



## **Overview report of the Domestic Homicide Review into the death of Laura.**

Initial report and analysis: Dr Jane Monckton Smith

Independent chair and report writer for submission to the Home  
Office: Elizabeth Hanlon

May 2018

Title		Page number
Main report	1.0	2
Introduction, background and commissioning of the review		2
Review panel		4
Reasons for conducting the review		5
Terms of reference		5
Details of parallel processes		7
Subjects of the review		7
Objectives of the review		8
Diversity considerations		9
The facts	2.0	10
Case specific background		10
Individual management reviews		11
Family involvement		12
Key episodes		15
Analysis	3.0	22
Conclusion	4.0	27
Recommendations	5.0	29
Previous reviews	Appendix A	30
Chronology	Appendix B	33
Glossary	Appendix C	48

## **Main overview report**

### **Section 1: Introduction**

#### **1.1 The Commissioning of the review**

1.2 This overview report has been commissioned by the Colchester Community Safety Partnership concerning the death of Laura that occurred in September 2013. The independent chair and report writer for this latest review is Elizabeth Hanlon, who is independent of Colchester Community Safety Partnership and all agencies associated with this overview report. She is a former (retired) senior police detective who has several years' experience of partnership working and involvement with several previous domestic homicide reviews, partnership reviews and serious case reviews. She has written several Domestic Homicide Review for Hertfordshire and Essex County Council. She is also the

current independent chair for the Hertfordshire Safeguarding Adults Board. Elizabeth Hanlon was commissioned to review the previous report and recommendations presented by independent chair Dr Jane Monckton Smith. This overview report pulls together that review and has been adapted for submission to the Home Office. The review panel would like to extend their thanks to Dr Jane Monckton Smith for all her work in carrying out the previous review process. They would also like to express their thanks to Major Adrian Grinonneau for conducting the first review.

1.3 It is important to understand what happened in this case at the time, to examine the professionals' perspective at that time, although it is likely as a consequence that hindsight will be encountered. This will be rationalised by taking key matters forward in order to broaden professionals' awareness both for the future and to ensure that best and current practice is embedded and that any learning is maximised both locally and nationally.

1.4 The death of any person in circumstances such as examined herein is a tragedy. Family members were contacted during this review and a request was made to speak to them regarding the family dynamics. The family of Laura were provided with the Home Office leaflet for families, and were represented by a specialist advocate from AAFDA (Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse).

1.5 The family were provided with a copy of the Terms of Reference and invited to contribute and comment. Jane Monckton Smith met with them to talk through the process, and to learn about Laura. The family made suggestions about the scope of the review and suggested people to talk to. All these people were approached and asked if they wanted to contribute. All declined to contribute or did not respond.

1.6 The family have been involved in the review from an early stage. They were visited by the first Chair in April 2014, and were involved in the decision to re-visit the review after the first Overview Report. They did not want to meet with the panel. They have been updated through their AAFDA advocate. The family also met three times with the second Independent Chair.

1.7 Elizabeth Hanlon met with the family together with their advocate and talked through the amended report. The final report has been shared with the family after being returned by the Home Office and a publication date was agreed.

1.8 The panel wish to send their condolences to the family of Laura. They would also like to thank them for their time and patience throughout the review process. Pseudonyms for both the victim and the perpetrator have been used throughout this report to maintain anonymity. The family were spoken to regarding the anonymity of the report and stated that they were happy for the name Laura and to be used.

1.9 The Home Office were notified by Colchester Community Safety Partnership (CSP) on the 17<sup>th</sup> September 2013 of their intention to carry out a Domestic Homicide review. The Essex Coroner was also notified that a Domestic Homicide Review was taking place. Given the criminal conviction of Paul for Laura’s murder, a formal inquest was no longer required.

1.10 The Domestic Homicide Review was started in April 2014 when the first meeting took place. The reasons for the lengthy review process have been documented in appendix A.

1.11 Paul was subsequently convicted of the murder of Laura in April 2014 and sentenced to life imprisonment with a tariff of 23 years.

1.12 The findings of each Individual Management Review (IMR) are confidential. At the beginning of the meetings of the review panel, attendees were asked to sign a confidential agreement.

**1.13 The Review Panel in relation to the agreed report and recommendations**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position/Organisation</b>
Elizabeth Hanlon	Independent Chair and Report Writer
Melanie Rundle	Community Safety and Initiatives Manager, Colchester Community Safety management.
Alison Hooper	Detective Inspector, Essex Police
Chris Pearson	Senior Probation Manager, National Probation Service
Andrew Harley	Equality and Safeguarding Co-ordinator, Colchester Borough Council
Helen Hammond	Named Nurse Safeguarding Children, Virgin Healthcare
Paul Secker	Director for Safeguarding Children, Essex County Council
Ruth Cherry-Galal	SaferPlaces
Sandra Garner	Designated Nurse Safeguarding Children, North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group.
Sonia Carr	Minute taker, Colchester Borough Council

**1.14 Reasons for conducting the review**

1.15 A Community Safety Partnership (CSP) has a statutory duty to enquire about the death of a person in accordance with the provisions of the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004, Section 9(3)(a). Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) came into force on 13<sup>th</sup> April 2011. The Act states that a DHR should be a review:

Of the circumstances in which the death of a person aged 16 or over has, or appears to have, resulted from violence, abuse or neglect by –

A person to whom he/she was related or with whom he/she was or had been in an intimate relationship with, or

A member of the same household as themselves, held with a view to identifying the lessons learnt from the death.

1.16 The purpose of a Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) is to:

- 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 upon, and what is expected to change as a result;
- c) Apply these lessons to service responses including changes to policies and procedures as appropriate; and
- d) Prevent domestic violence and abuse homicide and improve service responses for all domestic violence and abuse victims and their children through improved intra and inter-agency working.

### **1.17 Terms of Reference**

In conducting the Domestic Homicide Review into the death of Laura, the Panel shall have regard: -

- To examine the roles of the organisations involved in the case, the extent to which they had involvement with those agencies, and the appropriateness of single agency and partnership responses to the case.
- To establish whether there are lessons to be learnt from this case about the way in which organisations and partnerships carried out their responsibilities to safeguard the wellbeing of Laura.
- To identify clearly what those lessons are, how they will be acted upon, and what is expected to change as a result.
- To identify whether, as a result, there is a need for changes in organisational and/or partnership policy, procedures or practice in Colchester in order to improve their work to better safeguard victims of domestic abuse.
- To produce a chronology of events and actions leading up to, and in relation to the death of Laura from the period from 1st July 2004 until September 2013 seeking information from: Organisations who had contact with the victim, the perpetrator and their families, local community organisations, their family and friends.

- To review current roles, responsibilities, policies and practices in relation to victims of domestic abuse – to build up a picture of what should have happened
- To review this against what actually happened to draw out the strengths and weaknesses
- To review national best practice in respect of protecting adults from domestic abuse
- To draw out conclusions about how organisations and partnerships can improve their working in the future to support victims of domestic abuse

The review will also specifically consider:

- An assessment of whether family and friends were aware of any abusive or concerning behaviour from the perpetrator to the victim (or other persons).
- An assessment of whether family and friends were aware of any abusive or concerning behaviour from the victim to the perpetrator (or other persons).
- A review of any barriers experienced by the family or any other person, in reporting any abuse or concerns, including whether they (or the victim) knew how to report domestic abuse had they wanted to.
- A review of any previous concerning conduct or a history of abusive behaviour from the perpetrator and whether this was known to any agencies.
- An evaluation of any training or awareness raising requirements that are necessary to ensure a greater knowledge and understanding of domestic abuse processes and / or services in Colchester.
- Whether family and friends want to participate in the review. If so, find out if they were aware of any abusive behaviour by the perpetrator prior to the homicide.
- Communication to the general public and non-specialist services about available specialist services related to domestic abuse or violence.
- Whether the work undertaken by the services in this case was consistent with their own professional standards, compliant with their own protocols, guidelines, policies and procedures.
- To review the previous overview report.
- Any other information that becomes relevant during the conduct of the review.

8. The panel shall also request access to any parallel reviews taking place by individual agencies regarding their involvement with either Laura or Paul.

9. The Panel shall seek Information in respect of the background and any previous convictions of Paul and whether or not they had ever been subject to Multi Agency Public Protection (MAPPA) Arrangements or Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programs (DVPP).

10. The Overview Report shall be written by the nominated Review Panel Report Author who shall, subject to the agreement of the Panel Chair, submit a draft to the Panel for its consideration. The Report shall set out the extent, from the findings of the review, whether there are improvements that could be made in the way in which relevant agencies and organisations can work individually or together to safeguard future potential victims. The Panel shall also consider whether further information should be made available in the public domain for the benefit of family or friends who have concerns relating to potential abusive relationships.

11. Subject to 10. above the Panel will identify any changes in policies and procedures arising from the lessons learnt, make recommendations and will, through an agreed Action Plan, establish timescales for their implementation and identify what is likely to change as a result.

12. The Panel shall, once it has agreed the final report, submit it to the Colchester District Community Safety Partnership for its consideration. The Partnership will be requested to consider the content of the report, the recommendations and the associated Action Plan. If the Partnership is satisfied with the report, it shall be requested to:

- (a) submit the report to the Home Office;
- (b) consider whether, prior to the Home Office response, there are issues that should be brought to the immediate attention of Safer Essex; and
- (c) consider which agencies, organisations or individuals should receive a copy of the report and the degree to which its findings should be made public, following the approval of the report by the Home Office.

#### **1.18 Details of parallel reviews/processes**

1.19 There were no parallel reviews taking place.

#### **1.20 Subjects of the review**

<b>Name (pseudonyms)</b>	<b>Relationship</b>	<b>Ethnic Origin</b>
Laura	Victim	White British
Paul	Perpetrator	White British
Jill	Former partner of Pauls	White British

#### **1.21 Objectives of the review**

1.22 The purpose of Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) is to give an accurate as possible account of what originally transpired in an agency's response to Laura, to evaluate it fairly, and if necessary to identify any improvements for future practice.

1.23 Scoping letters were sent out to GP services, School, Children's Community Health Service, Family services, Essex Police, Colchester Borough Homes and the National Probation Service and as a result of the information received, agencies were asked to submit chronologies. Following a meeting the chronologies were discussed and a decision was made that Individual Management Reviews (IMRs) would be requested from Essex Police, Colchester Borough Homes and the National Probation Service. Information was also provided by the GP surgery and the schools attended by Laura's child. The panel also received comprehensive health records. The Police also supplied statements taken during the course of their investigation to the chair of the review panel.

1.24 This overall report is based on the relevant information obtained from those IMRs. These reports were written by professionals who are independent from any involvement with the victim, family, friends or the perpetrators. Should actions be necessary by any of the agencies, the maintenance of, and strategic ownership of any action plan will be the overall responsibility of the Colchester Community Safety Partnership (CSP). It is essential that any resulting ownership and recommended activity is addressed accordingly.

1.25 Whilst key issues have been shared with organisations the report will not be disseminated until appropriate clearance has been received from the Home Office Quality Assurance Group. In order to secure agreement, pre-publication drafts of this overview report are shared by the membership of the Review panel, commissioning officers and members of the Colchester Community Safety Partnership. The associated reports from agencies will not be individually published.

#### **1.26 Police**

Since the time of this incident there have been large scale changes into the management of Domestic Abuse within Essex Police.

1.27 Dedicated teams have been set up in each Local Policing Area and deal with all High and Medium Risk Domestic Abuse crime investigations and are overseen by a Detective Inspector and Detective Sergeants supervising a combination of Detective and Police Constables. Standard risk investigations are dealt with by Local Policing Teams.

1.28 Domestic abuse incidents are attended by Local Policing Team officers who will conduct the DASH risk assessment with the victim and assess the risk as High, Medium or Standard. This risk assessment will then be checked and verified by their supervisor.



1.29 High Risk cases are referred into the Central Referral Unit within the Public Protection Command for enhanced safeguarding.

1.30 ATHENA was introduced in April 2015 and replaced the Crime Recording system, Protect, Intelligence and Custody systems, bring them all together in one system so information is more easily accessible.

### **1.31 National Probation Service**

1.32 In June 2014, The Ministry of Justice (MOJ) split 35 probation trusts into a public sector National Probation Service (NPS) and 21 new Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs). The NPS now advises courts on sentencing all offenders and manages those offenders presenting a high risk of serious harm. CRCs supervise offenders presenting low and medium risk of serious harm. CRCs were in public ownership until February 2015 when, following an extensive procurement, they transferred to eight, mainly private sector, providers working under contract to the National Offender Management Service.

1.33 Essex CRC provides statutory supervision to adults (over 18 years) subject to Community Orders, Suspended Sentence Orders and those released from prison subject to a period on licence and Post Sentence Supervision Period who reside in Essex including Southend and Thurrock. Essex CRC complete risk assessments and sentence plans for those under statutory supervision.

### **1.34 Diversity considerations**

1.35 All of the protected characteristics of the 2010 Equality Act were considered by both the IMR authors and the DHR panel.

1.36 Sex: Gender is always relevant in cases of domestic homicide. Women are far more likely to be killed as a result of domestic abuse, and men are far more likely to be offenders. The majority of victims of domestic homicides recorded between April 2013 and March 2016 were females (70%).<sup>1</sup>

## **Section 2: The facts**

### **2.1 Case specific background**

2.2 Laura lived in a flat on a social housing estate in Colchester. She was the sole tenant, and was recorded as living in the flat with her four-year-old child. Paul lived there with her

---

<sup>1</sup> Office of National Statistics for Domestic Abuse for England and Wales ending in March 2017

also, but was not named on the tenancy. He had been in a relationship with Laura for around twelve to eighteen months.

2.3 Paul had come to live with Laura on being released from prison. He is said to have left the prison and gone to seek out Laura immediately. They were not known to have had a relationship prior to this, but had met some years previously when Laura was in a relationship with Paul's brother. Paul moved in with Laura very quickly and this may have been a mixture of his own need to be in control of the situation, and is quite common in domestic abuse and coercive control. It is also likely to have been tied to his difficulties in securing accommodation for himself on leaving prison.

2.4 Paul did not contribute financially to the household and did not have regular work. Laura had been working but had to resign from her job as it is believed that Paul became unreliable as a carer for her child when she was at work.

2.5 In September 2013 Laura and Paul were at their home address and Laura's child was present also. They were having a drink with a few friends from the local area. Laura was drinking alcohol, and Paul was drinking alcohol too, Paul appeared to be very drunk. There was also cocaine in his urine the following morning.

2.6 Paul and Laura were heard arguing loudly in the kitchen, and because of this the friends were asked to leave the house by Laura.

2.7 It is said that the argument stemmed from Paul's jealousy. He had been searching Laura's phone and had found contact with a male friend. The contact was not intimate and Laura was not having a relationship with the man. It appears that Paul had accused Laura of having an affair with another man on several occasions.

2.8 Family also say that Paul had been asking about Laura's contact with an old friend, and behaving strangely. Paul was showing controlling and jealous behaviour, and his paranoid tendencies were escalating in response to Laura's apologies on that night.

2.9 Laura's child, who was there at the time, told police that Laura was apologising to him. Some thirty minutes later Laura turned up at a friend's house stating that Paul had beaten her and smashed her phone. She stayed for around twenty minutes but then went home. This is estimated to be about 0130. Laura told her friend that she didn't want to leave her child with Paul.

2.10 Loud arguing was heard by neighbours until around 0300.

2.11 The following morning a female neighbour saw Laura's child in the street outside the house. The child told the neighbour that their mummy was dead. The neighbour went into the house and found Laura on the floor in the lounge. There was a significant amount of blood on Laura and in the house.

2.12 At 0726 Essex Police received a call from the Ambulance Service that they were treating a 23 year old woman (Laura) in cardiac arrest. She died at the scene whilst being treated for multiple stab wounds.

2.13 Laura had six stab wounds to her neck and chest. The child was present and had witnessed the murder. The key suspect was Paul and he was arrested on suspicion of Laura's murder.

2.14 At the time of this murder Paul was on Police bail for threatening a former girlfriend and her family with violence and sexual assault.

## **2.15 Individual Management Reviews**

2.16 The aims of the Individual Management Reviews (IMRs) are to:

- Enable and encourage agencies to look openly and critically at individual and organisational practice and the context within which people were working;
- Identify whether the homicide indicates that changes to practice could and should be made;
- Identify how those changes will be brought about; and
- Identify examples of good practice within agencies.

2.17 The initial chair and overview report writer guided the IMR authors through the process for the development of each IMR, as follows:

- Securing agency records;
- Commissioning IMRs;
- Gaining consent to view records;
- Drawing up a chronology;
- Conducting a desk-based review which investigated the agency's involvement relative to the agency's policies and procedures; relevant partnership / multi-agency policies and protocols; professional standards and good practice; and national and local research and evidence-based practice;
- Conducting interviews with relevant staff;
- Writing the IMR including analysing the information and making recommendations;
- Ensuring the report is quality-assured through the process of counter-signing by a senior accountable manager; the same guidance includes advice on:
- Conducting parallel investigations of disciplinary matters and complaints which will

- not be reported which are internal agency matters;
- Providing feedback and debriefing to relevant staff;

2.18 IMR authors were informed of the primary objectives of the process, which is to give as accurate as possible an account of what originally transpired in the agency's response to Laura and Paul and to evaluate it fairly, and to identify areas for improvement for future service delivery. IMR authors were encouraged to propose specific solutions which are likely to provide a more effective response to a similar situation in the future. The IMRs have also assessed the changes that have taken place in service provision during the timescale of the review and considered if changes are required to better meet the needs of individuals at risk of, or experiencing domestic abuse.

2.19 Agencies each prepared a chronology of their agency involvement and significant events during the specified time period. These chronologies were analysed by the Review Panel.

2.20 IMR authors produced a first draft of their reports which were quality assured within their own organisations through the signing-off process. These IMRs were then analysed by the Review Panel and discussed with the authors. Copies of IMRs had been circulated to all the panel members prior to these meetings and panel members were able to cross-reference significant events and highlight missing information.

## **2.21 Family involvement**

2.22 Laura's family state that when Paul was released from prison and was living with Laura, the two of them initially kept it a secret from friends and family. Paul is believed to have moved in with Laura at the beginning of 2013. Laura's family believe this was because of the previous relationship with Paul's brother. It could also have been because Paul had not accepted the end of his relationship with Jill. Family also say they were shocked when they found out about the relationship as Paul was not the type of man that Laura would ordinarily have been attracted to.

2.23 Laura's family state that Paul was not friendly with them and they did not really get to know him. Whenever they visited Laura and her child at home he would always stay out of the room. It was also said that Laura would leave the room to go and sit with Paul in the kitchen, and leave her family with her child, not returning to spend time with them. This was seen as quite concerning, and out of character for Laura.

2.24 This is a common behaviour of people living with controlling and abusive partners. The controlling person isolates the victim from outside influence, especially friends and family. They often make it a point that the victim must prove their loyalty. Laura may well

have felt she was walking on eggshells and been very worried about talking to her mother. There may well have been consequences for Laura in having her mother in the home. The evidence strongly suggests that Laura's behaviour was changing and those changes reflected chronic fear of Paul.

2.25 Chronic Fear is different to immediate fear of violence and can make people behave in ways which others do not necessarily understand. Chronic fear is related to fear of consequences, rather than just violence. It may be that there were consequences for Laura if her mother turned up to visit.

2.26 Laura would turn up regularly at her mum's flat with her child saying she had argued with Paul. She would ask to stay the night. She was always gone before morning, back to her home with Paul, but would leave her child with her mum. This may have been keeping her child away from the danger, or managing Paul's moods; perpetrators often complain about the behaviour of children so mums lock them away, or get them away, to stop things escalating. Reports from her child show that they were often locked in their bedroom. This is common behaviour. Perpetrators will complain about the attention the child is getting, or get angry by normal child behaviours like noise or crying. Laura leaving her child with her mum is a sign that she may have been trying to manage things and manage Paul's moods.

2.27 In the summer of 2013 Laura began to change. Her mother described being aware that Laura and Paul were having a lot of arguments and that on several occasions she would have to leave work early to go and pick Laura up after she had had a row with Paul. Laura's mother also believed that Laura had ended the relationship with Paul on several occasions. Laura's family stated that Laura stopped looking after her appearance, and stopped tidying her home. Laura's family say that although the home was not dirty, it was untidy and there were often signs of damage and broken things lying around which had not been cleared. This is another classic sign of domestic abuse and coercive control. Laura started to pay less attention to herself and her home. She may have been focusing her attention on Paul. He may have objected to her spending time on herself or the home. Laura was also giving Paul money and was asking to borrow money from family members. She had stopped paying her rent. Her things were seen lying broken around the living areas.

2.28 In August 2013 Laura's child minder let her down and had refused to take her child to nursery. This coincided with Laura changing from working the day shift to the night shift. Paul and Laura's mother started looking after her child but Paul would let her down at the last minute and would always put conditions on him helping out. As a result of this Laura had to leave her job. This is not uncommon in coercive control and domestic abuse situations, where the victim becomes isolated from all help, the perpetrator makes themselves indispensable and then use that to further control the activities of the victim.

2.29 Laura's family state that Laura had fallen out with her friends because of Paul's behaviour and their relationship. Laura took the side of Paul when her friend alleged that he stole her car. Friends of Laura believe that she lost her job as Paul had caused damage to Laura's friends car, this friend also was Laura's boss.

2.30 In the weeks before Laura's murder, Laura's mother says she noticed a change in Laura's child. She says the child had started to show signs of anxiety and was wetting the bed. She said that upon Laura's death she noticed that Laura's child's bed at her home was absolutely soaked with urine. It was also noticed by the family that a stairgate had been put up at the door of child which was identified as being unusual. This suggests that the child was both anxious and controlled. This is an indication of domestic abuse and coercive control.

2.31 Laura's mum didn't like Paul so was quite surprised when he turned up at her flat one night 'out of the blue'. He was on his own and behaved very strangely and wanted to know where Laura was. He said he had been at a party close by. Laura's mum was suspicious and assumed he was out looking for Laura. She made him leave. This is characteristic of stalking behavior directed at Laura. This behaviour was not known to any agency.

2.32 Friends of Laura stated that both Laura and Paul drank heavily, although Laura would appear to be happy and in control when drunk, Paul would sometimes turn aggressive and become verbally agitated towards them. They stated that they would often hear Laura and Paul having arguments. One friend described Laura and Paul as having "major rows once a week for the whole street to hear". Friends describe Laura showing them bruising but always saying that Paul had only caused them through play fighting and that he hadn't meant to hurt her. One friend had also seen a mark on her chest which Laura stated she had received from Paul where he had bitten her. This was also described as being in jest.

2.33 Laura's friend described Paul as being a jealous man and always wanting to know where Laura was and who she was out with.

## **2.34 Key episodes**

**11.2.2006** Paul is charged with racially aggravated assault but the proceedings were withdrawn. We have no other information on this incident. However, it sits within a known history of bullying which seems to have been a pattern through his early years.

**17.3.2006** Paul is arrested for an alleged assault and again no action was taken. Paul's problem behaviours appear to be escalating. He has known and documented issues with

violence, both his own, and in his home life. He is called a bully and is known to have psychological problems. A referral for support at this time may have been helpful.

**15.01.2007** Paul is arrested for a serious assault on a male in a public place. He caused life changing injuries to that person, and was accused of kicking and stamping to the victim's face and head after luring him into an alleyway. This offence was committed jointly with another male. Paul was charged with, and convicted of, a S.18 Grievous Bodily Harm for which he was sentenced to 72 months in prison. At this point Paul was considered to be high risk to the public.

**14.03.2007** Paul was seen by mental health services and considered to have no mental illness that required follow up.

**04.2008** Laura reports an incident of domestic abuse/violence to the police. She is in a relationship with a man from what is described as a known violent family (Paul's brother). She reported that he had hit her in the face and smashed up her house. Police noted criminal damage and there is suggestion there may have been a strangulation assault, but as the word 'neck' is used rather than throat it is difficult to tell. She had also been punched in the face. At this point the police assessed the risk to Laura as medium. Laura is 19 years old at this time and too old for children's services. Paul's brother was arrested and convicted receiving a community sentence and requirement to attend a community domestic abuse programme.

**10.11.08** Laura has been in some kind of relationship with a male who died on this day. He was killed in a motorbike accident. It is not known if this was a longer term relationship, but she may have been grieving at this time. This male subsequently was found to be the father of Laura's child. It is noted in reports that the male died just two days after conception. (Laura was only 19 years old at this point).

**14.04.2009** Laura is accepted as homeless. Laura is also pregnant.

**07.09** There are many visits with baby clinics for Laura and her baby around this time. All visits record a good loving relationship between Laura and the baby. No problems are noted. Laura is fully engaged.

**19.10.2009** Laura is struggling with debt and cannot pay her bills or rent. Colchester Borough Homes served a notice seeking repossession.

**13.11.2009** Paul is released from prison on licence. His sentence expiry date (SED) was 5.11.2012. This meant that Paul was expected to live in the community under some scrutiny and support from the probation service until this date. Paul was considered as High Risk to

the public, and as having alcohol misuse issues at the point of his release. He was released to live at his father's address.

**18.11.2009** A full Offender Assessment (OASys Risk assessment used by the National Probation Service) was completed with Paul which included a risk management plan.

**12.2009** Paul's father's partner suffered a late miscarriage and this affected the family group. Paul is said to be in low mood by his offender manager at this time and has been drinking alcohol with his father. A funeral is being arranged. At this time Paul fails to attend a basic skills assessment and reports that he is experiencing financial problems. Due to the circumstances of the bereavement Paul was not sanctioned.

**4.01.2010** Paul suffers a second bereavement when his grandfather dies on New Year's Eve.

**2.02.2010** Paul reports to his offender manager that he has started a relationship with Jill.

**15.02.2010** Paul makes a request to be able to live with Jill. This very quick beginning to a relationship is a noted risk marker for men who have control and relationship issues. Although not necessarily concerning on its own, when put in the context of violence and abuse it does add to the risk profile. The offender manager refused Paul's request to move in with Jill, which was a good decision. The offender manager also noted concerns with Paul's alcohol use and asked him to complete 'drink diaries'. At this point the safety of Jill could have been a key factor in Paul's management. Violent people are very often violent or controlling in their domestic lives, there is often what is called 'criminal coherence'. This just means that violence is a response to challenges and this will be a feature wherever that challenge occurs. The private nature of personal relationships makes partners particularly vulnerable to violent offenders.

**15.03.2010** Paul's offender manager notes that Paul is still considered high risk to the public. The report included an updated sentence plan with objectives for Paul to attend an Offender Substance Abuse Programme.

**23.03.2010** Paul makes another request to move in with Jill. The offender manager advises against this and informs Paul of the need for a home visit. This persistence around formalising a relationship and seeking to make things exclusive with Jill very quickly is a marker for concern.

**21.04.2010** There is a home visit with Jill and it is considered suitable for Paul to move in with her. There is no information from the records as to whether Jill received any disclosure about Paul's violent past and whether this should be considered suitable for Jill.



**05.05.2010** Paul says he has proposed to Jill.

**25.05.2010** Paul's estimated risk to the public is reduced to medium harm, which means 'there are identifiable indicators of risk of serious harm. The offender has the potential to cause serious harm but is unlikely to do so unless there is a change in circumstances, for example, failure to take medication, loss of accommodation, relationship breakdown, drug or alcohol misuse'. Any decision to reduce harm from high risk to medium risk requires management oversight. This does not appear to be unreasonable to this case. There is, however, some debate as to whether at the point of beginning a relationship someone like Paul should be monitored more closely to assess how they deal with the pressures of a relationship before having their risk reduced. This is especially the case when a relationship is moved on very fast, with a proposal of marriage and co-habitation so fast after meeting. This is a known behaviour of those men likely to be coercive and controlling. The start of a relationship is not always a sign of stability; it is a time of potentially increased pressure. The National Probation Service, however, assessed Paul as entering a stable relationship, having a stable home life and employment which indicated a lowering of risk factors to them.

**3.08.2010** Paul is arrested for theft and this is related to a domestic dispute between him and Jill and Paul's heavy drinking. Recall to prison is instigated.

**6.08.2010** Paul is recalled to custody as the result of an allegation of two offences of theft, but police take no action over the allegations. Whilst in prison Paul contacts Jill and her mother and threatens to kill himself. Threats of self-harm in a relationship, especially where that threat is made to a partner, is a high risk marker.

**28.08.2010** The recall process is completed and no recommendation for release is made at this time taking into consideration the seriousness of the index offence, and because there was alcohol involved in both incidents. There is no mention of the risk he poses to Jill. His risk to the public despite this, remains at medium.

**17.12.2010** Paul is due for release on the 20<sup>th</sup> December. He is required to take an alcohol management programme in the community. Paul is to be released to Jill's address. He tells his offender manager that Jill's mum has spoken to him about his treatment of Jill, especially when he was in custody.

Given this information there could have been some discussion of domestic abuse especially as there are now a number of known high risk markers present which all have the potential to raise the risk to Jill. The focus appears to be on Paul's alcohol misuse. Alcohol is not a cause of the behaviours which constitute domestic abuse or coercive control, but it can exacerbate problems and should be considered an aggravating risk marker. Coercive Control and domestic abuse should be considered a separate problem to alcohol misuse.

**20.12.2010** Paul is released from prison on license. At this time, he is not living with Jill and it appears that their relationship is not going well, if in fact there is still a relationship.

**01.2011** There is a referral to mental health services for Paul due to his threats to self harm, and he has been asked to leave Jill's home. He is living back with his father. Paul is still assessed as medium risk to the public.

**12.01.2011** Paul denies there are any problems with his relationship with Jill and says that they still plan to marry. This may not be the way Jill perceived the relationship, there is no comment from her. It seems they cannot live together and Jill could have had no intention of continuing a relationship with Paul. It is often a problem with controlling and violent men that they will not accept the end of a relationship and may even deny it is happening. This can become dangerous for Jill especially where any denial or stalking becomes clear.

Paul is seen by mental health services with reference to his suicidal ideation and threats whilst in prison. It is decided there is no need for follow up. This referral to the mental health services from Probation was good practice.

**27.01.11 and 10.02.11** Paul completes his pre programme work on alcohol with his Offender manager.

**02.2011** Paul tells his probation manager that Jill is pregnant, he says the pregnancy is unplanned but both are happy about it. Pregnancy is a high risk time for women being controlled/abused and Paul has a history of serious violence, alcohol misuse, domestic 'incidents' and mental health issues related to violence and self-harm.<sup>2</sup> The knowledge that Jill was pregnant should have triggered a review of the OASys, a referral was subsequently made to Children's Social Care.

**02.04.2011** Laura calls 999 to report that she has injured herself falling over a tow bar. She was not taken to hospital, and did not present herself there. It is not known what the context was for this incident as there were no notes recording it. It is not known why Laura would phone 999 for an injury that didn't require hospital treatment, and that as soon as paramedics arrived, she did not consider it an emergency. Laura was not in the habit of calling 999. Better record keeping could have helped identify the problem for Laura at this time.

**24.04.2011** Paul received a second recall to prison on 6.5.2011 for offences of taking a vehicle without the owner's consent, driving without insurance, driving other than in

---

<sup>2</sup> Pregnant women are at an increased risk of domestic abuse, with prevalence rates of 5% to 21% during pregnancy and 13% to 21% postnatally.

accordance with a licence, and driving with excess alcohol. Paul was sentenced to 8 weeks in prison which he served during his period of recall.

The circumstances surrounding this recall were domestic in nature. Jill's mother called police and reported a domestic abuse incident between Paul and Jill, and also that he had taken her car. She told police that Jill was pregnant with Paul's child. He had made statements saying he hoped the baby would die, and also that Jill's mother would die. He was drunk.

**06.05.2011** Paul is recalled to prison

**07.05.11** Paul was charged and convicted and received an eight week sentence. Paul was kept in custody until his Sentence End Date. Police risk assessed Jill using the Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Honour based Violence Risk Identification Checklist (DASH) at medium risk of harm. This medium risk assessment could be questioned as Paul is talking about relationship problems, he is accused of domestic abuse, he has a history of serious violence, he has mental health issues, he is talking about death, and he is on licence and is a risk to public.

It seems from probation records that Paul did not attend any alcohol programmes whilst on licence.

**14.05.11** Children's Social Care carry out an initial assessment in relation to Jill due to her being pregnant following a referral from Paul's Offender Manager.

**10.2011** Jill has her baby.

**02.11.11** Probation make a referral for an assessment to take place surrounding Jill and the new baby, given Paul's history and his plans to return home to where they both reside.

**18.11.11** The initial assessment was completed. Jill stated that Paul did not pose a risk to the baby as there had been no domestic violence between them. She stated that they had only had two arguments within the three year relationship. A recommendation was made that a core assessment was required. This is good practice.

**22.11.2011** Jill's mother dies suddenly.

**11.2011** Paul said he intends to live with Jill and the new baby when he leaves prison. This is not confirmed by Jill. She is very vulnerable at this time having just lost her mother, and now having to find new accommodation for herself and her baby.

**01.2012** Probation reports say there is no evidence of domestic abuse between Jill and Paul. Jill has advised that Paul would not be living with her upon his release. There have been no reported assaults on Jill by Paul, however there has been a history of threats to harm both Jill, her mother and Jill's baby. The National Probation Service utilize information from the Police regarding any call outs for domestic abuse as well as the current assessment from the Offender Manager.

**10.01.2012** The case is closed by social care and it seems there are no concerns about Paul and Jill.

**18.01.2012** Jill says she does not want Paul to come and live with her. She says she is trying to cope with bereavement and the new baby, and Paul has threatened self-harm.

**23.01.2011** Paul needs to find an address if he is to have early release. He will have licence conditions not to enter licensed premises without the approval of his probation officer. Paul is to stay in prison until his SED and will not be considered for early release. This is because he was fighting in prison. He will stay in prison now until November.

**17.11.2011** Laura is noted by her GP to have bruising to her thigh. No context is given for this injury. It was apparently an old injury that was not fading. There was no Routine Enquiry from the GP around domestic abuse. Routine Enquiry (RE) is an established practice where health and other professionals ask as a matter of routine about a person's home life, to give them the opportunity to talk about any problems or issues, or to disclose domestic abuse.

**03.2012** Jill has a new partner in her home. This was noted by the Health Visitor. He was not seen by the Health Visitor as he stayed in another room.

**21.02.2012** Jill is taking the baby to visit Paul in prison. She is in another relationship now, not with Paul.

**15.11.2012** Paul is released from prison at the end of his sentence date and goes straight to Laura's home. No agencies appear to be aware of the new relationship between Paul and Laura. As a previous MAPPA case, although there is no statutory probation supervision upon release a report to other involved agencies should have been made to inform them of the offender's release with an up-to-date risk management plan. This process is now in place within Essex.

**31.12.12** Paul and Laura's brother are involved in a fight at a New Year's Eve party. Family members state that Paul was extremely insulting and abusive to Laura. This incident was not reported to the Police.

**08.04.2013** Jill makes a 999 call after receiving threats from Paul that he is going to kill her and her child and mother, and to sexually assault them. He talked of masturbating over their dead bodies. Jill stated that she had received 23 calls in one week. The risk assessment classed Jill as medium risk. This could have been considered high risk if the behaviours reported were given due weight. Threats to kill and stalking are both very high risk behaviours. Paul was arrested, he denied the offences and was bailed. He was living with Laura and her child at the time. Risk should not necessarily be considered as confined to one person in these situations. Laura was at high risk also. This is an opportunity for learning, in that professionals should consider current partners, as well as former partners where there is negative behaviours towards both. Laura could have been risk assessed at this point.

**08.04.13** There are conditions attached to Paul's bail that he should not contact Jill either directly or indirectly. He was bailed until 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2013

**08.04.13** Social Care receive contact from the police reporting a domestic incident between Jill and an adult male, believed to be Paul. This relates to the threatening calls.

**23.05.2013** On reporting for bail Paul says he was with Laura when the calls were made – so effectively uses her as his alibi. There is every possibility that Laura would have supported this version of events. Bail was varied to 28<sup>th</sup> June 2013. This appears to be the first time that agencies become aware that Paul was involved in another relationship and that he was living with Laura. Since this case Essex Police use the Right To Know (RTK) procedures (Clare's law) to disclose information to potential victims, that someone they know may be a risk to them. RTK is considered by the Police Assessment Team for all domestic abuse incidents and the incident is endorsed accordingly regarding whether this is applicable or not. The RTK process is available to all officers and staff at any time, should they consider it appropriate. This would be applicable to any incident, not just domestic abuse.

**22.06.13** Jill makes a call to police that she has received contact from Laura asking for contact between Paul and her child. This is in contradiction to his bail conditions however this does not appear to have been followed up by the Police at this time, he was however interviewed about it when he answered his bail over a month later.

**28.06.13** Paul reports for bail and it is varied again to 29<sup>th</sup> July 2013

**18.07.2013** There is a non-emergency call to the police from a friend of Laura's claiming that Paul has taken her car. He was arrested and denied the offence. The police state the allegation could not be substantiated and no further action was taken

**29.07.2013** Paul reports for bail and tells police in the course of interviews that Jill had turned up at his home and spoken to Laura about Paul having access to his child. Bail is

varied again to the 21<sup>st</sup> August 2013. This is the fourth time that Paul has been bailed in relation to the threats to Jill. Changes to the Police bail provisions have since been implemented.

**08.2013** Laura is no longer engaging with health professionals re development checks for her child, although this does not raise any cause for concerns due to the child's age.

**08.2013** Laura attends her GP surgery and talks about being in low mood. She has never suffered with this before, she said she has no money, has fallen out with her work manager and has quit her job. She says she has no family support and her partner is unsupportive. There is no comment here about domestic abuse. This would have been a clear opportunity to have raised the issue with Laura.

**09.13** Date of murder

### **3.0 Analysis**

3.1 It is not known exactly when Laura began her relationship with Paul, but it does seem clear that on his release from prison he went straight to her home and seemed to move in within a short space of time. Laura's family state that the relationship wasn't going on whilst Paul was in prison but that he turned up on Laura's door step upon being released.

3.2 There was no Probation scrutiny of Paul's behaviour when he was released at his SED as he had reached the end of his sentence and there was no licence period.

3.3 There is now greater emphasis on returning individuals to the community for a period of management under licence rather than keeping someone in prison to SED. Whilst this is high on the NPS agenda at present, there are still likely to be cases where offenders are recalled and kept in custody until their SED rather than seeking their early release to both manage and address any risks posed by them.

3.4 Where an offender continues to pose at least a medium risk of serious harm at their licence/ order end date, this information must be shared with relevant agencies who are likely to have ongoing contact with the offender.

3.5 Essex Police receive daily emails via the PINS system (Prison Intelligence Notification System) which notifies the Police of certain individuals who are being released from Prison custody. The criteria for a PINS notification is where the offender's prison sentence was 12 months or longer, alternatively, PINS requests can be individually requested and placed against someone's prison record for early notification of their release.

3.6 The daily PINS emails are received by the Essex Police Intelligence Bureau. These are all reviewed, PNC (Police National Computer) is updated and a notification is placed on Athena. In domestic abuse cases the intelligence team notify the Central Referral Unit so that the victim can be contacted and their safeguarding reviewed. PINs relating to domestic abuse cases are regularly reviewed by a safeguarding officer to identify and action any safeguarding.

3.7 Prompt use of MAPPAs to drive risk management and sentence planning should be used to ensure that where it is assessed as safe re-release will be pursued prior to SED to facilitate resettlement risk management.

3.8 All relevant agencies working with an offender need to ensure that information continues to be shared outside of the MAPPAs arena.

3.9 Since 2016 the National Probation Service within Essex have introduced a new system in relation to offenders being released from prison who were subject to MAPPAs. These offenders are now referred to the MAPPAs board prior to their release so a multi-agency discussion can take place regarding the risk they pose to themselves and the public. This, however would not have helped in this case as no agencies appeared to know that Paul was moving in with Laura. If the offender is released at his SED then a suitable address for release is not always obtained.

3.10 Had there been some scrutiny they may have been able to pick up that Paul had moved in with a woman and young child. This may be an issue to consider at a national level that those offenders who serve their whole sentence have no licence period where they receive support or scrutiny from the probation service. It does seem problematic that those prisoners who behave well enough to have early release are supported, but those whose behaviour is challenging and criminal, and as such have to serve their full sentence, are released with no scrutiny or support. It may be that if there was some scrutiny as a result of the recalls to prison, that Paul may not have moved in with Laura, Laura may have been risk assessed, her child risk assessed, and Paul monitored for escalating problem behaviours. MAPPAs could potentially be developed so that police are at least aware that calls relating to high risk offenders are given priority in risk assessment terms.

3.11 Paul entered into the relationship with Laura with known behavioural issues, and having witnessed or experienced violence in the home. Laura appeared to have better relationships with her family at this time, and was a good mother to her child at the point of starting a relationship with Paul. Paul's problem and violent behaviour on the other hand, escalated to a point where he was imprisoned for violence and was considered at least at some period of time, high risk to the public.

3.12 The police took some considerable time to gather evidence for the allegations made by Jill. Processes within the police meant that Paul was repeatedly bailed whilst police sought evidence to prosecute; specifically evidence related to Jill's phone. In April 2017 the Policing and Crime Act 2017 reformed pre-charge bail. It introduced the requirements for pre-charge bail to be authorised for an initial period of up to 28 days by an Inspector, a further period up to 3 months by a Superintendent and any extension beyond that requires authorisation from Magistrates Court.

3.13 When officers attended the incident on the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2013 between Jill and Paul the risk assessment of Medium was determined by the attending officer based on the information provided by Jill and the answers that she gave to the DASH risk assessment. This was then signed off by their supervisor.

3.14 The DV/1 (Domestic Violence) booklet which included the DASH risk assessment was then forwarded to the Central Referral Unit where a further review of the risk assessment and further conversation with Jill was completed and verified by a Domestic Abuse Safeguarding Officer (DASO) and recorded on the PROTECT system.

3.15 The attending officer noted that Jill was not frightened of Paul, her only concern was that he would try to take their daughter away. The writer of the IMR reviewed the information held on the electronic record of the DV/1 and the PROTECT record and was satisfied that MEDIUM was the correct grading for this incident.

3.16 A DASH risk assessment is completed for every Domestic Abuse incident that Essex Police attend regardless of risk level. Officers complete this DASH regardless of the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim, as long as the relationship fits the DA definition. A DASH should be completed for each victim to obtain their correct risk level and therefore trigger any necessary safeguarding. Immediate concerns for the safety of the victim, children or other vulnerable people must be addressed. A secondary rationale is completed by the necessary supervisor (High/Medium Crime incidents then Op Juno Sergeant, all others would fall to the sergeant).

3.17 The Police would not complete a DASH for anyone not involved in the incident (i.e. a new partner, when an incident involves an offender and ex-partner), however if those details are known of a new partner then consideration should be given to usage of the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme DVDS/Clare's Law disclosure which could also lead to safeguarding if felt necessary.

3.18 The Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme was rolled out nationally in March 2014. It utilises the police's common law powers to disclose information where it is necessary to prevent crime.



3.19 The Scheme was introduced to set out structures and processes that could be used by the police in relation to disclosure of information about previous violent and abusive offending by a potentially violent individual to their partner where this may help protect them from further violent and abusive offending.

Following a review in 2015 the scheme was extended to include disclosure relating to ex partners.

3.20 There are two entry routes into the scheme:

- “Right to know” – triggered by the police making a proactive decision to disclose information to protect a potential victim.
- “Right to ask” - triggered by a member of the public applying to the police for a disclosure.

3.21 Essex Police would not complete a DASH risk assessment for an identified new partner, unless an incident of Domestic Abuse has occurred between them and the perpetrator.

3.22 Laura always denied that Paul was violent to her, but the circumstantial evidence strongly suggests otherwise. People who are controlled will often deny violence or any problems. They do not want to be challenged, and do not want anyone to challenge the perpetrator, as this can escalate things dangerously for them.

3.23 Text messages downloaded from Laura’s phone show that she was being accused by Paul of sleeping with one of her mother’s friends. She denied this. Analysis of text messages sent to Jill’s phone also confirm that Paul had been threatening her. Paul was still on police bail at the time of the murder. The implication of this is that Paul could potentially have been unable to abuse either Jill or Laura at this point had he been successfully prosecuted and maybe sentenced. This is speculation, but the extended bail is clearly a problem which needs addressing and this was in fact addressed by Essex Police in their IMR and this has instigated recommendations which go some way towards ensuring this extended bail would not happen again as procedures are now in place to make sure that evidence can be sought more quickly with clear instructions and guidance for officers.

3.24 The GP saw Laura just before she was killed and she complained of low mood lack of support. Although within North Essex the IRIS<sup>13</sup> project has not been commissioned, the Panel learnt that there was an extensive programme of training in place regarding the recognition of, and support for, adults experiencing domestic abuse and that this training

---

<sup>3</sup> “IRIS” – “Identification and Referral to Improve Safety” – a General Practice based domestic violence and abuse training support and referral programme. (Trialed in Hackney & Bristol in the period 2007 to 2010 – ref: irisdomesticviolence.org.uk).

had been provided to a wide range of health professionals including GPs, nurses, social workers, police officers and safeguarding leads in schools. This training involves the full definition of domestic abuse including coercive, controlling and threatening behaviour. Information regarding domestic abuse is available in locations such as inter alia, Jobcentres, Council Offices, Community centres, GP Surgeries and Children's Centres.

3.25 The J9 Domestic Abuse project has been introduced throughout certain areas of Essex. This Initiative is named in memory of Janine Mundy, who was killed by her estranged husband while he was on Police bail. The initiative was started by her family and the local police in Cambourne, Cornwall, where she lived and aims to raise awareness of domestic abuse and assist victims to seek the help they so desperately need.

3.26 J9 training sessions delivered by Safer Places are intended to raise awareness and increase knowledge and understanding of domestic abuse for staff in public and voluntary sector organisations. In the course of their work, these staff may come into contact with someone they suspect is a victim of domestic abuse, or a client may reveal that they are suffering abuse. The training aims to ensure that staff are equipped to respond appropriately and effectively.

3.27 Whilst the Panel recognises the huge strides made in identifying and making available services to those who are subject to domestic abuse, the Panel believes that health professionals should remain mindful at all times, that symptoms of depression or similar may well be masking an underlying episode or episodes of domestic abuse, whether or not there are accompanying physical signs of such abuse. Therefore, health professionals should ensure that they remain familiar with relevant local services and initiatives designed to support those being subject to potential domestic abuse and make referrals accordingly.

#### **4.0 Conclusion**

4.1 This is a very sad case, and when all the information is pulled together an escalating and dangerous situation can be seen. Not all the information presented in this report was known by any one agency at the time, and some information was not known by anyone.

4.2 Paul's behaviour was violent from an early age, but he was not always considered as having a high level potential for violence, especially in a domestic context. There were times when he was considered high risk, but this was reduced without full consideration of the things happening at the time. This is not necessarily just about what should have happened, and whether the risk reduction should have been checked, but is also about professional knowledge. Without the knowledge of how domestic abuse is linked to all violence, and without knowing that new relationships can reveal risky behaviours, the risk assessment

may not have been questioned at any level. This may be about systems strengthening, and education around domestic abuse and coercive control.

4.3 The end of the relationship with Jill seemed to be a key event, and Paul did not accept the end of that relationship. He continued to pay unwanted attention to Jill.

4.4 When Laura met him, he was already a man who was violent as a child, violent in and out of prison, and showing disturbing and controlling behaviours to a partner.

4.5 Although in domestic abuse there is a clear focus for control and violence, it is often the case that others can become a target. This is especially the case with children, and other partners. Children get killed in high risk domestic abuse. Laura's child was present when she was murdered.

4.6 There were a number of the commonly agreed high risk markers present, which could have alerted police and probation to the risk he posed to partners and former partners he was stalking. There seemed to be an assumption that his violence was only against other males. Paul's violence, as is nearly always the case, was not contained and focused, he was generally violent and this should be considered in any risk assessment.

4.7 The high risk markers present were identified as:

**Threats to kill:** These were reported by Jill as against her, her child, and her mother, and police responded to this allegation. Paul was bailed but there was a very slow response to investigating the evidence. There was also evidence of breaching the bail conditions which could have been acted on with more speed.

**Threats to suicide:** this is as dangerous as threats to kill in standard risk identification checklists. Paul was threatening self harm from the beginning of his relationship with Jill and when he was threatened with separation from her. This is known to be a high risk behavior, and threats to suicide should be considered as threats to kill.

**Alcohol and substance misuse:** This is known to exacerbate problems that perpetrators have in their relationships. They are not a cause of coercive control and abuse, but should be considered as escalating any risks.

**Extreme violence:** Paul had been convicted of extreme violence. He had a clear propensity for violence. It should never be assumed his violence would be confined to confrontations with other men.

**Violence against Laura:** Any use of violence is a risk marker.

**Control:** There was strong evidence that Paul was controlling of Laura, and attempted to control Jill. Threats to suicide are a method of control, as is speeding up the journey of a relationship, and stalking.

**Stalking:** There is evidence from witnesses and police to show that Paul was stalking Jill, and family members talk about stalking behaviours with Laura. Stalking is highly correlated with coercive control, and with homicide.

**Excessive Jealousy:** Paul was shown by witnesses to be very jealous and possessive.

**Escalation:** Paul's concerning behaviours were escalating in the weeks before Laura's murder. He was violent with Laura, threatening violence to Jill and pursuing forced contact and stalking.

**Breach of restraining orders/bail:** Those people who breach court orders or bail present higher risk than those who do not.

4.8 As has been noted no one agency had the full picture of all these risk factors.

4.9 The conclusions of the panel are that there were missed opportunities to safeguard Laura, and missed opportunities to properly risk assess Paul.

## **5.0 Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1: National Probation Service**

All individuals released at Sentence End Date (SED) who have been subject to the MAPPA process are to be referred back to MAPPA prior to release date so a multi agency risk assessment and risk management plan can be completed.

### **Recommendation 2: Colchester Borough Council**

The J9 project is to be rolled out through North Essex.

### **Recommendation 3: Essex Domestic Abuse Strategic Board**

Essex Domestic Abuse Board to consider a campaign specifically targeted towards raising awareness within communities and clear guidance on how to report domestic violence.

### **Recommendation 4: Essex Police**

Essex Police are to review their phone data analysis procedures to make sure that they are clear and well known and that this process is to be publicised internally via the Essex Police intranet to all staff likely to find themselves making applications.

**Recommendation 5: Essex Police**

Each Local Policing Area provides a person responsible for providing advice to officers completing communications data requests. This will provide consistency in advice and ensure that each application is of the required standard from the outset.

**Recommendation 6: National Probation Service**

The National Probation service to review their processes in relation to the de-escalation of risk of harm from high. Discussions need to take place with managers and decisions are to be clearly recorded.

**Appendix A****Previous Panel**

Dr Jane Monckton Smith, University of Gloucestershire, Independent Chair,

Karen Loweman – Director Colchester Borough Homes,

Melanie Rundle – Community Safety and Initiatives Manager, Colchester Community Safety Partnership,

Lindsay Green – Named Nurse Safeguarding Children, Anglia Community Enterprise

Caroline Venables – Detective Inspector, Essex Police

Sandra Garner – Designated Nurse Safeguarding Children, North East Essex CCG (Health)

Cherry Ruth-Galal – Team Leader, IDVA Service, Colchester and Tendring Women’s Aid,

Chris Pearson – Senior Probation Manager, National Probation Service

Andrew Harley – Equality and Safeguarding Co-ordinator, Colchester Borough Council

Paul Secker – Director for Safeguarding Children, Essex County Council,

Susan Haile - Personal Assistant to Dr Monckton Smith and minute taker

### **Previous Panel meetings**

This review began in September 2013 and was concluded in January 2017. Reviews, including the Overview Report, should be completed, where possible, within six months of the commencement of the review.

This review has taken significantly longer than would have been wanted and there are a number of reasons for this which are documented below:

Colchester Community Safety Partnership (CCSP) Responsible Authority Group (RAG) met on 17 Sep 2013 and decided that the death of Laura met the criteria for a DHR as defined in the Home Office Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance for the Conduct of Domestic Homicide Review

An Independent Chair was appointed on the 26th Sept 2013.

The business of the review did not begin until after the trial in April 2014, where the panel chair and report writer Major Adrian Grinonneau was commissioned.

The independence of the Chair was challenged by a family advocate, as was their experience and knowledge of domestic abuse and coercive control.

When the report was completed and submitted for quality assurance in April 2014 and subsequently reviewed, it was found that the analysis of the presence and influence of domestic abuse or coercive control was not fully explored, and it was decided to appoint a different Independent Chair to re-visit the review on the advice of the Home Office Quality Assurance panel.

The new Chair Dr Jane Monckton Smith was appointed in November 2015.

After reviewing the scope of the original review Dr Jane Monckton Smith expanded that scope and more information was sought. New IMRs were requested and the timescales for the review were also expanded. This development made it necessary to begin the review again and this has extended the timescales involved.

The family were kept informed of all the changes, and were represented by a specialist advocate from AAFDA. The family had contributed to the first review and were keen to be involved in the subsequent review.

The new Chair visited the family twice in summer 2016 and they contributed information to the review and the panel. They did not choose to meet with the panel. The family contributed to the scope of the review and talked about Laura and her life with Paul. They were also able to talk about how things had impacted on Laura's child who was four at the time of the murder.

The Panel contacted a number of people who could have given crucial information to the review including Paul's former girlfriend and their child's grandparents. These requests were ultimately unsuccessful, but also added to the extended time scales.

The first draft of the Overview Report was completed in January 2017.

The report was taken to Laura's family for review and it was found that there were discrepancies between the family's recall of events, and the official documents, this was further explored by the Independent Chair

The panel and the Independent Chair found it difficult to agree on the recommendations and learning points to be documented in the review. This too created some difficulties in producing a report which was acceptable to the panel. A final draft was completed in January 2018.

A meeting was subsequently held with the Colchester Community Safety Partnership lead and members of the Home Office specialist panel. It was explained that there were significant differences between the chair of the panel and the panel themselves and that an agreement could not be reached. The Home Office recommended that a further chair be appointed to continue with the review process.

We recognise that this is a very long time for this review, but it was decided this was the only way to produce a full report which reflected the history in this relationship. The family

have been kept updated and are content that everything has been done to produce a full and fair review.

#### Appendix B: Chronology

	Date	Brief details of contact and with whom
--	------	--



Children's Social Care	11/09/2005	<p>Safeguarding children: <b>Paul</b></p> <p>By the age of sixteen Paul seems a disaffected individual and the last health contact reported is an A&amp;E admission dated 11.9.05 where he presented himself at Colchester Hospital, alone at 03.10 hours reporting an incident where he was hit by a car. No Social Care referral was made according to A&amp;E records.</p>
Police	11/02/2006	<p>Paul was charged with racially aggravated ABH resulting from an incident on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2006. Proceedings in that case were withdrawn.</p>
Police	17/03/2006	<p>Paul was arrested for an alleged assault that took place on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2006. No further action was taken following his arrest.</p>
Police	14/11/2006	<p><b>Paul</b> is arrested for an assault which left another male with life changing injuries. He committed the assault with another male. He was charged with causing GBH with intent.</p>
Children's Social Care	2007	<p><b>Laura</b> appeared to settle with her grandparents from summer 2004 and she only became known once after that at age 18 via a Domestic Incident Report with her mother and sister whom she was alleged to have assaulted. The family refute this information.</p>
Police	15/01/2007	<p><b>Paul</b> is sentenced to 6 years and 6 months imprisonment for the offence of GBH with intent.</p> <p>Paul was also considered to have alcohol misuse problems and was assessed as high risk to the general public</p>
Mental Health Services	14/03/2007	<p><b>Paul</b> seen by Criminal Justice Mental Health Service. He was found not to have a mental illness which required follow up</p>

Police	05/04/2008	<p><b>Laura</b> reports an incident of domestic violence to the police. She told the operator that her boyfriend had hit her in the face and had smashed the house up. The officers noted that property had been damaged and that Laura had been the subject of assault by being grabbed around the throat. Her boyfriend was identified as a brother of Paul. Laura was in a relationship with Paul's brother at this time.</p> <p>Laura was risk assessed at medium level. Paul's brother was convicted at Magistrates Court and received a 24 month community order. He was also required to attend a 60 day Domestic Abuse programme.</p>
National Probation Service	15/07/2008	<b>Paul</b> is discussed re pre-release planning
Police	10/11/2008	<b>Laura's child's</b> father died – he was killed the day before this report in an accident on his motorbike (RTA). He was not on the birth certificate, and it appears Laura did not think he was the father. This was confirmed much later after a paternity test.
Housing	14/04/2009	<b>Laura:</b> Homeless/Customer service - confirms Laura was an accepted homeless case with effect from 14/04/2009.
Health	04/05/2009	<b>Laura</b> has pregnancy related admission to hospital, unspecified less than 24hr stay
Housing	18/05/2009	<b>Laura:</b> There are numerous records of contact regarding Laura's benefits claim.
Health	27/06/2009	<b>Laura:</b> Pregnancy related admission, unspecified less than 24hr stay
Health	16/07/2009	<b>Child</b> is born

Health	28/07/2009	<p><b>Laura:</b> New Birth Visit to Laura by HV. Laura is 19 years and is reported to have good support from her mother who lives nearby.</p> <p>The man Laura identified as the father of her child denies the child is his- he has a new girlfriend and together it is reported that they are making 'things uncomfortable for Laura'</p> <p>Laura is engaged with health and wider support services.</p>
National Probation Services	15/09/2009	<p><b>Paul</b> is discussed for the final time. It is confirmed that he will be living with his father on release from prison</p>
Health	16/09/2009	<p>Community Setting: <b>Laura</b> seen in baby clinic</p>
Housing	19/10/2009	<p>It is recorded that at this time Laura has debt arrears and is given a notice to seek possession of her tenancy. She and the child are threatened with eviction.</p>
Housing	19/10/2009	<p><b>Laura</b> is sole secure tenant of the address. She lives in the property with her child. There are records of contact between Colchester Borough Housing and the tenant relating to arrears, payments, a Notice Seeking Possession, a pre court interview, gas servicing and a repair.</p>
Health	26/10/2009	<p><b>Laura</b> registers with new GP: GP Surgery: New patient screen</p>
National Probation Services	13/11/2009	<p><b>Paul</b> is released from prison. He is assessed as high risk of harm to the public. Paul's sentence expiry date was 5<sup>th</sup> November 2012.</p>
National Probation Services	17/11/2009	<p><b>Paul</b> is visited at home by his offender manager (OM1). He is living with his father.</p>
National Probation Services	18/11/2009	<p>Initial Sentence Plan completed by OM1 for <b>Paul</b>.</p>
Housing	25/11/2009	<p><b>Laura</b> has meeting: Community Setting: Advice &amp; Support given</p>
National Probation Services	25/11/2009	<p><b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. Discussion around offences, victims and risk.</p>

National Probation Services	02/12/2009	OM1 visits <b>Paul</b> at home. Alcohol use is addressed, his father's partner had a late miscarriage and Paul had been drinking with his father. Alcohol was an issue in the index offences.
National Probation Services	07/12/2009	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. His mood is low, funeral has been arranged.
National Probation Services	11/12/2009	<b>Paul</b> fails to attend basic skills assessment due to family bereavement.
National Probation Services	14/12/2009	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He is experiencing financial pressures.
National Probation Services	21/12/2009	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. Discussion of plans for Christmas and alcohol management in particular. Benefit claim has been settled, so less financial worries.
National Probation Services	04/01/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. His grandfather died on New Year's Eve.
National Probation Services	11/01/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. Discussion of bereavement, coping skills and support.
National Probation Services	18/01/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. Alcohol issues discussed, Paul is committed to keep his alcohol use under control. Employment and training discussed
National Probation Services	25/01/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1
National Probation Services	02/02/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He has met a woman, (this is Jill and she becomes a steady relationship).
National Probation Services	08/02/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1
National Probation Services	15/02/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. Paul asks if he can stay at Jill's address. OM1 refuses this request.

National Probation Services	24/02/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He is spending more time with Jill. OM1 is concerned about a return to alcohol use and Paul agrees to complete drink diaries.
National Probation Services	04/03/2010	<b>Paul:</b> Review of Sentence Plan completed.
National Probation Services	04/03/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He is still in a relationship with Jill. Discussion of OSAP (offender substance abuse programme) which Paul is required to attend as a condition of his licence.
National Probation Services	11/03/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1.
National Probation Services	15/03/2010	<b>Paul:</b> Review of sentence plan and risk. OM1 still assesses Paul as high risk of harm to the public.
National Probation Services	18/03/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. The relationship with Jill is going well, not drinking heavily.
National Probation Services	23/03/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He asks about moving in with Jill. OM1 advises waiting a month to see how the relationship develops. A home visit with Jill would be necessary.
National Probation Services	30/03/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1
National Probation Services	06/04/2010	OM1 discusses a home visit with <b>Paul</b> .
National Probation Services	21/04/2010	<b>Paul:</b> Home visit to Jill's address. It is considered suitable.
National Probation Services	05/05/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He has proposed to Jill. Paul has a job interview for cleaning work.
National Probation Services	12/05/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1

National Probation Services	17/05/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He says relationship with Jill going well.
National Probation Services	25/05/2010	Review of risk. <b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. Assessment of risk of serious harm reduced to medium. Reporting will be reduced in frequency.
Health	27/05/2010	Children's Centre Premises: <b>Laura</b> didn't bring child for development check.
Health	17/06/2010	Home visit-8-12 month review <b>child</b> says 'mummy' and 'daddy', babbles, walking, crawling and sitting unaided, Eczema to body Seen. Advised by HV to see Practice Nurse re eczema
National Probation Services	22/06/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He is still in a relationship with Jill.
National Probation Services	20/07/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. Paul has found employment. Co-defendant is due to be released.
National Probation Services	03/08/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports unplanned to OM1. He has been arrested for theft and due in court 12/08/10. The offence arose after an argument with Jill when he had been drinking heavily. This is related to domestic context. Recall to custody is instigated.
National Probation Services	06/08/2010	<b>Paul</b> is recalled to custody. Whilst in custody Paul contacts Jill and her mother and threatens to self-harm.
National Probation Services	25/08/2010	<b>Paul:</b> Review of the decision to recall completed. No recommendation is made for Paul to be released. This was on the basis of the seriousness of the index offence and that alcohol was again a factor in the current offence. It is proposed that Paul will complete some work on alcohol whilst in custody. Risk of serious harm is assessed as medium to the public.
Health	15/11/2010	<b>Laura</b> has reported accidental fall – hit elbow on radiator bruising on elbow –no fracture- pain killers prescribed.

National Probation Services	24/11/2010	<b>Paul:</b> Release is proposed by OM1, Paul has engaged in work around his alcohol use.
National Probation Services	17/12/2010	<b>Paul</b> is due to be re-released on licence 20/12/10. He will be required to undertake an accredited alcohol management programme in the community.
National Probation Services	20/12/2010	<b>Paul</b> is released from prison
National Probation Services	20/12/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He has been released and will be living with Jill and her family.
National Probation Services	23/12/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He says that Jill's mother has talked to him about his behaviour towards Jill when he was in custody.
National Probation Services	29/12/2010	<b>Paul</b> reports to the office. Discussion of the dangers of drinking and new year celebrations.
National Probation Services	05/01/2011	<b>Paul</b> attends a 3-way with the group tutor and OM1. Paul has decided to move back in with his father to give him and Jill some space. Paul agrees to see criminal justice mental health team (CJMHT)
National Probation Services	06/01/2011	<b>Paul:</b> initial Sentence Plan completed by OM1. Risk of serious harm to the public is assessed as medium.
National Probation Services	12/01/2011	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He is due to see CJMHT. He denies any problems in his relationship with Jill and says they still plan to marry.
Community Mental Health	13/01/2011	<b>Paul</b> visits Surgery: Seen by community mental health nurse (Referred by Colchester Probation due to concerns regarding his self-harm behaviours whilst in prison towards the end of 2010).
Criminal Justice Mental Health	13/01/2011	<b>Paul</b> - Seen by Criminal Justice Mental Health Service on 2 occasions - 14/03/2007 and 13/01/2011. Both occasions he was in police custody. On neither occasion was he assessed to have a mental illness requiring follow up.
National Probation Services	20/01/2011	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He has seen CJMHT and no further input will be offered.

National Probation Services	27/01/2011	<b>Paul</b> completes pre programme work on alcohol with OM1.
National Probation Services	03/02/2011	<b>Paul</b> completes pre programme work on alcohol with OM1.
National Probation Services	10/02/2011	<b>Paul</b> completes pre programme work on alcohol with OM1.
National Probation Services	22/02/2011	<b>Paul</b> tells OM1 that Jill is pregnant. It was not planned but they are pleased.
National Probation Services	01/03/2011	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He has a full time job as a cleaner.
National Probation Services	08/03/2011	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1.
National Probation Services	24/03/2011	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1
National Probation Services	31/03/2011	OM1 continues pre programme work with <b>Paul</b> .
Ambulance	02/04/2011	999 Emergency call to <b>Laura</b> - she said she had fallen over a tow bar and injured elbow and wrist.
National Probation Services	14/04/2011	<b>Paul</b> reports to OM1. He has left his job due to a dispute over pay.
National Probation Services	20/04/2011	<b>Paul</b> has review of sentence plan and risk. Risk of serious harm to the public is medium.



National Probation Services	21/04/2011	<b>Paul</b> continues pre programme work with OM1.
Police	24/04/2011	<p>At 0.23am on 24th April 2011 Jill's mum made a 999 call to Essex Police reporting that her motor vehicle had been taken without consent. She told the operator that her daughter Jill's ex-boyfriend Paul, had been drinking and had taken her car without authority.</p> <p>Police officers attended that incident and completed a domestic violence form. This was signed off by a supervisor and risk assessed as Medium.</p> <p>Later that day Paul was arrested on suspicion of unlawful taking of the vehicle and taken to a police station.</p>
National Probation Services	03/05/2011	<b>Paul</b> attends a Job Deal interview.
Police	05/05/2011	<b>Paul</b> appears in court for drink driving, driving without a licence, no insurance and TWOC.
Police	06/05/2011	At 0.23am on 6th May 2011 Paul was arrested by Essex Police having had his licence revoked and was returned to prison
National Probation Services	09/05/2011	Paul: Recall is reviewed, recommendation for release to be considered in 6 months' time. Paul received an 8 week term of imprisonment for the offences and was disqualified from driving for 16 months on 13th May 2011
Children's Social Care	14/05/2011	Paul: Children's Social Care are completing an initial assessment in relation to Jill following referral from OM1.

Children's Social Care	30/10/2011	Jill's baby was born. Jill currently in a relationship with Paul.
Children's Social Care	31/10/2011	Contact received from hospital named nurse for safeguarding. Baby born yesterday to Jill. Father is in prison for stealing a car. Jill was noted to have engaged well with anti-natal care and no concerns about her care of the baby raised.
National Probation Services	02/11/2011	Contact received from Probation. Paul is subject to probation supervision for offences of GBH and ABH-convicted in 2007. Offending is said to be linked to alcohol use. Probation making referral for assessment given history and plans to return home to where child resides. Contact progressed to referral.
National Probation Services	08/11/2011	Review of risk. Paul is assessed as medium risk to the public and children.
Children's Social Care	15/11/2011	Jill and baby live with maternal Grandmother. Warm attachment noted with baby
Health	17/11/2011	Laura attended GP surgery O/E bruising to right thigh, fading- spontaneous, no other bleeding problems. Blood tests taken – no clotting disorder identified.
Children's Social Care	18/11/2011	Initial Assessment was completed following referral. Jill stated that Paul posed no risk to baby as there had been no domestic violence between them. She stated that they had only had 2 arguments within the 3 year relationship. Recommendation made that Core assessment was required.
National Probation Services	22/11/2011	Contact from Probation; Probation not supportive of Paul's release from prison in December as he has only just started an alcohol programme, and only just started to gain insight into alcohol misuse. Paul noted to be from a violent family.
Children's Social Care	22/11/2011	Jill's mother has died. She offered a lot of support to Jill and Paul.
Housing	09/12/2011	Jill has been told that she can remain in the house for 6 months, and then she will need to find a new home. Home visit arranged for 13.12.11
National Probation Services	23/12/2011	Confirmation received that Paul will not be released on licence.

National Probation Services	09/01/2012	Probation has confirmed there is no evidence of Domestic Abuse between Paul and Jill. Paul has completed Alcohol Rehab programme and Jill has stated that Paul will not be able to reside with her on release from prison.
Children's Social Care	09/01/2012	Children's Social Care confirm that case (Paul and Jill) is likely to be closed.
Health	10/01/2012	Opportunistic visit and seen by HV. Jill says she has help from her grandmother.
National Probation Services	10/01/2012	Referral made by Paul's probation officer in the prison where he is being held - concerns around his violent past
Children's Social Care	10/01/2012	Opportunistic home visit following a referral to Social Care, by the Probation officer of Paul. Jill has transfer to a new flat soon.
National Probation Services	18/01/2012	Jill tells OM1 that she does not want Paul to return to live with her. She is coping with the loss of her mother and a new baby.  Paul has threatened to self harm.
National Probation Services	23/01/2012	Probation inform they will be supporting Paul's release from prison. He was said to have insight into alcohol misuse and has requested a community alcohol programme on release. Jill has said that Paul cannot reside with her on release from prison. Paul will have license conditions not to enter any licensed premises without prior approval of probation officer. Release will not be supported until he has alternative address to move to (not Jill's).
Health	21/02/2012	Jill seen at home with new partner. Paul to remain in prison until November as he was fighting inside. Jill was visiting Paul in Prison later today. Jill seemed much happier in her new home
Health	21/02/2012	Journal states that Jill's baby is visiting Paul in prison for the first time this afternoon. Jill has a new partner in the home today who remained in the bedroom. Baby appeared happy and well.

Health	21/02/2012	Jill's grandmother lives nearby and visits daily. HV to speak to the children's centre regarding some home visits by the Nursery Nurse. Jill appears to be far happier, and has made the flat look very homely. New partner was present today. He said hello, then remained in the bedroom.
National Probation Services	13/03/2012	Final review of risk for Paul
Health	31/08/2012	Jill reports good support from her grandmother, but has had problems between herself and another relative. The relative sending text allegations against Paul. There is complexity here around previous relationships.
National Probation Services	15/11/2012	Paul is released from custody, no supervision at his sentence expiry date.
Family	31/12/2012	Paul and Laura's brother are involved in a fight at a New Year's Eve party. Family say that Paul was extremely insulting and abusive to Laura. Laura's brother stood up for her and there was violence. This was not reported to the police.
Police	01/04/2013	Jill calls police. She complained that she received 23 phone calls in a one week period from Paul. Paul was said to have threatened to kill her in the calls and threatened to rape her two year old child – his child.
Police	08/04/2013	<b>Jill</b> believes the calls are Paul

Health	08/04/2013	<p>Jill also tells HV that she has been receiving threatening phone calls, there was heavy breathing then a threat stating that the perpetrator would rape both the baby and Jill, and put them in the morgue. Jill thinks that this is Paul but he is denying it - police have threatened to arrest him if there are any further threats</p>
Children's Social Care	08/04/2013	<p>Child Protection receive contact from police. Informed that they had attended a report of a domestic incident between Jill and an adult male. They became concerned about Paul as Jill reported that he had been calling her house over the previous month and he was alleged to have said that 'I'm going to rape both you and your (child) and put you both in the morgue' and 'I'm masturbating over your dead mother and your (child).'</p>
Police	08/04/2013	<p>At 2.06am on 8th April 2013 Jill made a 999 call to Essex Police reporting an incident of domestic abuse She told the operator that she had been receiving telephone calls from a withheld number, initially with just breathing. Tonight she had been receiving more, but this time there was a male voice that she recognised as her ex-partner Paul. He was saying, 'I'm going to kill you'; 'I'm going to rape your nan and your child'.</p> <p>Police officers attended this incident and obtained a written statement from Jill. Officers risk assessed as Medium Risk. A Social services report was completed and forwarded to social care in relation to the threats made to the child.</p> <p>The allegation was investigated as a crime of Threats to Kill and an immediate attempt was made to arrest Paul without success. He was eventually arrested at 0815 on the same day and taken to a police station. He was interviewed but denied the offence and a crime report was completed in relation to the incident.</p>

Police	08/04/2013	<p>Paul: On 8th April 2013 he was released on police bail until 23rd May 2013 with a condition that he did not contact the victim either directly or indirectly. This was later varied until 28th June 2013 as police were still awaiting the results from telephone data and analysis to support the victim's account</p> <p>This bail was later extended until 29th July 2013 as the results of the telephone analysis were not available</p> <p>The various extensions to bail meant that Paul had been on conditional police bail since 08/04/2013 and was on bail at the time of the critical incident 5 months later.</p>
Children's Social Care	08/04/2013	<p>Call made to Jill. No further threats have been received.</p>
Children's Social Care	16/04/2013	<p>Jill: Child Protection report:</p> <p>In addition to information provided on the date of incident, Family services also informed that calls had been made on a daily basis via a withheld number and could be 4-8 times per day. During calls, heavy breathing as well as threats, Jill recognised Paul's voice. Noted Medium Risk.</p> <p>Outcome NFA as previously dealt with on 08.04.13.</p>
Police	23/05/2013	<p>Paul bailed to re-attend the police station on 23/05/2013 with a bail condition that he did not contact Jill either directly or indirectly.</p>
Police	22/06/2013	<p>Jill: At 8.28pm on 22nd June 2013 Jill made a non-emergency telephone call to Essex Police. She reported that she had been contacted by Laura on behalf of Paul. She told the operator that he had bail conditions not to contact her directly or indirectly. She stated that this was not a 'bad call' and didn't know if she had to make the police aware</p> <p>The circumstances were described as occurring on 22nd June 2013 when at 7.55pm Jill received a telephone call from Laura who asked Jill if she and Paul could meet up in order to see Paul's daughter. Jill told Laura that she should not be in contact and hung up. She then received a text purporting to be from Laura saying, 'Sorry to bother you, I'll leave you be'.</p>
Police	25/06/2013	<p>An officer attended on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2013 and obtained a witness statement from Jill concerning the circumstances of the contact. This statement was passed to the case officer as Paul was due to answer bail on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2013.</p>

Police	18/07/2013	<p>Paul: 4.58am on 18th July 2013 a woman made a non-emergency telephone call to Essex Police reporting that her vehicle had been taken without consent.</p> <p>She told the operator that she had left the vehicle at a friend's house and upon returning to collect it she found that the vehicle had been moved and a wheel punctured.</p>
Police	29/07/2013	<p>Paul was re-interviewed on 29th July 2013 re the phone calls and again denied the offence. He was released on police bail until 21st August 2013 to enable further telephone evidence to be obtained and to consult with CPS regarding possible charges</p>
Police	29/07/2013	<p>Paul gave an account that about two weeks previously Jill had arrived at his home whilst he was working and that she wanted to discuss access to their child and spoke to Laura about this.</p>
Police	09/2013	<p>999 Emergency call to a 23yr old female in Cardiac arrest. Child caller with neighbour, concern for mother as blood everywhere. Laura has been murdered.</p> <p>Paul was arrested and interviewed and made no comment to all questions put to him. He was charged with murder and remanded in custody.</p>

## Appendix C: Glossary

AAFDA - Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse  
A&E- Accident and Emergency  
ATHENA – Police crime recording system  
CRC- Community Rehabilitation Companies  
CPS - Crown Prosecution Service  
CSP - Community Safety Partnership  
DASH - Domestic Abuse, Stalking and 'Honour'-Based Violence Risk Identification Checklist  
DASO- Domestic Abuse Safeguarding Officer  
DV/1- Domestic Violence booklet  
DVDS- Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme  
DHR - Domestic Homicide Review  
DVPP – Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programme  
FLO - Family Liaison Officer  
GBH- Grievous Bodily Harm  
GMPS - Government Protective Marking Scheme  
IMR - Individual Management Reviews  
MARAC - Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference  
MAPPA - Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements  
MOJ – Ministry of Justice  
NPS- National Probation Service  
OM- Offender Manager  
OASys- Risk assessment used by the National Probation Service  
PINS- Prison Intelligence Notification System  
PNC- Police National Computer  
PROTECT system- System used by Essex Police to record incidents of domestic abuse  
RE- Routine Enquiry  
RTK- Right To Know procedures  
SED- Sentence End Date  
SIO - Senior Investigating Officer  
SMART - Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely  
TOR - Terms of Reference  
TWOC- Taken Without Consent  
VCS - Voluntary and Community Sector