

THE SAFER ROTHERHAM PARTNERSHIP

DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Victim 'Neil'

Died August 2016

Chair and Author David Hunter

Date 7 March 2019

CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
1. The Review Process	3
2. Contributors to the Review	5
3. The Review Panel Members	6
4. Author of the Overview Report	8
5. Terms of Reference for the Review	9
6. Summary Chronology	11
7. Key Issues Arising from the Review	16
8. Conclusions	17
9. Lessons to be Learned	19
10. Recommendations from the Review	21

1. THE REVIEW PROCESS

- 1.1 This summary outlines the process undertaken by the Safer Rotherham Partnership domestic homicide review panel in examining the death of Neil who was a resident in their area.
- 1.2 The following pseudonyms¹ have been in used in this review for the victim and two adult perpetrators to protect their identities and those of their family members:

Name	Who	Age	Ethnicity
Neil	Victim	34	White British
Emma	Offender	23	White British
Tariq	Offender	41	British Pakistani

¹ In the absence of engagement with the families, the pseudonyms were selected by the domestic homicide panel chair and notified to them in writing.

Juvenile 1 ²	Offender	N/A ³	N/A
Juvenile 2	Offender	N/A	N/A
Juvenile 3	Offender	N/A	N/A

- 1.3 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. A post mortem established Neil died as a result of head injuries.
- 1.4 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. 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. The juveniles' sentencing is not relevant to this review.
- 1.5 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'.
- 1.6 The process began with an initial meeting of The Safer Rotherham Partnership on 6 October 2016 when the decision to hold a domestic homicide review was agreed. All agencies that potentially had contact with Neil, Emma and Tariq prior to the point of death were contacted and asked to confirm whether they had involvement with them.
- 1.7 Nine of the eighteen agencies contacted confirmed contact with the victim and/or perpetrator and were asked to secure their files.

2. CONTRIBUTORS TO THE REVIEW

- 2.1 The following agencies contributed to the review.

² The domestic homicide review did not review the juveniles' involvement as they were not in an intimate relationship with the victim or family members.

³ Legal reasons prevent any identifying features being reported.

Agency	IMR⁴	Chronology	Report
The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust	Yes	Yes	
Rotherham Council Housing	Yes	Yes	
South Yorkshire Police	Yes	Yes	
General Practitioner	No	No	Short Note
Rotherham 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 Children's Services	No	No	Short Report

2.2 The Individual Management Reviews included a statement of the authors' independence from any operational or management responsibility for the matters under examination.

3. THE REVIEW PANEL MEMBERS

3.1 The panel members were:

Name	Job Title	Organisation
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

⁴ Individual Management Review

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

3.2 Procedures were carried out that confirmed the independence of the panel chair. 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.

3.3 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.

4. AUTHOR OF THE OVERVIEW REPORT

4.1 David Hunter was appointed as the Independent Chair and Author on 12 May 2016. He was supported by Paul Cheeseman. Both are independent practitioners who have chaired and written previous Domestic Homicide Reviews, Child Serious Case Reviews, Multi-Agency Public Protection Reviews and Safeguarding Adult Reviews. Neither has been employed by any of the agencies involved with this review nor are they connected to Rotherham's Community Safety Partnership who judged they had the necessary experience, skills and independence to undertake the review.

5. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE REVIEW

5.1 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:⁵

- 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?
5. What did your agency do to safeguard any children exposed to domestic abuse?

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

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.

6. SUMMARY CHRONOLOGY

6.1 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

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.⁶ 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 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.

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

⁶ 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

Event Table	
Date	Event
2010	Neil known to the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service as a high risk perpetrator of domestic abuse in relation to his ex-wife.
April 2011	Emma known to the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy service involving a different perpetrator.
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; 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.
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.
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.
25.02.2015	Neil and Emma were rehoused claiming they were fleeing violence which occurred in February 2015.
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. 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.

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.
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.
08.07.2016	Neil told Housing that Emma had left him and that there would not be any further incidents of nuisance behaviour.
06.08.2016	Neil arrested for threats to kill Tariq. Bailed without charge. Incident referred to Independent Police Complaints Commission following Neil's murder.
14.08.2016	Neil taken to hospital by the Police due to an overdose.

7. Key Issues

7.1 The panel identified the following key issues:

1. Neil had a chaotic lifestyle which centred on the misuse of drugs and sometimes alcohol.
2. For several years before his death he had almost no family support. This was believed to be his choice.
3. Prior to the homicide Neil was predominantly a perpetrator of domestic abuse and was not viewed as a victim. Comprehensive domestic abuse risk assessments on him and Emma may have shown a different picture.
4. When Neil identified his victimisation to agencies it was not reported to the police. One of these occasions was at his request.
5. His relationship with Emma endured for several years and it appears they provided mutual support through traumas directly link to their drug use.
6. Housing acted swiftly to provide alternative accommodation following alleged threats from drug dealers.

7. South Yorkshire Police identified that while they recognised domestic abuse there were probably further opportunities to look for indicators of abuse within anti-social behaviour calls. See Appendix A
8. Housing and Estate Service Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council received about twenty calls to Neil and Emma's last address. Some of those incidents, arguing, shouting, self-harm and threats could also be indicators of domestic abuse, albeit it was not always clear from the notes who was the victim and who was the perpetrator. See Appendix B
9. Tariq and Emma began a relationship which distressed Neil who had hopes it would be a short lived infatuation.
10. Neil self-harmed when it became apparent that Tariq had obtained her sole attention.
11. The level of activity between the trio and agencies, albeit it very frequent, never reached the threshold for a formal referral through a recognised pathway to a multi-agency forum.
12. Tariq and Emma plotted to kill Neil so that he would be out of their lives.
13. The judge who heard all the evidence over a long trial concluded that Tariq was the driving force behind the murder.

8. CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1 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.
- 8.2 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.
- 8.3 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.

- 8.4 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.
- 8.5 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.
- 8.6 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.
- 8.7 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.
- 8.8 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.
- 8.9 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.
- 8.10 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.
- 8.11 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.
- 8.12 An example of this is the disclosure he made to the Community Rehabilitation Company in June 2016 after Emma tried to stab him with a syringe. 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.

8.13 The DHR 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 debated whether 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 risk⁷ of causing harm to Neil. Therefore taking all these things into account the panel unanimously felt that on balance the decisions not to submit an intelligence report to the police by the Community rehabilitation Company and the Housing office about the alleged attempting stabbing was appropriate.

8.14 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.

8.15 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.

8.16 9. LEARNING ARISING FROM THE REVIEW

9.1 The key learning is:

Agency	Learning
Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clients with chaotic lifestyles will not always engage but good practice and duty of care requires practitioners/professionals to persevere. 2. Counselling support for the client, relationship programmes to support the client and

⁷ A generally accepted definition of standard risk is: Current evidence does not indicate likelihood of serious harm.

	<p>perpetrator are all options that could have been explored.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Accurate up to date case notes, detailed factual information. 4. Acknowledgement is required in respect of the lack of formal supervision for the Independent Domestic Abuse Advocates during this time period
General Practitioner	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The need to record details of people who accompany patients to consultations.
Rotherham Council Housing Services and Community Safety Unit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not recognising signs of domestic abuse. 2. Delays in taking enforcement action. 3. The need to have current contact details of agencies who support victims of domestic abuse. 4. The reduction in the number of multi-agency Safer Neighbourhood meetings means that information is not shared as frequently, widely or in such depth.
Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Further exploration of the allegation in the safeguarding information of 26 February 2013 may have given more clarity round risk.
The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The names of people attending with the patient were not always recorded.
South Yorkshire Police	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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

	<p>brought about by the stresses of an abusive relationship.</p>
<p>South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 3. Neil had difficulty accessing staff in the final fortnight of his supervision because of the unserviceability of IT systems. A review is being undertaken to address client services during system downtimes and Responsible Officer absences.
<p>Domestic Homicide Review Panel</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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]. 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. 2. 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. 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.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS

Agency	Recommendation
Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To review the domestic abuse strategy. 2. Review the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service’s handbook.
Rotherham Council Housing Services and Community Safety Unit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure that all front line staff have been trained in the Domestic Abuse Stalking and Honour Based Violence⁸ risk assessment model and include the principles of dynamic risk and continuous assessment of cases. 2. To improve cross service collaboration when considering the use of enforcement tools (such as Civil Injunctions) 3. That the Domestic Abuse Allocation Policy be developed to become a living document with relevant contact details of local as well as national supporting services. 4. Consideration be given to changing the terms of reference for the Case Identification Meetings to reflect both a more operational focus.
The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure compliance with the Health Records Policy.
South Yorkshire Police	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Officers to provide a more comprehensive narrative when completing risk assessments on victims who are reluctant to engage. 2. That officers should be alert to tangential indicators of domestic abuse when dealing with what appear to be anti-social behaviour incidents.
South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To introduce vulnerability assessment as part of the risk assessment process and launch victim safety planning for all vulnerable service users. 2. To provide practitioner refresher briefings for working with substance misusers

⁸ Honour based violence is now generally referred to as, 'so called honour based violence.

	<p>3. To review and address client services and needs during information communications technology downtime and responsible officer absence</p>
<p>Domestic Homicide Review Panel</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>2. That the Safer Rotherham Partnership ensures that agencies complete the recommendations they made for this review.</p>