic violence and abuse victims and their children by developing a co-ordinated multi-agency approach to ensure that domestic abuse is identified and responded to effectively at the earliest opportunity;
- e) Contribute to a better understanding of the nature of domestic violence and abuse; and
- f) Highlight good practice.

##### **Specific Terms**

1. What indicators of domestic abuse did your agency identify, what risk assessments were done, were the risk levels appropriate and how did you manage the risks?
2. What did your agency do to keep the levels of risk under review and what was the response to new risk information?
3. What services did your agency provided for the victim and perpetrators and were they timely, proportionate and 'fit for purpose' in relation to the identified levels of risk?
4. How did your agency ascertain the wishes and feelings of the victim and perpetrators about their victimisation and offending and were their views taken into account when providing services or support?

---

<sup>5</sup> Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance for the Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews [2016] Section 2 Paragraph 7

5. What did your agency do to safeguard any children exposed to domestic abuse?
6. How effective was inter-agency information sharing and cooperation in response to the victim and perpetrators 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 perpetrators?
8. What did your agency do to establish the reasons for the perpetrators' abusive behaviour and how did it address them?
9. Were single and multi-agency policies and procedures, including Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference [MARAC] followed?
10. How effective was your agency's supervision and management of practitioners involved with the response to the needs of the victim and perpetrators 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 perpetrators or to work with other agencies?
12. Do the lessons arising from this review appear in other reviews held by the Safer Rotherham Partnership?
13. These terms can be amended at the discretion of the DHR Panel Chair following consultation with Steve Parry Rotherham Council.

## **5. METHODOLOGY**

- 5.1 South Yorkshire Police notified The Safer Rotherham Partnership of the murder and that it potentially met the criteria for a domestic homicide review. The domestic homicide review screening panel called for reports from agencies on their contacts with Neil, Emma and Tariq. The screening panel, using the agencies' information, determined during a minuted discussion that a domestic homicide review was required.
- 5.2 The screening meeting decided the review period should begin on 1 March 2013 and end in August 2016 when Neil died. The 1 March 2013 was selected because of the forthcoming birth of Emma and Neil's baby.
- 5.3 The review panel determined which agencies were required to submit written information and in what format. Those agencies with substantial contact were asked to produce individual management reviews and the others, short reports. Some agencies interviewed staff involved in the case so as to gain a better understanding of how and why decisions were made.
- 5.4 The written material was distributed to panel members and used to inform their deliberations. During the course of those deliberations additional queries were identified and auxiliary information sought.
- 5.5 Thereafter a draft overview report was produced which was discussed and refined at panel meetings before being agreed. To date the report has not been shared with Neil's family because his sister did not want to see it. The position will be kept under review before publication.

## **6. INVOLVEMENT OF FAMILY, FRIENDS, WORK COLLEAGUES NEIGHBOURS AND WIDER COMMUNITY**

- 6.1 South Yorkshire Police identified Neil's sister as the family's spokesperson. The police family liaison officer hand delivered a letter from the panel chair telling her of the review and inviting her to contribute after the trial. Also delivered at the same time was the Home Office domestic homicide leaflet for families and the Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse<sup>6</sup> leaflet. Additionally the terms of reference for the review were included. Feedback from the family liaison officer indicated Neil's sister had decided not to take part in the review a decision the panel accepted. The family liaison officer advised that Neil had no friends, had been estranged from his wider family for several years and did not work. What is known about Neil has been gleaned from agency reports and information gathered by the police during the criminal investigation into his homicide.
- 6.2 The panel chair also wrote to the offenders' families telling them of the review and inviting them to contribute and the family liaison officer also encouraged them to take part. To-date no contact has been made.
- 6.3 The two adult offenders did not respond to invitations to contribute to the review.

---

<sup>6</sup> [www.aafda.org.uk](http://www.aafda.org.uk) A centre of excellence for reviews into domestic homicides and for specialist peer support

## 7. CONTRIBUTORS TO THE REVIEW.

7.1 This table shows the agencies who provided information to the review.

Agency	IMR <sup>7</sup>	Chronology	Report
The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust	Yes	Yes	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Housing Services and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Anti-Social Behaviour Unit	Yes	Yes	
South Yorkshire Police	Yes	Yes	
General Practitioner	No	No	Short Note
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Adult Care Independent Domestic Violence Advocate	Yes	Yes	
South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company Limited	Yes	Yes	
Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust	Yes	Yes	
Rotherham Action Homeless Service	No	No	Short Report
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Children's Services	No	No	Short Report

7.2 The individual management reviews contained a declaration of independence by their authors and the style and content of the material indicated an open and self-analytical approach together with a willingness to learn. With one exception the authors explained they had no management of the case or direct managerial responsibility for the staff.

7.3 The Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust individual management review author had some managerial responsibility for staff involved with Neil and Emma. However the panel judged that no conflict of interest existed in his, or any other person's, case.

---

<sup>7</sup> Individual Management Review

## 8. THE REVIEW PANEL MEMBERS

8.1 This table shows the review panel members.

<b>Review Panel Members</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Job Title</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Sharon Baldwin	Case and Policy Review Officer	South Yorkshire Police
Helena Bland	Minutes	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Paul Cheeseman	Support to panel chair	Independent
Malcolm Chiddey	Public Health Specialist	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Michaela Cox	Safeguarding Operations Manager	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Tara Havenhand	Team Manager Vulnerable Persons Team and Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Alan Heppenstall	Community Safety and Anti-Social Behaviour	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Samantha Housley	Operations Manager South Yorkshire and Humber	Victim Support Independent
David Hunter	Panel chair and author	Independent
Janet Kay	Minutes	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Kirsty Leahy	Safeguarding Adults and Clinical Quality Lead	NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group

Steve Parry	Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Manager	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Matt Pollard	Service Manager	Rotherham Drugs and Alcohol Services Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust
Samantha Perrins	Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) Lead	Children and Young People's Service Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Amanda Raven	Domestic and Sexual Abuse Coordinator	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Jackie Scantlebury	Safeguarding Adult Board Manager	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Rebecca Slack	Head of Support	Action Homeless Rotherham
Graham Stead	Detective Inspector	South Yorkshire Police
Jean Summerfield	Named Nurse Adult Safeguarding	The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust
Maryke Turvey	Deputy Director	South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company
Dave Wade	Case and Policy Review Officer	South Yorkshire Police
Paul Walsh	Service Manager	Housing and Estate Service Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Robin Williams	Solicitor Lead Social Care, Education	Legal Services Team Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

- 8.2 The chair of The Safer Rotherham Partnership was satisfied that the panel chair was independent. In turn the panel chair believed there was sufficient independence and expertise of the panel to safely and impartially examine the events and prepare an unbiased report.
- 8.3 The panel met five times and matters were freely and robustly considered. Outside of the meetings the chair's queries were answered promptly and in full.

## **9. AUTHOR OF THE OVERVIEW REPORT**

- 9.1 Sections 36 to 39 of the Home Office Multi-agency Statutory Guidance for the Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews December 2016 set out the requirements for review chairs and authors. In this case the chair and author was the same person, a position permitted by the guidance.
- 9.2 The chair completed forty one years in public service [HM Forces and a British Police Force] retiring, from full time work, in 2007. Since then he has undertaken the following types of reviews:  
child serious case reviews, safeguarding adult reviews, multi-agency public protection arrangements [MAPPA] serious case reviews and domestic homicide reviews.
- 9.3 He undertook a domestic homicide review in Rotherham in 2013 but otherwise has never worked in Rotherham or for any agency providing information to the 2016/17 review, including The Safer Rotherham Partnership.

## **10. PARALLEL REVIEWS**

- 10.1 On 5 September 2016 Her Majesty's Coroner for Derby and Derbyshire opened and adjourned an inquest into Neil's death pending the outcome of the criminal trial. The Derbyshire Coroner was involved because Neil's body was found in his jurisdiction.
- 10.2 South Yorkshire Police completed a criminal investigation and prepared a case for the Crown Prosecution Service and court.
- 10.3 The Independent Police Complaints Commission investigated one of Neil's contacts with Tariq in the months before the homicide.
- 10.4 Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust undertook a serious incident investigation which focused on the care provided to Neil.
- 10.5 The review drew on material from the homicide investigation and Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust serious incident investigation.
- 10.6 The chair of the domestic homicide review liaised with the Independent Police Complaints Commission investigator and concluded that their terms of reference did not impact on the domestic homicide review and that it was appropriate to finish the review before the findings of the Independent Police Complaints Commission were known.

## 11. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

11.1 Section 4 of the Equality Act 2010 defines protective characteristics as:

- age
- disability
- gender reassignment
- marriage and civil partnership
- pregnancy and maternity
- race
- religion or belief
- sex
- sexual orientation

11.1.2 Section 6 of the Act defines 'disability' as:

- (1) A person (P) has a disability if—
  - (a) P has a physical or mental impairment, and
  - (b) The impairment has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on P's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities<sup>8</sup>

11.1.3 Neil had some mental health needs but there was nothing to suggest these conditions impaired his ability to carry out normal day-to-day functions. The misuse of illegal drugs and alcohol are statutorily excluded from the definition of disability under the Act.

11.1.4 The panel could not find any record of Neil being employed. He claimed four different benefits including a Personal Independence Allowance and two types of Employment Support Allowance. Together these allowances indicate he could not work because of long term ill-health or disability. Neil had a broken syringe needle in his groin which surgeons felt was too risky to remove. While Neil mentioned this to several professionals it cannot be fairly described as a disability. Nevertheless the Panel thought Neil's journey through life was likely to have been difficult.

11.1.5 It will be seen later in the report that Neil, Emma and Tariq frequently accessed services as evidenced by the large number of contacts. The panel felt this demonstrated they knew how, and who, to ask for support.

11.1.6 The evidence will also show the patience and longevity of agencies support to Neil. Their doors were always open to him.

11.1.7 Tariq's Pakistani heritage did not preclude him from asking for or receiving services. His first language was English and he never needed an interpreter.

11.1.8 There are several references in agency reports that Neil and Emma had capacity.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Addiction/Dependency to alcohol or illegal drugs are excluded from the definition of disability.

## **12. DISSEMINATION**

12.1 The following organisations/people will receive a copy of the report after any amendment following the Home Office's quality assurance process.

The victim's sister<sup>10</sup>

The perpetrators' Offender Managers from Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service

The Safer Rotherham Partnership

Rotherham Metropolitan Brough Council

Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust

The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust

NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group

South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company

South Yorkshire Police

Action Homeless Rotherham

---

<sup>9</sup> Mental Capacity Act 2005

<sup>10</sup> They will be written to in advance of publication telling them the date and place of publication.

### **13. BACKGROUND INFORMATION [THE FACTS]**

- 13.1 At the time of the homicide Neil lived alone in the centre of a small town in the Dearne Valley. He and Emma had been allocated the accommodation by Rotherham Council following reported threats to his life in March 2015.
- 13.2 In 2016 Emma formed an intermittent relationship with Tariq which caused substantial friction between her, Neil and Tariq.
- 13.3 Around midnight on a day in late August 2016 Neil was attacked by five people in a lay-by situated on the edge of a Rotherham suburb. From there his body was taken by car and deposited in the Derbyshire Hills where it was soon found by a dog walker.
- 13.4 A post mortem established Neil died as a result of head injuries.
- 13.5 Emma, Tariq and three juveniles were charged with Neil's murder. On 17 May 2017 Emma and Tariq were found guilty of Neil's murder and the three juveniles were found guilty of manslaughter.
- 13.6 On 16 June 2017, Emma and Tariq were sentenced to life imprisonment. Emma's minimum tariff was nineteen years and Tariq's minimum tariff was twenty two years.
- 13.7 The sentencing judge is reported as saying Tariq was 'the driving force' in the homicide, adding, 'Neil ... did not have much of a life. What little he had revolved around his abuse of class A drugs and his fixation with Emma... nevertheless he was a human being who did not deserve this painful and degrading death'.

## 14. CHRONOLOGY

### 14.1 Background to Neil, Emma and Tariq

#### Neil

Neil was one of five siblings/step siblings who was born, brought up and educated in Yorkshire. The family was close and the children saw their grandparents and cousins very often.

His sister recalls Neil's behaviour in school was poor and does not recall him finishing secondary education. He mixed with young criminals and adopted that lifestyle.

Neil's relationship with his step-father was strained resulting in Neil entering the local authority care system. He was then caught in a cycle of offending, temporary accommodation and periods of imprisonment. This pattern stayed with him during his transition to adulthood.

His family tried very hard to alter his pattern of offending and were particularly concerned about his drug misuse. Despite their support he was unable to alter his lifestyle. He never had permanent employment.

His mother and sister visited him in prison but, stopped when he was convicted of drug offences.

Neil married and for a period became 'drug free' and was reconciled with his family. That period was not sustained; he relapsed and resumed his use of illegal drugs. Following a family tragedy his wife moved away. There was another brief period of remission from drug use and he was reunited with his sister. Neil was unable to continue his remission and reverted to drug use.

In February 2010 he was known to the Independent Domestic Violence Service as a high risk perpetrator of domestic abuse in relation to his ex-wife. She obtained a non-molestation order against him which he breached in 2011. In February 2011 the police referred his ex-wife to the Independent Domestic Violence Service because of his behaviour towards her. In July 2012 Housing made a similar referral.

His relationship with Emma began in about 2011/2012. This will be explored in more detail later in the report.

He seems to have been without friends and inhabited a world where those he knew were also living disordered lifestyles influenced by their use of illegal drugs and misuse of alcohol. Alcohol featured in some of his anti-social behaviour.

It seemed Neil offended to buy drugs. It appeared his drug free periods were limited to his spells in prison. He had significant support from drug services but was unable to break his substance misuse disorder.

His mental and physical health deteriorated because of his persistent use of illegal drugs and alcohol.

The breakdown of his relationship with Emma was particularly distressing as he felt they had a future together. The impact of the relationship ending can be seen throughout the review and very tragically his life was over before he could come to terms with the breakdown.

His sister wants Neil remembering as a loving father who cared for his own and his extended family; a kind person who despite the support of his family was unable to overcome the challenges life threw at him.

### **Emma**

Emma was born, brought up and educated in Yorkshire.

She was subject to child protection planning and considered to be at risk of neglect and sexual abuse. Emma lived with her grandparents and after some years returned to her father and mother.

Emma witnessed domestic abuse in the household and was also a victim of physical abuse. She never had permanent employment.

Emma had four children who were all known to social care services from early in their lives. They were all removed from her care. Records in relation to Emma indicated that she was a victim serious domestic assaults from partners and was known to substance misuse services.

### **Tariq**

Little is known about Tariq's background and it was felt inappropriate to continue with attempts to see his family.

However, it is believed he was brought up and educated in Yorkshire and was one of several siblings.

In 2015 Rotherham children's social care received notification from another local authority that Tariq was a person posing a risk to children. The concerns were; physical abuse, allegations of grooming and emotional abuse. He is not known to have any children in his care, the only children of note with links to him were his niece's children.



**The Relationships**

Neil and Emma began their relationship in 2011/2012. Evidence from agencies shows it was chaotic and dysfunctional. The event schedule illustrates the domestic abuse between them. Both used illegal drugs and misused alcohol.

They took prescribed Methadone.<sup>11</sup> There was evidence/intelligence they were involved in the supply of drugs and threats were made against them. It was a self-reported 'threat' crisis that led to their rehousing in March 2015.

Their relationship was described by several agencies as, 'on-off'.

In early 2016 Emma began seeing Tariq. The chronology shows the tension between Neil, Emma and Tariq and how Emma's affections swung from one to the other. However, the gravitational pull was towards Tariq as evidenced when she changed her name by deed poll to one that reflected his heritage.

In late June 2016 Neil told his Community Rehabilitation Company case manager that Emma tried to stab him in the back of the neck with a syringe while he was sitting in the passenger seat of a car being driven by Tariq. He told a housing officer the same story. Both organisations urged him to report the incident to the police, but he did not.

On 6 August 2016 Tariq reported to South Yorkshire Police that Neil had threatened to have him shot because Tariq had taken his girlfriend. The chronology shows the relationship between the three was complex and unstable with Neil and Tariq vying for Emma's sole affection.

14.2 The following table contains events which help with the context of the domestic homicide review.

<b>Event Table</b>	
<b>Date</b>	<b>Event</b>
2010	Neil known to the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service as a high risk perpetrator of domestic abuse in relation to his ex-wife. There were further referrals to the service regarding the same victim; February 2011 from the police and July 2012 from housing.
April 2011	Emma known to the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy

<sup>11</sup> Methadone is a synthetic opiate manufactured for use as a painkiller and as substitute for heroin in the treatment of heroin addiction. [www.talktofrank.com](http://www.talktofrank.com)

	service involving a different perpetrator. Case heard at Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference in May 2011. Client did not engage; however she was being supported by an organisation who provided accommodation for young mothers.
2012	Emma was pregnant, told the midwife domestic abuse was not present in current relationship. The relationship is thought to refer to Neil.
2013	Neil undertook the Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme after he assaulted his ex-wife.
March 2013	Emma, accompanied by Neil, admitted to antenatal via ambulance. She said ex-partner [not Neil] kicked her in the abdomen last night and the police were aware. Baby born and Rotherham's Children's Services obtained an Interim Care Order.
25.04.2013	Emma's case is heard at a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference. Ex-partner is the offender.
May 2013	Tariq known to Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy service as a perpetrator following a police referral; however incident against victim [not Emma] was assessed as medium risk, therefore victim did not have contact from the service.
08.08.2013	Neil began supervision by South Yorkshire Probation Trust. Suspended sentence order for fifteen months for Driving Whilst Disqualified; six month Drug Rehabilitation Requirement.
10.09.2013	South Yorkshire Probation Trust reduced Neil's risk of causing serious harm to Emma from high to medium.
17.12.2013	Police took Neil to hospital. He had been injecting heroin into his groin and the needle snapped off.
24.03.2014	Emma sentenced to twelve months Supervision [shop theft], six months Drug Rehabilitation Requirement Order and began supervision by South Yorkshire Probation Trust.
21.04.2014	Neil told Housing that Emma will be co-habiting with him.
February 2015	Emma gave birth. Children's Services obtained an Interim Care Order.
25.02.2015	Neil attended hospital accompanied by Emma. Said he had been attacked last night with a blade. Noted to have superficial scratches and lacerations to his face. Attacked believed to be related to drug dispute.
25.02.2015	Neil and Emma were rehoused claiming they were fleeing violence which occurred in February 2015. A month later they moved to

	another Council property to accommodate easy and safe access to a pharmacy for their Methadone prescriptions.
2015 to 2016	Multiple events of anti-social behaviour and domestic abuse dealt with by the Police and Housing during Neil's tenancy.
09.02.2016	Emma told a drug worker that she had left Neil and was moving out of the area. [She went to West Yorkshire.] It is believed Emma had formed a relationship with Tariq.
17.02.2016	Ambulance took Neil to hospital. He had taken overdose of tablets and alcohol. Abusive to staff left before admission.
20.02.2016	Police took Neil to hospital. He taken overdose and alcohol. He had suicidal thoughts and reported relationship problems in that his partner [Emma] left him yesterday.
18.05.2016	Neil reported to his case manager at South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company that Emma had left him.
17.06.2016	Neil and Emma attended drug services together. The worker pointed out to Neil that his bail conditions prohibited him from approaching Emma. West Yorkshire did not pursue a kidnap allegation by Emma because of evidential inconsistencies.
20.06.2016	Neil told Housing he was in Tariq's car when Emma tried to stab him with a syringe. He blamed Tariq for it.
23.06.2016	Neil tells South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company that Emma tried to stab him in a car that Tariq was driving. Not discussed with manager nor reported to the police.
27.06.2016	Neil told the police that Emma told him she is pregnant with his child.
27.06.2016	Neil involved in an incident on a communal balcony at his home. He was crying uncontrollably and wanted to kill himself. The police resolved the immediate crisis and took Neil to hospital. He wanted to leave hospital and was judged to have capacity.
30.06.2016	Neil failed to attend South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company planned appointment. He telephoned and disclosed he has self-harmed through taking medication and cutting his arms.
30.06.2016	Neil saw drugs worker and was 'unkempt'. He disclosed attempted self-harm because his 'on-off' relationship with Emma.
05.07.2016	Neil attended South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company. Prior to leaving he disclosed that he had found out that Emma and Tariq had been squatting in his flat.
08.07.2016	Neil told Housing that Emma had left him and that there would not be any further incidents of nuisance behaviour. During a later

	conversation between Housing and a local resident it was made known to Housing that Emma was still visiting Neil.
06.08.2016	Neil arrested for threats to kill Tariq. Bailed without charge. Incident referred to IPCC following Neil's murder.
14.08.2016	Neil taken to hospital by the Police due to an overdose.
Late August 2016	Neil's body found in Derbyshire

## **15. OVERVIEW**

### **15.1 Introduction**

15.1.1 This section of the report summarises what information was known to the agencies and professionals involved with the victim and perpetrators. The analysis of the contacts appears at section 17.

## 15.2 South Yorkshire Police

15.2.1 The next table is a synopsis of South Yorkshire Police's involvement with the victim and the two adult offenders during the review period. The categories of victim, perpetrator and general were chosen by the panel chair as a fair reason why the person made the call.

<b>Synopsis of Police Contacts with Subjects</b>				
Category of Contact	Neil	Emma	Tariq	Totals
Victim	15	9	17	41
Perpetrator	18	17	10	45
General	9	8	17	34
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>120</b>

15.2.2 Among the one hundred and twenty calls were about twelve that could be classified as verbal domestic abuse. It was not always possible to say whether Neil or Emma was the victim or offender. South Yorkshire Police reported that, '...all risk assessments in relation to incidents involving the three subjects were carried out in line with procedure and were appropriate in the circumstances'. Neil was generally viewed as a perpetrator of domestic abuse and not a victim. On the single occasion he was seen as the victim he was assessed as facing a low risk of serious harm from Emma. The police received a report from a social worker saying that Tariq's ex-partner was complaining of his emotional and financial abuse. The Panel noted this was controlling and coercive behaviour.

15.2.3 Many of the other calls were about property ownership, damage, and other matters the panel felt were the irritations of daily living that most people would solve or tolerate without recourse to the police. For example, in August 2015 the following is recorded, 'Emma had fallen out with a friend who was visiting Neil'. Another in February 2016 says, 'Neil reporting Emma has his medication and other items'.

15.2.4 The panel and South Yorkshire Police recognised that such a large volume of calls to the police could contain indirect clues to the presence of domestic abuse. For example damage to the property and falling out with neighbours brought about by the stresses of an abusive relationship.

15.2.5 The final segment of calls were to report allegations of crime, including kidnapping and assault. They illustrate the disordered lifestyle and general

vulnerability of Neil and Emma and their susceptibility to exploitation by thirds parties because of their drug use. Tariq's calls were more focused on using the police to reinforce the particular argument he was having at the time.

- 15.2.6 Here is a typical call from Tariq which reflects the ready way he would turn to the police for matters more generally dealt with in other ways. 'Tariq contacted the Police to report that he has split up from his wife and she is threatening to go to his mother's address to cause problems'. He was given appropriate advice.
- 15.2.7 One theme running through the contacts is the suspicion that Tariq was sexually involved with juveniles. They were always followed up by services and no evidence was found to substantiate the suspicions.
- 15.2.8 From about February 2016 it was apparent, from reading the chronology, of the increasing tension between Neil, Emma and Tariq. For example, in June 2016 Neil told his Community Rehabilitation Company case manager that Emma had tried to stab him. This is explored in more detail later. He told the same information to Housing.
- 15.2.9 Emma advised Tariq that Neil said he had contracted someone to kill Tariq and that Neil had access to firearms. In the first week of August 2016 Tariq reported this matter to South Yorkshire Police adding that Neil's motive was jealousy after losing Emma. Tariq reported having had issues with Neil over the last 6 months. This contact is the subject of an investigation by the Independent Police Complaints Commission following a self-referral from South Yorkshire Police after the homicide.
- 15.2.10 Within a few weeks of the alleged threat to Tariq, Neil was dead.

### **15.3 Rotherham Council: Housing and Neighbourhood Services Unit**

- 15.3.1 This Unit deals with the allocation of housing, tenancy management and anti-social behaviour.
- 15.3.2 Neil and Emma had five different properties during the review period. In February 2015 Housing staff acted commendably quickly when they immediately relocated Neil and Emma after they reported being attacked in their property the previous evening in what was believed to be a fallout over drugs. Within another month Housing moved them again to facilitate easier and safer access to a pharmacy for the dispensing of their Methadone prescriptions. This was the last move they had together.
- 15.3.3 Thereafter there was substantial contact between Housing and the couple. Housing received twenty one complaints relating to either Neil or incidents at his address.

- 15.3.4 Housing's individual management review records, 'Within the review period Neil was visited by officers...on thirteen occasions. Most of these visits were in relation to complaints about Neil's behaviour and the nuisance he and his visitors were causing other residents. What is not calculable is the number of times Neil was additionally warned about his behaviour on the telephone by Housing staff. However, what is apparent from the chronology is that Neil was warned during the home visits that he was at risk of losing his tenancy because of the breaches he was making to his agreement'.
- 15.3.5 This is contrasted by Housing staff who noted that on occasions Neil and Emma were quiet, polite and obliging when sober and that their home was clean and tidy.
- 15.3.6 The Housing report continues by saying, '... reports from local residents however would often describe Neil and Emma as rowdy and argumentative with each other when drunk, and that this could be at any time of the day or night'.
- 15.3.7 Housing noted that between May 2015 and June 2016 they carried out nine repairs, including broken windows and lock changes. The average number of repairs per annum for the Council is two point five.
- 15.3.8 On 20 June 2016 Neil told Housing he was in Tariq's car when Emma tried to stab him with a syringe.
- 15.3.9 In early August 2016, the local policing team told a Council anti-social behaviour officer that there had been '...thirty seven incidents associated with Neil or his address that had required Police intervention in the previous thirteen months'. See paragraph 16.1.11 for details of the anti-social behaviour calls.
- 15.3.10 There is ample evidence in the report of good information sharing with several agencies.

#### **15.4 Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust**

- 15.4.1 This organisation provides drug and alcohol services in Rotherham. Neil and Emma were well known to staff who also knew they were in a relationship which had temporary periods of separation. Tariq was not known to the service.
- 15.4.2 Neil's record shows '...an extensive drug using history from earlier assessments by the services... he disclosed first Cannabis use at the age of thirteen and that he had begun using both Heroin and Crack cocaine at sixteen'. At the same age '...he began his intravenous drug use and is recorded as stating that he "just went off the rails"'.

- 15.4.3 The report continues, '...Neil has had many years of being in treatment related to his street opiate [heroin] dependency, receiving methadone and Subutex/buprenorphine as substitute opiate therapies and psycho-social interventions...he had suffered from depression and had previously self-harmed by cutting his wrists and slashing his stomach and also through overdose of both prescribed anti-depressants and illicit medication'.
- 15.4.4 Included in Neil's social history were the following points.
- two children to a previous partner but no contact with her or the children
  - had no other recorded next of kin/family of note
  - had never been in employment and advised staff that he had no plans to seek employment
- 15.4.5 Emma was known to drug and alcohol services from July 2011 due to her long term use of street heroin. Up to February 2016 she was in receipt of prescribed methadone. Emma was discharged from services in February 2016.
- 15.4.6 The chronology shows substantial contact between Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust and Neil and Emma. Sometimes they were seen together and on many occasion did not attend appointments. Nevertheless the evidence from the agency's report shows that staff persevered, were non-judgemental and treated them with courtesy and respect.
- 15.4.7 The agency reported there were no concerns or omissions in the care provided to Neil and Emma and nor were any recommendations made. The Panel explored this stance and was satisfied that the statement was accurate and the services provided to Neil and Emma were in line with its policy and practice.

## **15.5 Rotherham Adult Care Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service**

- 15.5.1 This agency's individual management review has the following introductory paragraph.
- 15.5.2 'The Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service works with both men and women who are at high risk victim of domestic abuse. The Independent Domestic Violence Advocates are specially trained who afford unbiased advice and information and work in partnership with multiple agencies with the purpose of increasing safety for individuals experiencing domestic abuse and also their dependents. The Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service's aim is to reduce the risks of further incidents of domestic abuse by carrying out risk assessments and safety planning. They will provide signposting /access to other services, such as health, substance misuse and

also mental health. The Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service also represent a victim's view at Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences'.

15.5.3 Neil, Emma and Tariq were known to the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service as follows.

**Neil**

He was a high risk perpetrator of domestic abuse in relation to his ex-wife since February 2010. There were further referrals into the service regarding the same victim in February 2011 and July 2012.

**Emma**

In April 2011 she was referred as a victim. The offender was neither Neil nor Tariq. The case was heard at MARAC in May 2011 but Emma did not engage; however she was being supported by Fleming Gardens<sup>12</sup>, Choices and Options<sup>13</sup> and Children's Social Care were also involved. In August 2012, a probation officer contacted the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy service informing them that Emma had disclosed domestic abuse and that they would make a referral; however no referral was sent.

In March 2013 Emma was assaulted by a former partner [not Neil] when she was pregnant. The case went to a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference in April 2013.

**Tariq**

Referred to the service by the police in May 2013. The female victim was assessed as medium risk and did not have contact from the service.

After 2013 there was a three year gap before a referral from the police. In March 2016 Tariq reported to West Yorkshire Police that Emma had told him she had been kidnapped by Neil and an unidentified male. She escaped when Neil fell asleep after taking drugs. The South Yorkshire Police individual management review has the following account of the incident. '...They held her against her will and Neil assaulted her. West Yorkshire Police stated that they were of the opinion that Emma had an on/off relationship with both males [this is taken to mean Tariq and not the other kidnapper] and at varying points both males were using the Police as a tool to locate Emma. The account provided by Emma contained major discrepancies. West Yorkshire

---

<sup>12</sup> Supported accommodation

<sup>13</sup> A confidential support service that offers advice to victims experiencing domestic abuse in Rotherham

Police provided Tariq with a tecSOS<sup>14</sup> phone and discussed further safeguarding measures with Tariq and Emma but these measures were declined. Neil was interviewed and denied any involvement or asking others to make the threats. It was reviewed by a supervising officer who felt that there was no chance of a realistic prosecution and the matter was filed'. The case did not meet the threshold for referring to a multi-agency risk assessment conference.

- 15.5.5 The Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service noted that Emma's general lack of engagement made it difficult to complete risk assessments and safety planning. They made five recommendations.

## **15.6 General Practitioner**

- 15.6.1 Neil's general practitioner records did not identify him as a victim or perpetrator of domestic abuse. In general Neil had difficulties with low mood and anxiety which increased from March 2016. A letter from substance misuse services said he was the victim of a kidnapping in early April 2016.

- 15.6.2 In August 2016 Emma told a general practitioner in West Yorkshire that she had moved there to escape domestic abuse. She moved back to Rotherham and registered with a South Yorkshire general practitioner the same month when she presented with anxiety and depression. She was seen with an older partner whose details were not recorded. During that consultation she stated that she had been 'on the sick' for the past couple of months since being kidnapped by her ex-boyfriend. The entry states that he had allegedly been stalking her, the police were involved and that he was on bail for sexual offences. Emma stated that she was still having anxiety problems and nightmares but was having counselling. The notes suggest that this was at Rotherham Women's Counselling Service although not confirmed.

- 15.6.3 The practice has already identified the need to record details of those who attend consultations with patients and have shared the finding with the clinical team. Therefore they did not make a recommendation.

- 15.6.4 Tariq's GP reported his records held nothing of relevance to the terms of reference.

## **15.7 Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust**

- 15.7.1 Neil attended hospital for physical ailments and was also taken, or went, to accident and emergency following episodes of self-harm and assault. He was known to be an intravenous drug user. He accompanied Emma to some of her appointments. Neil did not disclose any domestic abuse and hospital staff had no suspicion or knowledge that he might be a victim. Therefore there was no opportunity to complete a domestic abuse risk assessment.

---

<sup>14</sup> A Global Positioning Satellite telephone linked to police.

- 15.7.2 Emma's attendances at hospital were centred on her two post 2013 pregnancies, albeit she attended for other matters. There was good evidence that staff knew of the historical child protection issues and shared information with other agencies to ensure the safety of the unborn children.
- 15.7.3 Hospital staff knew Emma was using illegal drugs and referred her to relevant specialist services including the substance misuse midwife. Emma's hospital records show many 'did not attend' entries indicating she missed appointments. Staff used a variety of methods to locate her and innovatively made contact with the pharmacy where Emma was obtaining her Methadone in order to ensure that she was safe and well.
- 15.7.4 Staff screened Emma for domestic abuse when she attended her first antenatal appointments. She disclosed domestic abuse from previous partners but said her relationship with Neil was not abusive. There was some suggestion she was worried that if she left Neil he would react badly. When Emma's third child was born the hospital ensured that Neil's visits to Emma and the baby were supervised.
- 15.7.5 Neil and Emma had separate admissions to hospital and on occasions both would absent themselves without telling staff. These absences were always followed up.
- 15.7.6 The individual management review has the following entry about Tariq.
- 'He had little contact with services. His care was confined to a surgical issue and associated investigations and is not deemed to be relevant to this management review'.

## **15.8 South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company<sup>15</sup>**

- 15.8.1 Neil and Emma were known to this service. Tariq was not known.
- 15.8.2 Neil had two periods of statutory supervision. The first was for five months from August 2013 to the January 2014. The second was for three months from April 2016 to his death in August 2016.
- 15.8.3 Emma was under statutory supervision for one period; March 2014 to March 2015. During that period the agency supervising her changed from South Yorkshire Probation Trust to South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company following a national reorganisation of probation services.

---

<sup>15</sup> The Community Rehabilitation Company's individual management review included information from South Yorkshire Probation Trust prior to its transformation into the National Probation Service in June 2014.

- 15.8.4 Neil's involvement with South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company came from his convictions for shop theft and driving offences. He was known to use illegal drugs and to be in a relationship with Emma, albeit in June 2016 he told his case manager that the association had ended. In June 2016 he was assessed using the Offender Assessment System<sup>16</sup> as presenting a medium risk of causing serious harm to Emma and a medium risk of causing serious harm to children.
- 15.8.5 The individual management review noted, '...given the time scale since the last recorded offence of violence (five years since 2011), domestic abuse was not considered to be a major factor in his supervision'.
- 15.8.6 The significant event from Neil's involvement with the Community Rehabilitation Company came on 23 June 2016 when he told his case supervisor that Emma had tried to stab him in the neck with a syringe while he was a front seat passenger in a car being driven by Tariq. The case manager discussed the report with a colleague but did not report it to the police. Comment will be made on that later in the report.
- 15.8.7 Emma's supervision also stemmed from shop thefts. Like Neil she had a Drug Rehabilitation Requirement<sup>17</sup> in recognition of her use of illegal drugs.
- 15.8.8 The individual management review helpfully concludes:  
'Neil's risk of harm assessments considered him as a potential perpetrator rather than as a victim due his previous offence of domestic abuse on his ex-wife. Emma's risk of harm assessments considered her as a potential victim rather than as a perpetrator. In light of the information available to the service and the responsible officers these assessments are considered to be of sufficient standard and quality'.

## **15.9 Rotherham Action Homeless Service**

- 15.9.1 Separately Neil and Emma had contact with this agency to help them with their accommodation needs. They both missed many appointments. Neil was known to use illegal drugs but there is nothing to say he was a victim of domestic abuse.

---

<sup>16</sup> The preferred risk assessment tool of the South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation and Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service.

<sup>17</sup> A Drug Rehabilitation Requirement is an order by the court given as part of a community sentence order and adherence is mandatory.

## **16. ANALYSIS USING THE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **16.1 Term 1**

**What indicators of domestic abuse did you agency identify, what risk assessments were done, were the risk levels appropriate and how did you manage the risks?**

- 16.1.1 The panel only considered risk within the definition of domestic abuse. This excluded any offences that may have been committed between Neil and Tariq. No agency held information to suggest that Emma and Tariq were in an abusive relationship. In a media report during the homicide trial, Emma is quoted as saying Tariq was abusive towards her.
- 16.1.2 South Yorkshire Police was the only agency to identify Neil as a victim of domestic abuse when in August 2015 he was recorded as the complainant in a non-crime domestic incident. He was assessed as facing a low risk of serious harm from Emma. On other occasions where a risk assessment was completed Emma was identified as the victim and Neil as the offender. Neither was arrested for domestic abuse incidents as they were judged not to be crimes. The incidents did not meet the threshold for a referral to a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference. South Yorkshire Police identified that while they identified domestic abuse there may be further opportunities to look for indicators of abuse within anti-social behaviour calls.
- 16.1.3 The domestic homicide review panel's scrutiny of the agency material identified some potential opportunities for other agencies to complete risk assessments and also some opportunities to stop and take stock of what was happening in the relationship between Neil and Emma.
- 16.1.4 The first potential opportunity came on 20 June 2016 when Neil told a Housing official that an incident of violence took place in Tariq's car when Emma attempted to stab Neil with a syringe. During this conversation Neil also referred to Tariq and commented that Tariq had known Emma since she was a child. Neil told the Housing officer that he had reported the attempted stabbing to the police when they attended his flat in response to a broken window. Therefore the Housing officer did not refer the attempted stabbing to the police. The Panel felt that the Housing officer's decision not to refer the syringe incident to the police was appropriate because Neil said he had already done so. The panel then considered whether the Housing officer should have completed a domestic abuse risk assessment for the syringe incident and judged it was unnecessary given that they believed the police were involved. It is now known that Neil did not report the matter to the police. The Housing officer had concerns about possible child sexual exploitation and later passed the information verbally to the local policing team. The panel felt the Housing Officer's decisions showed a considered approach of how to deal with both pieces of information.

- 16.1.5 The second potential opportunity came on 23 June 2016 when Neil told his Community Rehabilitation Company case manager that Emma had tried to stab him in the neck while he was in the car with her and Tariq. This appears to be the same incident Neil told Housing about. Neil's account included the fact that Emma and Tariq '...insisted he sat in the front seat in the car and that Emma had then tried to stab him during that journey home'.
- 16.1.6 Neil told the case manager that he had not, and was not going to report the incident to the police. Neil blamed Tariq for the attack albeit recognising it was Emma who wielded the weapon. Neil showed the case manager a text which indicated Emma was going to renew a relationship with him.
- 16.1.7 The individual management review comments, '...the case manager did not escalate this to his line manager but did discuss it with his peers who felt it was "part of Neil and Emma's story of an on /off relationship". The case manager did not report this conversation to the police because he did not perceive Neil to be at significant risk. There were no visible wounds and Neil was overall unkempt and showed signs of historic drug use'.
- 16.1.8 The panel considered whether the case manager's decision not to report the incident to the police was appropriate in the circumstances known at the time. The panel chair's initial thought, which he shared with colleagues, was that on balance the case manager should have reported the matter to the police. That view was not held by other panel members and the chair facilitated a more detailed discussion on the point over two meetings. The Community Rehabilitation Company's representative on the panel put additional context around the disclosure. This was the initial meeting between Neil and the case manager. The focus was on collecting basic information and ensuring he knew and understood the conditions of his licence. Neil told the story of the attempted stabbing as though it was a bizarre event rather than a real threat or successful attack. The panel heard the case manager was an experienced professional who on this occasion should have been more inquisitive about the story. For example did Neil know if the syringe contained a substance that could have caused him harm or whether the syringe was used simply as a sharp weapon with which to cause physical injury?
- 16.1.9 The panel's discussion widened and the chair sought views on what other agencies would have done on receiving such a disclosure. Unsurprisingly there were mixed views. The consensus suggested the decision would have to be made in context and include the history of the person making it; the judgement on what it meant for risk and the level of concern shown by that person to the incident. The panel then applied that criteria to the syringe incident. Neil lived a chaotic lifestyle; was casual in the way he described the incident and his dismissal of the incident by blaming Tariq. Additionally

Emma had never been assessed as posing more than a standard risk<sup>18</sup> of causing harm to Neil. Therefore taking all these things into account the panel unanimously felt that on balance the case manager’s decision not to submit an intelligence report to the police about the alleged attempting stabbing was appropriate.

16.1.10 The third potential opportunity to identify Neil as a potential victim of domestic abuse also came on 27 June 2016 when Neil told a Housing officer that he and Emma had been arguing on 23 June 2016. During this incident Emma hit a neighbour on the head with a bottle. The panel felt that was evidence of Emma’s aggressive behaviour and ideally should have prompted the Housing officer to consider what it meant for Neil’s safety and whether he was a victim. However, Neil was not seen as a victim of domestic abuse. He was known to housing for anti-social behaviour and the panel felt that in the overall context of Housing’s involvement with Neil it was not reasonable to expect a domestic abuse risk assessment to have been completed on this occasion.

16.1.11 Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Housing Services and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Anti-Social Behaviour Unit attended approximately twenty incidents of what they categorised as anti-social behaviour at Neil and Emma’s address. The following table provides the detail.

Type of Incident	Number of Incidents
Neil verbally abusing a passer-by/other resident	2
Noise nuisance from a dog at Neil’s flat/pet related complaint	2
Loud music	2
Neil throwing rubbish and needles from the balcony and tipping rubbish	1
Noise due to Neil and Emma arguing/fighting/associated noise	8
Neil and Emma driving a vehicle while disqualified	1
Teenagers left at Neil’s property fighting	1
Visitors calling to the property looking for Neil	1
Neil self-harming/suicidal thoughts	1
Neil making threats to Emma and Tariq on social media	1

16.1.12 Some of those incidents, arguing, shouting, self-harm and threats could also be indicators of domestic abuse, albeit it was not always clear from

<sup>18</sup> A generally accepted definition of standard risk is: Current evidence does not indicate likelihood of serious harm.

the notes who was the victim and who was the perpetrator. However, no domestic abuse risk assessment took place which might have identified who, was doing what, to whom. Housing's individual management review acknowledges that the domestic abuse was not identified and added the following explanation of why that might be.

- 16.1.13 '...Interviewing the operational officers involved it is clear that they had no cognitive recognition of domestic abuse relating to this case. No officer has suggested that they did not know how to recognise such issues. Three officers also appreciated that the principles of a dynamic risk requires a continuous assessments of the circumstances witnessed. None of the entries made by officers in Housing Services ...mention domestic abuse. Therefore no enquiries, alerts or referrals were made using the domestic abuse allocation policy'.
- 16.1.14 '...The focus of interaction with Neil by Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Housing Services and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Anti-Social Behaviour Unit related to anti-social behaviour which is a subjective issue [what affects one individual may not affect another] and cases can often be compounded further when the subject is both the perpetrator and at times the target'.
- 16.1.15 '...Consequently, disturbances such as the one at Neil's address in August 2016 place the blame squarely with Neil in the eyes of local residents. However, Neil's simultaneous phone call to South Yorkshire Police for assistance also cannot be ignored and would suggest that he is the victim. This paradigm is something that I feel further complicates this particular case and can see service and practitioner standards refocusing to accommodate individuals as they exchange roles between protagonist and victim. Where evidence does not assist in determining whether an individual with complex needs is a perpetrator or not, then the reliance to plan a suitable course of action defers to the professional judgement of the Officers involved. It is on such occasions that perhaps a management steer is required'.
- 16.1.16 '...This confusion is not uncommon with individuals that have complex needs, dependencies and display attributes of a chaotic lifestyle. It may be a sentiment that explains why there was a fifteen month period between the first complaint against Neil and the beginning of formal litigation'.
- 16.1.17 The panel chair/author has been involved in other domestic homicide reviews where anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance has disguised domestic abuse.
- 16.1.18 While Neil can be seen primarily as a perpetrator of domestic abuse there is evidence to say that he was sometimes a victim and that Emma was the perpetrator. In the panel's view the relationship between them was fraught

and throughout the period under review Emma was predominately the victim save for that last six months where the dynamics changed once Tariq became involved with Emma. The evidence then suggests that Neil became more vulnerable because of the breakdown in his relationship with Emma, who we now know enlisted the help of Tariq to harass and finally murder Neil. The judge who heard all the evidence over a long trial concluded that Tariq was the driving force behind the murder.

**16.1.19** Had practitioners undertaken comprehensive domestic abuse assessments on Neil and Emma a clearer picture of their relationship would have emerged. This should have benefited agencies in formulating plans to manage and support them. The reasons why comprehensive risk assessments were not undertaken are centred on the practitioners being unable to effectively engage Emma in the process. The one risk assessment done on Neil showed he faced a low risk of harm from Emma. Perhaps that was an underassessment because Neil was generally viewed by practitioners as a perpetrator of domestic abuse.

## **16.2 Term 2**

### **What did your agency do to keep the levels of risk under review and what was the response to new risk information?**

- 16.2.1 South Yorkshire Police identified Neil as facing a low risk of serious harm from Emma. Nothing in their subsequent dealings with him suggested the risk was higher.
- 16.2.2 When the chronology is examined it is apparent that from February 2016 the risk faced by Neil was increasing and initially came from Tariq in his desire to be the sole beneficiary of Emma's affections. As 2016 progressed Tariq appeared to have gained ascendancy and then formed a coalition with Emma to ensure Neil would not displace him.
- 16.2.3 The sheer volume of calls and contact made by Neil, Emma and Tariq to services made it very difficult for one agency to fathom what was happening in terms of risk factors. The panel discussed whether there would have been benefit after February 2016 for one agency to take the lead in co-ordinating what was happening in this complex situation.
- 16.2.4 Neil, Emma and Tariq did not meet the criteria for a referral under the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements, Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference or Vulnerable Adult Risk Management protocols. There was no single incident that could reasonably have prompted someone to take the lead and arrange a multi-agency meeting outside of these formal structures. The panel concluded that it was not realistic to expect that a professional would call for a 'special' multi-agency meeting in these circumstances.

- 16.2.5 The panel had a long debate on what agencies would do if faced with similar circumstances. Agencies reported that they dealt with many people fitting Neil's profile of complex needs and that successful interventions did happen. The key to success was the willingness of individuals to engage reasonably consistently with service providers and for the providers to always keep their door open to those users whose commitment to change varied. In this case Neil was always welcomed back and offered services. The Panel felt that when Neil was in crisis he would reach out for help but withdraw once the immediate issue had been dealt with. In the experience of the Panel his pattern of contact with services is not unusual and therefore it is necessary for agencies to keep doors open, as they did for Neil.
- 16.2.6 The Panel heard from its public health representative that, 'Rotherham Council, Police, Health and Voluntary Sector are working towards Integrated Locality working. Rotherham will have three locality areas (already identified) in which multiagency working and information sharing should vastly improve the case management of vulnerable individuals / families in our communities. Plans and implementation time scales are expected by the end of the year and this process has full Chief Officer support'.

### **16.3 Term 3**

#### **What services did your agency provide for the victim and perpetrators and were they timely, proportionate and 'fit for purpose' in relation to the identified levels of risk?**

- 16.3.1 Neil was very well supported in coping with his drug misuse and agencies involved with that persevered and always welcomed him back when he was released from prison sentences. Agencies were tolerant of the many occasions he did not attend appointments.
- 16.3.2 Housing provided Neil and Emma with what the panel thought was an excellent service after they reported they had been threatened and needed to move immediately. The speed of response, the use of discretion and the coordination of activity by Housing was impressive. Part of that discretion was to waive rent arrears which are normally a significant obstacle to re-housing. The chronology shows that Housing displayed a significant level of tolerance when dealing with Neil and Emma for the multiple reports of anti-social behaviour. Housing recognise that the level of tolerance was probably too much in favour of Neil.
- 16.3.3 Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust provided midwifery services to Emma which met her needs. They were also understanding of her and Neil's drug use and always afforded them access to services and followed them up when they absented themselves from hospital without informing staff.

- 16.3.4 South Yorkshire Police dealt with about one hundred and twenty calls from Neil, Emma and Tariq and did not seem to suffer from fatigue as could have happened. They dealt with each call diligently. As stated above the volume probably masked the build-up of risk from February 2016.
- 16.3.5 The Community Rehabilitation Company was also accommodating in its supervision of Neil and Emma recognising they had significant difficulties which emanated from their drug use.
- 16.3.6 The Police, Housing and Rotherham Hospital knew that from February 2016 Neil had several episodes of self-harm. Individually they were dealt with appropriately. The panel thought Neil's actions might have resulted from the breakup of his relationship with Emma. The potential link between his self-harm and his vulnerability to domestic abuse victimisation was also discussed by the panel who were unable to say whether there was a link. Therefore the panel concluded it was not reasonably possible for professionals in real time to spot self-harm as a risk factor in his victimisation.
- 16.3.7 Within the terms of reference for the review the panel believed that overall the services provided to Neil, Emma and Tariq were timely, proportionate and 'fit for purpose' in relation to the identified levels of risk. This statement sits outside of any findings from the Independent Police Complaints Commission investigation into the police response to the alleged threats made by Neil against Tariq in 2016.

#### **16.4 Term 4**

##### **How did your agency ascertain the wishes and feelings of the victim and perpetrators about their victimisation and offending and were their views taken into account when providing services or support?**

- 16.4.1 There was substantial contact between Neil, Emma, Tariq and agencies whose records show they must have listened as evidenced by the detail recorded. The following are examples.
- 16.4.2 In 2013 Neil attended the Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme after he assaulted his former wife. This will have been negotiated between professionals and Neil, who is likely to have expressed a willingness to attend. In this instance he was an offender.
- 16.4.3 Neil was also the victim of several non-domestic abuse assaults and other crimes. The records from the police show they listened to his needs and provided victim services accordingly. Neil, like Emma and Tariq, did not always want to pursue complaints once they were made. The police abided by their wishes and did not investigate.

- 16.4.4 Drug services responded to Neil and Emma's accounts of their victimisation by encouraging them to report matters to the police. The Community Rehabilitation Company also encouraged Neil to report the attempted stabbing of him by Emma to the police. The Community Rehabilitation Company terminated an appointment with Neil because they felt he needed to go to hospital to have the needle in his groin assessed. Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust helped Emma through her pregnancies and persevered with their support of her when she left hospital without warning.
- 16.4.5 A good example of listening and responding was found when Housing arranged alternative accommodation so that Neil and Emma could access an alternative pharmacy when the one they were attending was frequented by people they wished to avoid for personal safety reasons.
- 16.4.6 Overall and with the caveat of the Independent Police Complaints Commission investigation, the panel felt that the wishes and feelings of Neil and the two adult offenders were taken account of when providing services.

## **16.5 Term 5**

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

- 16.5.1 Neil's children from his marriage were protected from the effects of domestic abuse when their parents separated and he was prosecuted for assaulting his wife. In 2016 South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company assessed Neil as presenting a medium to children. Emma's children were protected by Rotherham Children's Services who removed them from her care. There was information that Tariq could be sexually exploiting girls and this was reported to the police who together with partners assessed whether any child was at risk. There was no evidence that he was exploiting children and the Panel thought that raising the possibility demonstrated a good awareness of child sexual exploitation.
- 16.5.2 The panel noted that no child came to harm from Neil, Emma or Tariq during the period under review. This statement excludes any issues associated with interaction between the two adult offenders and three juveniles who were found guilty of manslaughter.

## **16.6 Term 6**

### **How effective was inter-agency information sharing and cooperation in response to the victim and perpetrators and was information shared with those agencies who needed it?**

- 16.6.1 The Panel judged there was very good information sharing between all agencies. The agency chronologies evidence that professionals were in contact with colleagues in other agencies and shared information on

domestic abuse and child protection. There was good information sharing between Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust and Children's Services about Emma's pregnancies aimed at protecting the unborn child and completing pre-birth assessments.

- 16.6.2 Primarily information was shared bilaterally. The Panel debated whether there was an opportunity to share information in a wider forum, particularly from February 2016 onwards when Emma seems to have favoured Tariq over Neil. No single agency had information about Neil which reached the threshold to make a referral into a multi-agency forum and there is no system that automatically collects information from all the agencies involved with Neil. He was not viewed as a victim of domestic abuse and on the one occasion he was such a victim he was assessed as facing a low risk of serious harm from Emma.
- 16.6.3 All agencies believed Neil had capacity to make informed decisions and choices and he did not meet the criteria for a Section 9<sup>19</sup> Care Act 2014 assessment. Therefore a multi-agency meeting under this framework was inappropriate.
- 16.6.4 The Community Rehabilitation Company's case manager made a defensible decision not to share information with the police that Emma had attempted to stab Neil. Housing did not share that information with the police.

## **16.7 Term 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 perpetrators?**

- 16.7.1 Section 11 above examined this term of reference by exploring the protected characteristics of Section 4 Equality Act 2011. The Panel concluded that Neil, Emma and Tariq were treated without bias by agencies completing assessments and providing services to them.

## **16.8 Term 8**

**What did your agency do to establish the reasons for the perpetrators' abusive behaviour and how did it address them?**

- 16.8.1 Neil was the victim of this domestic homicide. However his abusive behaviour towards his ex-wife would have been explored when he undertook the Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme in 2013.

---

<sup>19</sup> Assessment of an adult's needs for care and support

- 16.8.2 Emma had complex needs stemming from her use of illegal drugs and was predominantly thought of as a victim and not a perpetrator. Her one reported episode of verbal abuse towards Neil was viewed in the context of their chaotic lifestyles and not seen as requiring further intervention.
- 16.8.3 Tariq was known to use controlling behaviour with one female in 2014. His behaviour was such that his ex-partner obtained a court order against him banning contact with her and her children. During the trial a report on BBC television said, '...She [Emma] claimed 'Tariq' had been "fine" towards her initially but had later shown his "true colours", becoming violent and controlling'.
- 16.8.4 The panel heard there is no voluntary domestic abuse perpetrator's programme in Rotherham, however, work was underway to find the resources for such work.

**16.9 Were single and multi-agency policies and procedures, including Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference [MARAC] followed?**

- 16.9.1 Neil's victimisation was assessed low and therefore a referral to Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference was not considered.
- 16.9.2 Agencies compliance with domestic abuse policies was good. Housing did not identify domestic abuse and viewed the issues involving Neil and Emma as anti-social behaviour. They have learned a lesson from it.

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

- 16.10.1 The Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Team acknowledge a lack of formal supervision for the Independent Domestic Abuse Advocates during this time period partly resulting from sickness absences.
- 16.10.2 Housing reported that '...prior to summer 2015, weekly/bi-weekly briefings were held between Anti-Social Behaviour Officers, Housing Officers, the Fire Service, Environmental Wardens, Local Policing Teams, NHS, Social Care, Mental Health workers, Community Protection Officers and Elected Members. These minuted briefings were known as Safer Neighbourhood meetings and had three distinct strengths. In the first instance they had a focus on problem households and individuals. Secondly, the frequency of meetings ensured that service areas and individuals were accountable; actions got completed. Thirdly, the partners in attendance were operational and would often carry out an action together immediately after the briefing'.
- 16.10.3 'However, from summer 2015 these changed to monthly Case Identification Meetings and developed two distinct problems. In the first instance, the

meetings were too infrequent and condensed to discuss cases in sufficient detail to make a plan of action that could be measurable and hold services accountable. Secondly, operational officers were discouraged from attending and instead, line managers would take their place. Therefore rather than officers agreeing to take a proactive course of action immediately after the Safer Neighbourhood style briefings, each manager would instead have to relay each requests from the Case Identification Meeting back to his/her respective office’.

16.10.4 No other agency reported any gaps in management and supervision of staff nor did the panel identify any.

**16.11 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?**

16.11.1 No agency reported any specific resourcing issues nor did the panel identify any.

**16.12 Do the lessons arising from this review appear in other review held by the Safer Rotherham Partnership?**

16.12.1 Steve Parry the Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Manager for Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council provided the review with all the lessons/recommendations from The Safer Rotherham Partnership’s previous domestic homicide reviews. This review chair/author confirm that the lessons/recommendations identified in ‘Neil’s’ review have not featured in the previous Rotherham domestic homicide reviews.

## **17. Conclusions**

- 17.1 The Panel recognised this case was unusual in that Neil's history was one of perpetrating domestic abuse and not that of being victimised. Nevertheless the panel kept reminding itself that he died as a result of domestic abuse perpetrated by Emma, a former intimate partner. One other adult was also convicted of murder and three juveniles were convicted of manslaughter.
- 17.2 Neil had known Emma for several years and they shared similar experiences of using illegal drugs and drinking. There is evidence that their physical and mental wellbeing were adversely affected by the use of drugs and the exposure to the dangers that come from drug dealing. When younger they were known separately to children's service who protected them from family violence.
- 17.3 In terms of domestic abuse all agencies saw Neil primarily as a perpetrator. He was recognised on one occasion as a victim of domestic violence. In the months leading up his death there were no real opportunities to identify him as a victim of domestic abuse. The one assessment completed by South Yorkshire Police showed that he faced a low risk of serious harm from Emma and as such he did not reach the threshold for a referral to a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference.
- 17.4 Emma was seen by agencies as a victim of domestic abuse and her case went to a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference in 2013 after a former partner assaulted her. She described her relationship with Neil as argumentative but not violent. However, there was a little evidence that she was wary of him but declined any domestic abuse services. In the same year Neil attended an Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme after he assaulted his ex-wife.
- 17.5 Neil and Emma stole from shops and used the proceeds to generate money so they could buy drugs. They were arrested several times and came under the statutory supervision of the National Probation Service and from June 2014, the South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company.
- 17.6 Emma had four children taken into the care of the local authority in order to protect them from her life style. Neil fathered one of the children.
- 17.7 Neil and Emma's constant use of illegal drugs brought them into contact with drug dealers. That resulted in some conflict with the suppliers which manifested itself in threats and violence. After one such episode they attended Housing and were immediately allocated a new property as part of their safety planning. The speed and flexibility of Housing's actions was commendable.
- 17.8 Housing had many contacts with Neil following complaints by neighbours. They were classified and dealt with as anti-social behaviour. They fell into two main areas: general noise and litter nuisance and arguments between Neil

and Emma. Housing now recognise that such behaviour cloaked the domestic abuse that was happening in the relationship.

- 17.9 Neil's relationship with Emma appeared to endure in mutual support and understanding until about February 2016 when the foundations of Tariq and Emma relationship were set down. It is not known what brought them together.
- 17.10 What is known is that Neil resented the development as evidenced by his words and deeds in trying to restore his former position as Emma's sole partner.
- 17.11 The chronology from that period illustrates the tensions and battles between Neil, Emma and Tariq. There were allegations and counter allegations of kidnap and harassment, sometimes involving third parties. The police were sometimes involved and Neil told several agencies about these incidents. It appeared to agencies that he was describing 'adventures' which, while potential criminal offences, he did not take too seriously.
- 17.12 An example of this is the disclosure he made to the Community Rehabilitation Company in June 2016 after Emma tried to stab him. He was encouraged to report the matter to the police but was adamant he was not going to. The panel felt, as evidenced by his remarks to his case manager, that his reluctance stemmed from his view that Tariq was behind Emma's actions and any report to the police would damage any chance of a reconciliation. Neil told a Housing officer that he had reported the attempted stabbing to the police. The police were unaware of the incident until after Neil's death.
- 17.13 Neil appears to have taken matters into his own hands when in the first week of August 2016 he was arrested after Tariq reported to the police that Neil had threatened to kill him. The Independent Police Complaints Commission is investigating the police handling of that incident.
- 17.14 Emma and Tariq were found guilty of Neil's murder and three juveniles were found guilty of his manslaughter. The reporting of the trial showed a clear pattern of Emma and Tariq wanting Neil out of their lives and this appears to be the motive for his death.

## 18. LESSONS IDENTIFIED

### 18.1 Agencies Lessons

Agency	Lesson
Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clients with chaotic lifestyles will not always engage but good practice and duty of care requires practitioners/professionals to persevere.</li> <li>2. Counselling support for the client, relationship programmes to support the client and perpetrator are all options that could have been explored.</li> <li>3. Accurate up to date case notes, detailed factual information.</li> <li>4. Acknowledgement is required in respect of the lack of formal supervision for the Independent Domestic Abuse Advocates during this time period</li> </ol>
General Practitioner	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The need to record details of people who accompany patients to consultations.</li> </ol>
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Housing Services and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Anti-Social Behaviour Unit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The need to remain alert to the potential that reported incidents/complaints, for example of anti-social behaviour and other breaches of tenancy, could inadvertently mask domestic violence as a contributory factor and/or risk. In this case the complex nature of this case, made it difficult to identify domestic abuse.</li> </ol>
Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further exploration of the allegation in the safeguarding information of 26 February 2013 may have given more clarity round risk.</li> </ol>
The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The names of people attending with the patient were not always recorded.</li> </ol>
South Yorkshire Police	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Each incident was dealt with in isolation and had all the information been collated together it may have been possible to explore other interventions to diffuse the resultant toxic relationship between the three subjects.</li> <li>2. Neil and Emma made about seventy six call to the police some of which were recorded as domestic incidents. The panel noted that such a large volume of calls to the police could contain indirect clues to the presence of domestic abuse. For example damage to the property and falling out with neighbours brought about by the stresses of an abusive relationship.</li> </ol>

<p>South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Staff to not make assumptions that injuries and self-harm result from a chaotic lifestyle, instead to gather information from other agencies and the client to determine the causes.</li> <li>2. In terms of domestic abuse Neil was viewed to be a likely perpetrator as a consequence of the historic information available, rather than recognising he could also be a victim.</li> <li>3. Neil had difficulty accessing staff in the final fortnight of his supervision because of the unavailability of IT systems. A review is being undertaken to address client services during system downtimes and Responsible Officer absences.</li> </ol>

## 18.2 The Domestic Homicide Review Panel's Lessons

### Lesson 1

#### Narrative

Neil was almost exclusively seen as a perpetrator of domestic abuse and while that was true, it is now clear that on at least two occasions he was also a victim. [The assault by Emma and the homicide].

#### Lesson

When professionals deal or are aware of domestic abuse in relationships where complex needs exist, they should be aware that just because one party has a history of perpetrating domestic abuse, it does mean they cannot also be a victim.

### Lesson 2

#### Narrative

Collectively agencies held information which if brought together may have shown that Neil's risk of victimisation was higher than 'standard'. However no single incident met the threshold for any agency to call a multi-agency meeting.

#### Lesson

Professionals dealing with victims or suspected victims of domestic abuse need to be aware that colleagues in other agencies may hold information relevant to risk the victim faces from domestic abuse.

## 19. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 19.1 Agencies Recommendations

Agency	Recommendation
Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To review the domestic abuse strategy.</li> <li>Review the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service's handbook.</li> </ol>
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Housing Services and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Anti-Social Behaviour Unit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undertake a programme of refresher training for Housing and ASB staff, focussing on good practice, referral pathways and the specific learning points from the domestic homicide review.</li> <li>That the learning points from the DHR are also incorporated into the operational principles and practices of the neighbourhood working model being implemented in Rotherham.</li> </ol>
The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure compliance with the Health Records Policy.</li> </ol>
South Yorkshire Police	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Officers to provide a more comprehensive narrative when completing risk assessments on victims who are reluctant to engage.</li> <li>That officers should be alert to tangential indicators of domestic abuse when dealing with what appear to be anti-social behaviour incidents.</li> </ol>
South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To introduce vulnerability assessment as part of the risk assessment process and launch victim safety planning for all vulnerable service users.</li> <li>To provide practitioner refresher briefings for working with substance misusers</li> <li>To review and address client services and needs during information communications technology downtime and responsible officer absences.</li> </ol>

### 19.2 The Panel's Recommendations

Number	Recommendation
1	That the Safer Rotherham Partnership satisfies itself that its constituent agencies understand that perpetrators of domestic abuse can also be victims and take this into account when completing risk assessments.
2	That the Safer Rotherham Partnership ensures that agencies complete the recommendations they made for this review.

End v0.1 Overview Report

Post HO QA letter

## Appendix A Action Plan

Recommendation	Scope local or regional	Action to take	Lead Agency	Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation	Target Date Completion	Completion Date and Outcome
<b>Rotherham Adult Services Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Team</b>						
1. To review the domestic abuse strategy.	local	Review existing strategy	IDVA Service Rotherham	Consult with stakeholders Revise document Agree and publish revisions	June 2017	Completed June 2017
2. To review the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service's handbook.	local	Review handbook Consult practitioners	IDVA Service Rotherham	Prepare Draft Confirm final version Disseminate new handbook Brief staff	---	Completed 01.06.2017 Staff will use procedures for the benefit of victims
Recommendation	Scope local or regional	Action to take	Lead Agency	Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation	Target Date Completion	Completion Date and Outcome
<b>Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Housing Services and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Anti-Social Behaviour Unit</b>						
1. Undertake a programme of refresher training for Housing	Local	Refresher training	housing	Housing and DA Coordinator to arrange	2017	New pathways in place and

and ASB staff, focussing on good practice, referral pathways and the specific learning points from the domestic homicide review.				programme of training and pathways		full training completed 2017/18
2. That the learning points from the DHR are also incorporated into the operational principles and practices of the neighbourhood working model being implemented in Rotherham.	Local	Update working procedures	housing	Pathways and practices updated	2017/18	2017/18
<b>Recommendation The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust</b>	<b>Scope local or regional</b>	<b>Action to take</b>	<b>Lead Agency</b>	<b>Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation</b>	<b>Target Date Completion</b>	<b>Completion Date and Outcome</b>
1. Ensure compliance with the Health Records Policy.	local	Heads of Service to reiterate and reinforce the requirement for staff to practice in accordance with the Health Records Policy by providing briefings to staff regarding compliance with this policy	The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust	Briefings to be produced	31/03/2017	Complete

		<p>Heads of Service to complete quarterly audit to measure compliance. Audit to specifically include the naming of other people present at clinical consultation</p> <p>Heads of Service to feedback audit results to the Operational Safeguarding Group</p>		<p>Audits to be completed quarterly</p> <p>Completed audits to be presented to the Operational Safeguarding</p>	<p>31/03/2017 30/06/2017 30/09/2017 31/12/2017 31/03/2018</p> <p>05/2017 08/2017 11/2017 01/2018 04/2018</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>Complete</p>
<b>Recommendation South Yorkshire Police</b>	<b>Scope local or regional</b>	<b>Action to take</b>	<b>Lead Agency</b>	<b>Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation</b>	<b>Target Date Completion</b>	<b>Completion Date and Outcome</b>
1. Officers to provide a more comprehensive narrative when completing risk assessments on victims who are reluctant to	Local	Determine what is more comprehensive	South Yorkshire Police	Consult stakeholders Prepare and approve new guidance Implement guidance	30.11.2017	completed

engage.				through briefings and training		
2. That officers should be alert to tangential indicators of domestic abuse when dealing with what appear to be anti-social behaviour incidents.	Local	Provide examples of tangential incidents	South Yorkshire Police	Examples identified Implement guidance through briefings and training	30.11.2017	completed
<b>Recommendation South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company</b>	<b>Scope local or regional</b>	<b>Action to take</b>	<b>Lead Agency</b>	<b>Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation</b>	<b>Target Date Completion</b>	<b>Completion Date and Outcome</b>
1. To introduce vulnerability assessment as part of the risk assessment process and launch victim safety planning for all vulnerable service users.	Local	Safety planning	SYCRC OA TMs	1. Operational Assurance (OA) to Re-circulate the adult safeguarding practice direction.  2.All Team Managers to do a group supervision illustrating where a safety plan has been used and been helpful, or where a safety plan has been missed and there have been consequences	Safety planning	completed
2. To provide practitioner	Local	Commission	OA	Sessions to be arranged	December	completed

refresher briefings for working with substance misusers		Laurus to deliver training about working with substance misusers, especially on wider health issues and risk management.		for Autumn 2017	2017	
3. To review and address client services and needs during information communications technology downtime and responsible officer absences.	Local	Duty Cover arrangements	OA	Operational assurance to consider "duty officer" roles and devise a practice direction to cover colleagues' absences and completion of tasks when IT systems have gone down.	September 2017.	completed

<b>Recommendation The Safer Rotherham Partnership</b>	<b>Scope local or regional</b>	<b>Action to take</b>	<b>Lead Agency</b>	<b>Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation</b>	<b>Target Date Completion</b>	<b>Completion Date and Outcome</b>
1. That the Safer Rotherham Partnership satisfies itself that its constituent agencies understand that perpetrators of domestic abuse can also be victims.	Local	Included in Multi-Agency Domestic Abuse 'Gold' Training	Community Safety	Training Dates: 23 <sup>rd</sup> January 2017 27 <sup>th</sup> February 2017 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2017 24 <sup>th</sup> April 2017 22 <sup>nd</sup> May 2017	2017	completed

		programme		26 <sup>th</sup> June 2017 24 <sup>th</sup> July 2017 21 <sup>st</sup> August 2017 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2017 23 <sup>rd</sup> October 2017 27 <sup>th</sup> November 2017 18 <sup>th</sup> December 2017		
<b>2. That the Safer Rotherham Partnership ensures that agencies complete the recommendations they made for this review.</b>	<b>Local</b>	Progress monitored through the Partnerships Multi-Agency Domestic Abuse Priority Group. (DAPG)	<b>DAPG</b>	<u>DAPG meeting dates:</u> 25 <sup>th</sup> January 2017 15 <sup>th</sup> February 2017 22 <sup>nd</sup> March 2017 19 <sup>th</sup> April 2017 11 <sup>th</sup> May 2017 6 <sup>th</sup> June 2017 26 <sup>th</sup> July 2017 10 <sup>th</sup> August 2017 20 <sup>th</sup> September 2017 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2017 23 <sup>rd</sup> November 2017 19 <sup>th</sup> December 2017 18 <sup>th</sup> January 2018 6 <sup>th</sup> February 2018 13 <sup>th</sup> March 2018 17 <sup>th</sup> April 2018	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>completed</b>

