Home Office

Interpersonal Abuse Unit
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Tel: 020 7035 4848
www.homeoffice.gov.uk

Mandi George
Lead Officer, Safe Accommodation & Domestic Abuse
Huntingdon Community Safety Partnership
St Mary's
Huntingdon
PE29 3TN

16th September 2024

Dear Mandi,

Thank you for resubmitting the report (Louise) for Huntingdonshire Community Safety Partnership to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was reassessed in August 2024.

The QA Panel notes the positive engagement with Louise's mother and friends who contributed to the DHR process. The tributes to Louise throughout the report also help provide a sense of her as a person. There are condolences provided to Louise's family and it is understood the pseudonym used for the victim was chosen by Louise's mother and her children.

Whilst minor amendments have been made, unfortunately much of the feedback given by the Home Office Quality Assurance Panel does not appear to have been adequately responded to. It is also disappointing that the responses appear to have come from the Chair only, and the feedback relating specifically to the CSP has not been responded to.

There were aspects of the report which the Panel felt needed further revision. On completion of these changes the DHR should be resubmitted to the Home Office for review by **16th November 2024.**

Areas for further development

- 1.93 now confirms that friends and a work colleague contributed to the review, however it does not fully address the feedback in that it does not explain whether they were offered access to advocacy and how they contributed. This should be added.

- The executive summary was not resubmitted with this report. This needs to be resubmitted and reviewed before the DHR can be cleared for publication.

- At 1.54 ‘age difference’ is discussed which is somewhat confusing as at 1.53 the victim’s partner is described as being of a ‘similar age’ at the time of her death. The amendment made does not appear to address the feedback or help to clarify this.

- 3.18, by saying the right to ask option was also available to Louise and her family etc it has a slight victim blaming tone. It would be more accurate to say: Due to the lack of publicity to the general public neither Louise, her family, nor her friends had knowledge that they had the right to ask the Police about Paul's background.

- In relation to the equality and diversity section, the QA Panel recognise that research has been referenced but the relevance of the research to the case should also be discussed and analysis included. Simply referencing the research without any discussion or analysis does little to improve the review. The QA Panel would expect the Chair to have reflected on the research and related it to the circumstances of this case.

- Analysis in 3.22 and 3.23 is somewhat confusing. There is now no mention of an assault but discussion of injuries; para. 3.22 discusses coercive control and 3.23 discusses injuries. This is not resolved and the Chair/CSP should offer some clarity here.

- It is not clear why the panel felt that involving young children is inappropriate – young children have been supported to contribute to other reviews. Please document why the children were not involved. For example if the panel had a discussion and in consultation with family, took the decision not to involve the children, the review should document this.

- Issues with anonymity remain. The names for the children remain at 1.5.2 and the ‘Hampton surgery’ is also still referenced at 2.44. The discussion suggests that Louise worked there – 2.5 confirms that she did work at a GP surgery at the time of her death. The name of the surgery and children should be removed for anonymity.

- Whist references are made to a range of forms of financial/economic abuse at paragraphs1.73, 1.80, 2.14 and 2.28, these are statements and descriptions. There is no critical reflection or analysis included. This should be added.

- 3.31 – 3.39 now discusses the challenges faced by GPs in Covid-19 and the lack of face-to-face appointments, this touches on safeguarding (including domestic abuse). Whilst this is useful and relevant, it does not address the feedback around the lack of probing relating to routine enquiry. Please add that.

- It remains unclear if the relationship was 4 or 8 years long. Please see 3.1 “Louise and Paul had been in a relationship for approximately 4 years at the time of her tragic death” and 1.7 which states: “Isolating from support system

– Louise and Paul separated on numerous occasions, in the eight years they were together".

- The family have not been added to the distribution list on page 48.

- Please confirm if the action plan is now complete and if so, please resubmit it with the report.

- The previous feedback advised that the CSP might consider adding the final copy of the review to the children's social services file if they now have one. That will ensure they can access their mother's story if they wish to as they get older. Please confirm if this has happened.

- Please ensure that all changes are highlighted in yellow.

On resubmission, please clearly indicate where changes have been made by using a different colour font or highlighting the added or amended text in the report. If paragraph numbers have changed, please give revised location of the answer to the feedback comment. Please make it clear in the subject line of your email that the documents contained are revised versions for reconsideration. The deadline for this resubmission is 16th November 2024.

Yours sincerely,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel