

Nicolette Richards  
Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator  
Bassetlaw, Newark & Sherwood Community Safety Partnership  
Public Protection Business Unit  
Newark and Sherwood District Council  
Castle House  
Great North Road  
Newark  
NG24 1BY

24<sup>th</sup> June 2024

Dear Nicolette,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Katarzyna) for Bassetlaw, Newark & Sherwood Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2024. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

The QA Panel felt that the report was openly written, concise and follows a clear structure. The inclusion of the note the victim left was referred to as powerful, and key in bringing the victim's voice into the report.

The QA Panel felt that the report thoroughly considered the victim's culture. A culturally appropriate pseudonym was used, written communications with the victim's family were translated into Polish, and the panel included representation from an independent Eastern European Gender-based Violence Consultant.

The QA Panel recognise that the chair provided condolences to the victim's family, and took time to consider contacting the victim's partner, but on reflection, felt that this was not appropriate.

The QA Panel felt that there are some aspects of the report which may benefit from further revision, but the Home Office is content that on completion of these changes, the DHR may be published.

**Areas for final development:**

- The QA Panel felt that the report would benefit from explaining attempts made to contact any of the victim's family, friends or employers to gain a wider sense of who the victim was as a person.

- The CSP panel would have benefitted from a representative from public health, mental health, or suicide prevention to provide an intersectionality lens of domestic abuse and suicidality.
- The report does not currently indicate whether the victim's GP provided an individual management review. If this was not requested as part of scoping, this is potentially a missed opportunity to conduct routine enquiries around the victim's safety.
- The victim's relatives were used as interpreters within hospital settings, which may have presented a barrier to the victim disclosing domestic abuse.
- Section 1.1.1 reveals the date of the victim's death. Whilst Section 5.2.20 refers to the cultural significance of the date, the QA Panel felt it would be more appropriate to refer to the "Christmas period", instead of specifying what is currently written.
- Section 2 of the report should be structured in such a way that addresses the victim first.
- To prevent confusion, Section 2.1.1 of the report should refer to a pseudonym, instead of 'Male A'. The same applies to 'Male B' at 2.2.1.
- Section 2.1.2 includes wording that obscures the actions of the perpetrator. Phrases such as "as a result of several incidents" should provide more clarity where possible.
- Further clarity is needed at Section 2.2.1 around the phrase "made by a warrant officer".
- Section 6.1.1 highlights the officer did not activate their body worn video in line with force policy. The QA Panel felt that it is not clearly communicated as to why, and the report would benefit from including any local learning delivered as a result.
- Section 4.1.16 could include evidence of behaviours when analysing economic abuse, such as verbal abuse following an argument about money (2.2.6), or difficulties with the victim's landlord due to concerns he was stealing electricity (3.2.19). Further analysis could then evidence the victim's financial dependence on the perpetrator due to her inability to claim benefits.
- Section 4.2.20 refers to the victim's immigration status as having no impact on her ability to call the police. However, the QA Panel perceive this placed a significant barrier to the victim's ability to access public funds or services.
- Section 7.4.1 requires stronger wording when referring to agencies providing guidance to interpreters when engaging with practitioners, agencies should not solely "consider" how they provide this guidance.

- Footnote 13 refers to research on low-income African-American women, but it is not contextualised to highlight this may not be applicable to a white Polish woman residing in the UK. The QA Panel felt that more relevant research could be used on suicidality and domestic abuse.
- The Equality and Diversity section of the report is somewhat underdeveloped. The QA Panel felt that further exploration of the protected characteristics, and the victim's experience of accessing services as a Polish national, is needed.
- The Equality and Diversity section also includes information relevant to victims who died by suicide whilst under the care of mental health services, which does not appear to be applicable in this case.
- The Action Plan requires updating to reflect developments; it is not currently populated with all the relevant information.
- The CSP should ensure this report is disseminated to local public health/suicide prevention teams.

Once completed the Home Office would be grateful if you could provide us with a digital copy of the revised final version of the report with all finalised attachments and appendices and the weblink to the site where the report will be published. Please ensure this letter is published alongside the report.

Please send the digital copy and weblink to [DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gov.uk](mailto:DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gov.uk). This is for our own records for future analysis to go towards highlighting best practice and to inform public policy.

The DHR report including the executive summary and action plan should be converted to a PDF document and be smaller than 20 MB in size; this final Home Office QA Panel feedback letter should be attached to the end of the report as an annex; and the DHR Action Plan should be added to the report as an annex. This should include all implementation updates and note that the action plan is a live document and subject to change as outcomes are delivered.

Please also send a digital copy to the Domestic Abuse Commissioner at [DHR@domesticabusecommissioner.independent.gov.uk](mailto:DHR@domesticabusecommissioner.independent.gov.uk)

On behalf of the QA Panel, I would like to thank you, the report chair and author, and other colleagues for the considerable work that you have put into this review.

Yours sincerely,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel