



DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW IN THE CASE OF 'JENNY'

October 2018

CONTENTS	PAGES
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	3-7
2. CONDUCT OF THE DHR	8-12
3. CONTACT WITH AGENCIES DURING THE PERIOD UNDER REVIEW	12-19
4. ANALYSIS OF AGENCY INVOLVEMENT, RESPONSES TO THE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND SUMMARY OF LEARNING	19-22
5. CONCLUSIONS	22
6. RECOMMENDATIONS	22

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The review offers condolences to Jenny's family and friends on her tragic death and thanks them for their contributions to the DHR.

1.1 Key People

This DHR relates to the death of Jenny who was murdered by her husband Philip in January 2017.

Other people referred to in the report are members of Jenny's family, who are not referred to by name or pseudonym, and Jenny's friend who is referred to as Liz.

Reference is made to historic events involving Philip's previous partner who is referred to as Charlotte.

All of the people referred to in this report were over the age of 18 years at the time of the incident leading to the review. The review has not identified any matters relating to safeguarding children.

1.2 Background to the Case and Incident Leading to the DHR

On a day in January 2017 Greater Manchester Police (GMP) received an emergency call from Jenny's daughter. She reported that Jenny had not been in contact with her since the previous day, which was unusual. They were due to be going out together and with friends that day and, when Jenny did not make contact, her daughter became concerned.

Acting on her concerns, Jenny's daughter had made her way to Jenny's home accompanied by her brother. When they arrived they found the doors locked and they noticed that the car used by Jenny and Philip was not outside the house. Jenny's son got a ladder and looked into one of the bedrooms where he saw his mother on the floor. He smashed a window and gained entry to the house.

When he entered the property Jenny's son noticed there was a strong smell of gas in the house and blood on the kitchen floor. Philip's mobile phone and laptop were in the kitchen. When he went upstairs Jenny's son found Jenny in a bedroom. Her body was on the floor and she had blood around her mouth. It was clear to her son that she was deceased. Jenny's son noticed that there was some writing on a bedroom mirror (it was later established that this had been done by Philip). The writing referred to a third party. It was the panel's view that to quote the text in this report was cause harm to the third party to whom it related, if published. The matter was dealt with at the criminal trial.

Police arrived at the address and sealed it as a crime scene. There was no sign of Philip at the address, and no indication of where he might be. Police began a search for Philip. On the following day Jenny and Philip's car was sighted by a member of the family. It was on the car park of a local supermarket. Police were called, when they arrived they found Philip asleep in the car. There was a knife covered in blood on the passenger seat (**Note: this was later analysed and found to be Philip's blood**). Philip was arrested and was transported to a local hospital under police supervision to receive treatment for the injuries to his arms (these were established as being self-inflicted). Philip was questioned by police and subsequently charged with Jenny's murder.

1.3 Background to Jenny

Jenny worked in a local nursery school/children's centre. She had worked there for a number of years. In the last three/four years she had returned to education and gained a degree. She received promotion at work and was a senior staff member and was recognised as being a valued member of the staff team. She was extremely popular with her colleagues and she was described by family, friends and colleagues as gregarious and open.

Jenny met Philip around fifteen years ago; they had both had previous relationships. Jenny's daughter told the review that the relationship between Jenny and Philip had developed very quickly and that, within a few months he had moved into the family home.

When they first met, Philip was known to be quite a heavy drinker, although he did cut down his alcohol consumption in later years. According to members of Jenny's family, Philip did not get along with Jenny's children and, when they were younger, he was critical of them and was described by one of Jenny's children as being emotionally abusive. Jenny's children all left the family home when they reached 18 because they did not want to live in the same house as Philip. Jenny's family said that when grandchildren came along Philip seemed to change, and that he was a loving and supportive grandparent and adored their first grandchild.

Jenny was sociable and enjoyed seeing her friends. She enjoyed swimming and went to the local swimming pool as often as she could. She was usually accompanied by her friend Liz.

For some time before her tragic death, Jenny was said by family and friends to have become discontent in her marriage to Philip. She had told friends and some members of her family that she intended to leave Philip, but that she did not want to disrupt the family who were all very close to each other.

In the weeks prior to her death Jenny and Philip had agreed to separate and to sell their house (Note: the house was owned by Jenny). Although Jenny and Philip were continuing to live together, they were reportedly living separate lives and did not see each other at home very much due to work commitments and to leading separate social lives.

They had made plans to live separately following the sale of the house. Jenny was going to stay with Liz and Philip was going to stay with a member of Jenny's family. Jenny and Philip had told family that they had agreed to these arrangements together, although friends and family felt that it was Jenny who wanted the separation rather than Philip. Within a short time of the house being put up for sale an offer was made and a sale agreed. The speed with which the property sold came as a shock to both Jenny and Philip and meant that their plans to separate were brought forward.

1.4 Brief Information - Philip

As outlined above Philip had a relationship before he met Jenny. The relationship ended in around 2002/03 and he appears to have met Jenny shortly after this.

The review learned that Philip's previous partner (Charlotte) had made three reports to police complaining that she was being harassed by Philip over a period of three years. It appears that the break-up of the relationship was acrimonious and there were issues in relation to child

access. On one occasion Charlotte had reported to police that Philip had said to her that he would shoot her.

Philip's daughter saw him regularly and established a good relationship with Jenny. She lived with the couple for a period of time, until she formed a relationship and moved out of the family home.

In recent years Philip worked as a private hire taxi driver and as a delivery driver. Philip had a chronic health condition that required regular contact with his GP and with hospital services. The condition has no direct relevance to this review.

1.6 Time Period under Review

The panel agreed that the review would focus on the period September 2009 to January 2017 to provide as wide a scope as possible. The panel felt that this was important given the very minimal contact that either Jenny or Philip had with services.

1.7 Police Investigation and Criminal Proceedings

Philip was questioned by police and provided a 'no comment' interview. He was charged with the murder of Jenny and a trial date was set. Until a week before the trial Philip intended to plead not guilty to murder. Shortly before the trial was due to take place Philip entered a plea of guilty to murder. He received a sentence of life imprisonment to serve a minimum of 12 years.

1.8 Coronial Matters

The Coroner was informed by letter of the commencement of the DHR and received updates on the progress of the review.

1.9 Family Involvement in the Review

Jenny's family were informed in writing at the commencement of the review with an invitation to contribute to the review following the conclusion of criminal proceedings.

Jenny's children were all invited to contribute to the review. Jenny's daughter agreed to meet with the Chair of the panel on behalf of her siblings. A meeting was arranged via the police Family Liaison Officer, and took place at a local police station at the request of Jenny's daughter. The views of Jenny's daughter are set out below and, where appropriate, reference is made to her views throughout the report.

A close friend of Jenny (Liz) was invited to contribute to the review. The DHR Chair met with Liz at a neutral venue. The views of Liz are set out below and, where appropriate are referenced throughout the report.

Philip's daughter also contributed to the review. The DHR Chair met with her at her home. The views of Philip's daughter are set out below and, where appropriate are referenced in the body of this report.

The panel discussed whether Philip should be invited to contribute to the review. Enquiries were made with his offender manager who informed the review that Philip appeared to show no remorse for his actions; had not reflected on the impact of the murder of Jenny and was

'self-absorbed'. The review panel therefore agreed that there would be little learning or value to be gained from speaking to Philip.

1.10 Views of Jenny's Family

Family members were informed at the commencement of the review and were invited to participate after the criminal case had been concluded. AAFDA literature was sent to the family at this time encouraging them to seek independent support following the homicide.

The review shared the terms of reference with family members to ensure that they were informed of the questions that would be asked in the review, and to give them an opportunity to add any questions they may wish to have answered. They did not suggest any additional questions.

The information and observations set out below are in summary form and in the words of the author. Views have not been attributed to individual people, as each participant was mindful of the impact that speaking to the review may have on other family members when reading the report.

Each of the participants said that they were shocked by what had happened. None of them interpreted Jenny's relationship with Philip as abusive in any way, although they recognised he was jealous and manipulative. None of them had ever witnessed Philip being physically aggressive or violent towards Jenny.

Family members did however say that Philip could be bad tempered and that sometimes his behaviour might be seen as being controlling and manipulative. (Note: one family member referred to a press article that appeared following Philip's trial, that had reported Philip as being controlling, they said that they could not relate to this description of Philip, particularly as Jenny was the much stronger character who lived life in the way that she wanted without seeking Philip's permission or feeling accountable to him).

One family member talked about their experience of growing up with Jenny and Philip, and said that Jenny's children did not get on with Philip, and that he did not treat them well. He had never hit them but they all felt he put them down and did not show them affection.

After Jenny's children left home their relationships with Philip improved. They stood up for themselves and did not let Philip intimidate them. Philip's daughter was also very close to Jenny. She is younger than Jenny's children and did not share the same experiences as Jenny's children whilst growing up. She lived with her mother (Charlotte) for the most part, but did spend a lot of time with Jenny and Philip and saw Jenny as her 'second mum'.

In late 2016 Jenny had firmly decided that she wanted to separate from Philip. At a family party Jenny and Philip were heard having a disagreement which made it clear to everyone present that the relationship was breaking down. Following this Jenny and Philip sat down with the family together and told them that they were going to separate. Jenny said she did not want their separation to disrupt the rest of the family and said that she and Philip would do everything possible to ensure that the family stayed together. During this time Jenny and Philip lived together but did not see very much of each other.

The house went up for sale and sold very quickly. This was said to be a shock to Philip as it brought matters to a head. Jenny and Philip had both made plans for where they would live when they left the family home.

None of the family members participating in the review felt that Jenny would have considered herself to be subject to domestic abuse from Philip. They said they had heard him being critical of Jenny and trying to intimidate her; they said that on these occasions Jenny 'gave as good as she got' and that Philip invariably came off worse in these situations. They said that this was because Jenny was a much stronger character than Philip.

A member of Jenny's family said that Philip was very jealous of Jenny's relationship with Liz, and that there had been an occasion at a family party where he had blamed Liz for the deterioration in his relationship with Jenny.

Despite the difficulties between Jenny and Philip, family members said they could not have foreseen that Philip would have murdered Jenny. They saw no indications of abuse and Jenny had never suggested that the relationship was abusive. One family member said that the only thing that might be learned from what had happened is that it is better to leave a relationship in a planned way, and that frustration may have built up between Jenny and Philip during the time that they were planning to separate.

1.11 Views of Liz (friend of Jenny)

Liz met Jenny around five years ago. They immediately felt a connection to each other and became close friends. They spent a lot of time together, they enjoyed similar pastimes and found it easy to relate to each other. They shared confidences and offered each other support when needed. Liz felt that Jenny would have been comfortable in discussing personal matters with her, and they did talk about Jenny's relationship with Philip and that Jenny was no longer happy in the relationship and wanted it to end.

Philip was described by Liz as being possessive of Jenny. She said that Philip would sometimes try to intimidate Jenny in front of other people. As Jenny became more successful in her career and confident in herself, the relationship with Philip deteriorated. He was said to be jealous of Jenny and increasingly possessive, frequently asking where she was going, who she was with and checking up on her with family, friends and colleagues.

Liz said that Jenny had made some changes in her life and had told family and friends that she 'felt good about herself'. Before she met Philip, Jenny had been in an abusive relationship and had lost confidence, however Liz said Jenny was a strong and determined character who knew what she wanted.

Liz said that Jenny was very sociable and popular and loved to go out. She said Jenny sometimes felt guilty about this and felt she should 'compensate' Philip by spending specific time with him.

Over the months before her death Jenny had told Liz that she intended to leave Philip. She said she was unhappy with him, and resented the years she had tolerated his behaviour towards her children. Philip was aware that Jenny wasn't happy and tried to improve their relationship, however this didn't change things and Jenny told Philip that she didn't want to remain in a relationship with him.

Jenny developed an independent social life with Liz and other friends and she and Philip did not spend as much time together as they used to.

Plans were made with Liz that Jenny would go to live with her when she had separated from Philip. They were looking forward to enjoying their social lives together. Liz said that Jenny did

talk to her about being unhappy in her relationship, but she also said that she felt guilty and did not want to hurt Philip or family members.

Liz said Jenny was not afraid of Philip and never discussed domestic abuse with her, she said that her reason for wanting to leave Philip was that the relationship was no longer what she wanted and she was looking forward to her independence.

2 CONDUCT OF THE DHR

Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) were established on a statutory basis under Section 9 of the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act (2004)¹. This provision came into force on the 13th of April 2011. This Act makes it a statutory responsibility for Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) to complete a Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) when a case meets the criteria set in the guidance.

This Domestic Homicide Review was commissioned by Manchester Community Safety Partnership in March 2017. The Review has been completed in accordance with the regulations set out by the Act and with the revised guidance issued by the Home Office to support the implementation of the Act. The Home Office definition of domestic abuse and homicide is employed in this case and this definition is attached to this report at Appendix 1.

Following the publication of the Home Office Action Plan in March 2012 (particularly Action 74, which gave a commitment to “review the effectiveness of the statutory guidance on Domestic Homicide Review”), guidance on the conduct and completion of DHRs has been updated.²

The panel noted the revised definition of domestic abuse to ensure that all aspects of domestic abuse were addressed in the terms of reference and in the reports provided by agencies.

Revised guidance produced by Home Office in November 2016 has been followed in conducting this review.

2.1 Terms of Reference and key lines of enquiry

The over-arching purpose of a Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) is to:

- Establish what lessons are to be learned from a domestic homicide, particularly regarding the way in which professionals and organisations work individually and together to safeguard victims;
- Identify clearly what those lessons are, both within and between agencies, how and within what timescales they will be acted on, and what is expected to change as a result;
- Apply these lessons to service responses including changes to policies and procedures as appropriate; and
- Prevent domestic violence, abuse and homicide and improve service responses for all domestic violence and abuse victims and their children through improved intra and inter-agency working.

2.2 Rationale for the Review and Terms of Reference

¹<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-domestic-violence-crime-and-victims-act-2004>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/revised-statutory-guidance-for-the-conduct-of-domestic-homicide-reviews>

The rationale for the DHR is to ensure that the review process derives learning about the way agencies responded to Jenny's needs.

It is the responsibility of the panel to ensure that Jenny's daily lived experience is reflected in its considerations and conclusions and, wherever possible and practicable, family and friends of the victim should participate in reviews to enable the panel to gain a deeper understanding of Jenny's daily life.

The review aims to understand how agencies respond to domestic abuse by offering and putting in place appropriate support mechanisms, procedures, resources and interventions with the aim of avoiding future domestic homicides, violence and all forms of domestic abuse.

Learning from the review will help to improve services to victims of domestic abuse, their families, friends and others who may be affected by domestic abuse. A multi-agency action plan is appended clearly setting out the actions that agency should undertake to improve service delivery.

2.3 Terms of Reference:

a) To establish what contact agencies had with the victim and the alleged perpetrator; what services were provided and whether these were appropriate, timely and effective.

b) To establish whether agencies knew about domestic abuse and what actions they took to safeguard the victim and risk assess the alleged perpetrator.

c) To establish whether there were other risk factor present in the lives of the victim and alleged perpetrator.

d) To establish whether organisations have appropriate policies and procedures in place to identify, refer and escalate concerns to appropriate safeguarding pathways.

e) To establish what lessons can be learned from the case about the way in which professionals and organisations carried out their duties and responsibilities.

f) To engage with the family and provide them with an opportunity to shape the terms of reference and questions to be asked by the review.

g) To identify what the lessons are, how (and within what timescales) they will be acted upon and what is expected to change as a result through the production of a multi-agency action plan.

h) To recommend to organisations any appropriate changes to such policies and procedures as may be considered appropriate in the light of this review.

2.4 Key Lines of Enquiry

(i) Did any agency know that the victim was subject to domestic abuse by the perpetrator at any time during in the period under review?

- (ii) If so, what actions were taken to safeguard the victim and were these actions robust and effective?**
- (iii) Was the alleged perpetrator known to any agency as a perpetrator of domestic abuse and if so what actions were taken to reduce the risks presented to the victim and/or others?**
- (iv) Did any agency have knowledge that the victim and/or alleged perpetrator was experiencing difficulties in relation to drugs, alcohol, mental health or other vulnerabilities/risk factors?**
- (v) Did the victim disclose domestic abuse to family and/or friends, if so what action did they take?**
- (vi) Did the perpetrator make any disclosures regarding domestic abuse to family or friends, if so what action did they take?**
- (vii) Are there any matters relating to safeguarding vulnerable adults and/or children that the review should take account of?**
- (viii) Were issues of race, culture, religion and any other diversity issues considered by agency when dealing with the victim and alleged perpetrator?**

2.5 The DHR Panel

A DHR Review Panel was established by the CSP and met on four occasions to oversee the review. The Panel received reports from agencies and dealt with all associated matters such as family engagement, media management and liaison with the Coroner's Office.

The Community Safety Partnership appointed Maureen Noble as independent Chair and Author to oversee and direct the Review and to write the overview report. The Chair/Author has extensive experience in the field of public protection and community safety and significant experience in conducting Domestic Homicide Reviews and Serious Case Reviews. The Chair/Author has extensive experience in the field of domestic abuse having been the strategic lead for domestic abuse whilst employed by Manchester City Council as Head of Crime and Disorder. The Chair/Author retired from Manchester City Council in 2012 and has not been employed by them or any public body since that time. The Chair/Author has also served as a member of the NICE national programme management group on domestic abuse which produced the current NICE guidance and has worked on the production of domestic abuse service standards with NICE. The Chair/author is also an expert advisor to NICE in a pro-bono capacity.

The Chair had no contact with the victim or perpetrator in this case and had no professional or personal contact with any of the agencies involved in the Review prior to the incident occurring.

In line with Home Office guidance a panel of senior officers was appointed to conduct the Review. Panel members were selected based on their seniority within relevant agencies and ability to direct resources to the review and to oversee implementation of review findings. The names and roles of DHR panel members are included below.

Representatives of two local independent sector agencies with specific expertise in domestic abuse were members of the panel.

2.6 Panel Membership

Name	Agency
Maureen Noble	Independent Chair/Author
Catherine Cutt	Manchester Women's Aid (Specialist Domestic Abuse Agency)
Delia Edwards	Manchester City Council
Louise Honour	Clinical Commissioning Group
Michelle Hulme	Manchester City Council
Simon Hurdley	Greater Manchester Police
Joanne Simpson	Independent Choices (Specialist Domestic Abuse Agency)

2.7 Sources of Information to the Review

The scoping exercise to determine agency involvement with Jenny and/or Philip indicated that there had been little contact with agencies during the period under review. Agencies with whom there had been contact provided chronologies, individual management reports and short reports.

There were no conflicts of interest recorded during the Review. Authors of Individual Management Reports and short reports were not directly connected to the parties and did not sit on the Review Panel.

IMRs and short reports were received from the following agencies:

Agency	Role
Clinical Commissioning Group - IMR	On behalf of the GPs for Jenny and Philip
Greater Manchester Police – IMR	Police Services
Pennine Care – Short Report	Provider of Medical Services
Nursery/Children's Centre – Short Report	Jenny's Employer

Due to very limited contact with agencies, and in light of two members of the panel being IMR Authors, report Authors were not invited to separate meetings. To ensure that there were opportunities to explore specific points in reports the Chair met with Jenny's employer.

Each agency was asked to make single agency recommendations based on learning from the review. Each agency contributed to the compilation of the multi-agency action plan provided at Appendix 2.

2.8 Additional Information Sought by the Review Panel

As set out above, the review Chair met with Jenny's employers to gain insight into her daily life; following the meeting the employer was asked to complete a short written report for the review. Information from the short report is set out in Section 3 of this report.

The review panel made enquiries into license conditions in relation to Philip's job as a private hire taxi driver. The purpose of this enquiry was to establish whether police intelligence regarding historic allegations of stalking and harassment would impact on the granting of a taxi driver's licence. The panel were informed that this type of information was not recorded on the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) / Disclosure and Barring Services (DBS) checks that were conducted by the relevant authority. Copies of the CRB / DBS certificate are not kept and therefore it is not possible to check individual records. However as recording of such information is not routine, it is unlikely that it was entered onto Philip's application for clearance. Had the information been included on the CRB / DBS, then the application would have been referred to the local Licensing Committee by the local authority for their consideration

3 CONTACT WITH AGENCIES DURING THE PERIOD UNDER REVIEW

For the most part, Jenny and Philip's contact with agencies was in relation to specific events that have no relevance to this review.

The primary contacts for both Jenny and Philip were with their GPs and occasionally with other medical services. Philip had a long-term health condition for which he received treatment in primary care.

There are a number of significant events recorded on police systems relating to Philip's previous relationship with Charlotte. Although these fall outside of the timeframe of the review, the panel decided that information relating to these incidents should be included in this report to provide context.

The integrated chronology below sets out what the panel deem to be notable contacts with agencies, further detail for which is provided (by agency) in narrative form.

3.1 Significant Contacts

3.1.1 General Practitioner - Jenny

Jenny and Philip were registered with the same general practitioner.

Jenny was registered with the practice from 2010. During the period under review she saw her GP for a number of general medical issues. In early August 2010 Jenny attended a new patient health check with her GP. She reported feeling stressed in relation to an issue with one of her children; she also said her job was stressful and that she had difficulty sleeping. The GP completed an alcohol screening check and other lifestyle checks.

Two weeks after registering with the practice Jenny attended an appointment with the GP where she reported that she felt stressed and had pain in her chest when breathing.

A week later Jenny attended a further appointment at the GP surgery where she was accompanied by Philip. This consultation was about an unrelated medical matter. She also reported that she had difficulty sleeping and was prescribed Amitriptyline³ (an anti-depressant medication that is also prescribed for chronic pain).

Over the next 16 months Jenny saw her GP on four occasions for minor conditions.

In December 2012 Jenny presented with an injury to her elbow which she said was the result of a fall in the kitchen that had happened six weeks ago. She reported that she had been taking her sister's painkillers. The GP examined Jenny and prescribed pain-killers for the injury.

In March 2013 Jenny attended a local Accident and Emergency department having been involved in a road traffic accident. She reported pain in her neck and back. Jenny left the department before being treated. The following day she attended her GP to report pain in her elbow related to the road traffic incident, she had she had swerved to avoid another vehicle.

In January 2014 Jenny underwent day surgery for the injury to her elbow.

Jenny consulted her GP on 15 separate occasions over the next three years in relation to a number of minor conditions.

During the entirety of the period under review Jenny did not consult her GP in relation to drug or alcohol issues. There were no enquiries or disclosures of domestic abuse in any of Jenny's consultations with her GP. Jenny was prescribed a tri-cyclic antidepressant and reported to her GP that she sometimes had trouble sleeping and experienced anxiety and stress. There is no indication that Jenny's GP had concerns about her mental health. There is no indication that Jenny's GP conducted a review of Jenny's anti-depressant medication.

3.1.2 General Practitioner - Philip

Philip had been registered with the GP since 2009. He had frequent appointments regarding a long term medical condition for which he required monitoring, review and medication. The nature of this condition has no direct bearing on the review.

³ <https://www.arthritisresearchuk.org/arthritis-information/drugs/amitriptyline/what-it-is.aspx>

There is no record of Philip consulting his GP in relation to stress, mental health, drug or alcohol issues or domestic abuse.

3.1.3 Analysis of Practice

Jenny was prescribed anti-depressant medication in 2010 when she reported that she felt stressed and was having difficulty sleeping. The review noted that the prescribing of Amitriptyline was not reviewed at any time by the GP, which would have been good practice in line with NICE guidance.⁴

The review was unable to establish whether the GP was prescribing primarily for depression or pain relief as Jenny presented with both issues during the period under review.

On one occasion Jenny was seen with Philip in relation to an unrelated medical condition. At this consultation Jenny said she felt stressed. The GP did not take the opportunity to ask Jenny about psychosocial factors related to her stress, nor did they record that they had asked to speak to Jenny separately to establish whether she wished to talk about stressors without Philip being present.

When Jenny presented with an elbow injury there was no routine enquiry with regard to the cause of the injury, and whether domestic abuse may have been a factor. Although there were no other presenting issues it would have been good practice for the GP to enquire about domestic abuse to give Jenny an opportunity to disclose any issues or concerns. Jenny had previously talked to the GP about stress related issues for which it appears she was prescribed anti-depressants.

The practice is IRIS (Identification and Referral to Improve Safety) accredited and staff in the practice were trained about domestic abuse. The panel noted that since the practice became IRIS trained there were no clinical presentations that might alert the clinician to ask Jenny about domestic violence or abuse.

The management of Philip's medical condition was robust and in line with recommended practice.

3.2 Greater Manchester Police

Until the fatal incident Jenny was not known to Greater Manchester Police other than reporting a burglary at her home in 2013.

Philip was previously known to police for an offence relating to an MOT certificate in 1994 for which he received an adult caution.

⁴ <https://www.nice.org.uk/sharedlearning/medicines-optimisation-for-neuropathic-pain>

As part of the police investigation into Jenny's murder it was established that, prior to the break-up of his previous relationship, GMP had received intelligence from Philip's previous partner, Charlotte, that he had been harassing her.

Although this is outside of the period under review the DHR panel felt that this was important contextual information and should be included in this report. The details of this intelligence are as follows:

On 24th December 2002 police were contacted by Charlotte reporting harassment by Philip. This report followed their relationship breaking down. On 4th August 2003 police received a further report from Charlotte that Philip had been sending her abusive text messages with regards to their child. This appears to be in relation to Philip having access to the child. The log was closed by the attending officers as being a dispute over child access.

On 3rd October 2003 Charlotte made a further contact with GMP to report continuing harassment by Philip. In her initial call she told the call taker that Philip had made a number of threats towards her including threatening to shoot her.

A police constable attended her address and on 13th October 2004 an intelligence report was entered onto the GMP IT system by the officer, to the effect that Philip was warned under the Harassment Act. This took the form of Philip signing the officer's Pocket Note Book agreeing that he would no longer engage in harassing behaviour towards Charlotte.

There are no other reported incidents involving Philip from that date onwards.

3.2.1. Analysis of Practice

During the period under review police had no knowledge of either Jenny or Philip.

The review has reflected on the incidents that took place in 2002, 2003 and 2004 which indicate that Philip was engaging in harassing behaviour towards his ex-partner. It is noted that practice in relation to stalking and harassment has changed considerably since these events took place. The review is assured that, if these incidents were to occur now, they would be dealt with under the most recent legislation in relation to stalking and harassment.

3.3 Acute Hospital Trust

In March 2013 Jenny attended accident and emergency on one occasion following a road traffic incident. She left the emergency department before being seen for treatment and did not return. The A&E department notified Jenny's GP of her attendance.

Jenny attended other hospital services on four other occasions in relation to matters that are not directly connected to this review.

Philip attended for treatment on two occasions, firstly on a matter unrelated to this review. The second occasion was for treatment of a self-inflicted wound following the murder of Jenny.

3.3.1. Analysis of Practice

Jenny did not disclose domestic abuse to hospital staff. Jenny's encounters with the Acute Hospital were dealt with in line with clinical guidance.

Philip received appropriate treatment for presenting conditions. He did not discuss domestic abuse with any member of hospital staff. On the second occasion that he attended the hospital he was in police custody in relation to the murder of Jenny.

3.4 Additional Information

3.4.1. Jenny's Employer

Jenny had worked for the same employer, a nursery school/children's centre for many years. She began her career as a nursery assistant and progressed to a senior role, where she held considerable responsibility in a management role. She was described as a valued and valuable member of the senior leadership team. Her employment record was exemplary and she was a committed and enthusiastic employee.

Jenny was well known in the workplace; she was described as a larger than life character who had an impact on those who met her. She was described as a lively, strong character who related well to people and was trusted and admired by the people she worked with.

Some staff in the workplace were aware that Jenny was having difficulties in her relationship with Philip. She spoke with some openness to close colleagues about her growing dissatisfaction with the relationship with Philip. Some colleagues were aware that Philip was possessive and jealous and that he would ring Jenny at work to check her whereabouts. Jenny asked colleagues not to discuss with Philip any aspects of her life, or to tell him where she was or whether she had been to certain places at certain times.

Jenny's colleague talked about Philip contacting Jenny when she was at work. Jenny's manager explained that Jenny worked quite autonomously, and from a number of different sites, so she was not aware of this.

(Note: Following further enquiry the review received information that reception staff at a number of sites associated with the school where Jenny worked were aware that Philip called her on her mobile and sometimes on the 'work phone'. Staff at these sites did not feel that the number of calls was unusual. No records were kept by the school, or by individual sites, regarding the number of times that Philip called and whether he left messages. A close colleague of Jenny's noted that the calls were to discuss day to day things, such as what to have for tea. The colleague noted that Jenny found the calls to be unnecessary and a nuisance.

In her professional role Jenny had responsibility for matters in relation to safeguarding children, including supporting staff who may be experiencing domestic abuse. Her employer commented that this meant Jenny was 'very aware' of safeguarding issues, and that she would have known what to do had she needed any support in her personal life.

Jenny's employers have a staff safeguarding policy, however this is not specific in relation to domestic abuse.

3.4.2. Analysis of Practice

Jenny's employer was aware that Jenny was unhappy in her relationship with Philip and provided support to her. This took the form of informal support from colleagues who were also friends of Jenny's. There is no record that Jenny sought more formal support in the workplace, nor that she was deemed by her employers to require such support.

The employer did not perceive Jenny to be subjected to or at risk of domestic abuse, although they were aware that Philip's contacts in working hours were unwelcome to Jenny. The opportunity to formalise enquiry regarding the potential for domestic abuse was not taken by the employer. However, the review is mindful that the boundary between professional and personal support in this particular environment may be difficult to identify, and a recommendation is made in this regard.

The school did not take any action to establish whether Jenny perceived Philip's frequent calls to be anything more than a nuisance

The employer does not have a specific domestic abuse policy that addresses circumstances in which the lines between professional and personal relationships are blurred. Nor is there a policy that assists managers in identifying where the circumstances in which formal and informal support and action should take place.

4 LEARNING FROM THE REVIEW

4.1 Addressing the Key Lines of Enquiry

Did any agency know that the victim was subject to domestic abuse by the perpetrator at any time during in the period under review?

Jenny did not make disclosures of domestic abuse to any agency, nor was she asked by any agency whether she was a victim of domestic abuse.

On one occasion Jenny consulted her GP regarding an injury to her elbow. The GP enquired as to how the injury had occurred but did not feel that there was any suggestion that Jenny may have sustained the injury as a result of domestic abuse, at this point in time the practice was not IRIS registered and the review has identified that there were no apparent triggers, risk factors or disclosures upon which to base routine enquiry.

Jenny did talk to work colleagues about Philip's possessive nature. Jenny's employer told the review that Philip used to contact Jenny at work by phone. The employer informed Jenny when Philip rang but did not consider Philip's behaviour to be coercive or controlling. They were aware that Jenny and Philip were having difficulties in their relationship. Jenny confided in a particular member of staff who acted as a confidante outside of line management responsibilities.

It would be useful to have a clear policy on disclosures regarding personal relationships in which there may be safeguarding or domestic abuse risk factors.

Jenny was perceived by those around her as a strong and resilient character. Conversely Philip was perceived as 'weak' and someone who would have difficulty managing his life if separated from Jenny. This may have influenced the perception of friends, family and colleagues in relation to Jenny's experience of domestic abuse.

Family and friends were accessible to Jenny and reported that she was open about her feelings and her concerns. She had supportive relationships with her family and friends, and no-one around her perceived her to be at risk of a violent act by Philip.

If so, what actions were taken to safeguard the victim and were these actions robust and effective?

No disclosures were made, therefore no actions were taken to safeguard the victim.

Was the alleged perpetrator known to any agency as a perpetrator of domestic abuse and if so what actions were taken to reduce the risks presented to the victim and/or others?

Philip was not known as a perpetrator of domestic abuse in relation to Jenny in the period under review.

As part of their investigations into Jenny's death, police established that there was intelligence regarding stalking and harassment of Philip's previous partner. This was established following Jenny's death.

The review concluded that the historic allegations would have been dealt with differently had they occurred more recently and would have been subject to more recent legislation and guidance.

Did any agency have knowledge that the victim and/or alleged perpetrator was experiencing difficulties in relation to drugs, alcohol, mental health or other vulnerabilities/risk factors?

Both received routine alcohol screening when registering with their GP in 2009 and 2010.

Philip received regular alcohol screening in relation to an ongoing medical condition. He was said to have 'enjoyed a drink' and been a heavy drinker several years ago, however there is no indication that he was a chronic or dependent drinker.

Jenny reported to her GP that she experienced feelings of stress. In one of her first consultations with the GP she identified that she was stressed regarding a matter involving one of her children, however this appears to have passed. Jenny also reported that she was stressed at work and sometimes had trouble sleeping, however the GP did not note any specific concerns in relation to Jenny's mental health.

Jenny was prescribed anti-depressants by her GP. The review found that there were no reviews of Jenny's prescribed medication or mental health needs, which is not in line with clinical guidance.

Neither Jenny nor Philip disclosed any difficulty in relation to drug misuse.

Did the victim disclose domestic abuse to family and/or friends, if so what action did they take?

Jenny did not make any disclosures of domestic abuse to family or friends.

Did the perpetrator make any disclosures regarding domestic abuse to family or friends, if so what action did they take?

Philip did not make disclosures in relation to being a perpetrator of domestic abuse to family or friends.

Are there any matters relating to safeguarding vulnerable adults and/or children that the review should take account of?

There are no matters in relation to safeguarding children.

Were issues of race, culture, religion and any other diversity issues considered by agency when dealing with the victim and alleged perpetrator?

The review considered equality and diversity in relation to the seven 'Protected Characteristics' set out in the Equality Act 2010 and found that there were no issues for further consideration in this case.⁵

4.2 Summary of Learning

Whilst it is clear to the review that Jenny and Philip's relationship had broken down over time, there is no evidence that there was violence or financial/economic abuse in the relationship. Jenny was the owner of her own property and she and Philip had reached an arrangement regarding the profits from the sale of the home that they shared together. This was confirmed by Jenny's family and by Liz.

There is evidence of controlling and manipulative behaviour on Philip's behalf. He openly expressed feelings of jealousy regarding Jenny's independence. Jenny's family, friends and work colleagues were aware of his jealousy, however this was not perceived as controlling behaviour, but as an expression of his unwillingness to 'let go' of the relationship.

Neither Jenny nor Philip ever discussed or disclosed any form of domestic abuse to any agency or to their family or friends.

Family and friends expressed the view that Jenny would have spoken to them if she had been in an abusive relationship with Philip. The review cannot counter this viewpoint as Jenny's family and friends knew her and were close to her daily lived experience.

However, the review believes it is important that agencies and individuals are aware of the nature of controlling and coercive behaviours, particularly that strength of character and determination are not necessarily protective factors in relationships where abusive behaviours are present.

Philip had a history of harassing a previous partner and he had threatened to shoot her on one occasion. This information was not known to any other agency than the police, however, because Philip had no further contact with the police in relation to any criminal activity or domestic abuse, this information was not known until after Jenny's death.

The review recognises the significance of previous behaviours as a potential indicator of abuse in current or future relationships. The review acknowledges that legislation and practice in relation to investigating and prosecuting harassment and stalking has changed since the events described in the report and welcomes the revised guidance (a summary of which is attached).⁶

Jenny's workplace environment was supportive and accessible, however there was a lack of clarity regarding formal and informal support which the panel believes is not uncommon in many work-places. A more robust approach to offering formal support, and in providing guidance to staff who have personal friendships in the workplace, would be a beneficial modification to policy emerging from this review.

⁵ <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/equality-act>

⁶ researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN06261/SN06261.pdf

Although Jenny did not disclose domestic abuse to her GP, there were opportunities for the GP to enquire about any underlying psychosocial factors relating to Jenny's stress. There was also an opportunity to make routine enquiry regarding domestic abuse when Jenny presented to her GP with a physical injury.

Regarding Jenny's mental health, there is no record that the GP formally reviewed the prescribing of anti-depressant medication, or enquired as to the appropriateness of ongoing prescribing. This would have been good practice and in line with clinical guidance.

There were no apparent precursor events leading up to the fatal incident. A potential risk factor was that Jenny had told Philip that she intended to leave him and, according to family and friends Philip did not wish to separate from Jenny.

The tragic events leading to Jenny's death were a shock to everyone who knew Jenny and Philip and a member of Jenny's family told the review that she would never have predicted that Philip could have done this. However, another family member told the review that as soon as they knew that Jenny was dead, they felt that Philip was responsible.

5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Workplace Policies

Workplace domestic abuse policies should recognise the needs of potential victims and staff who are acting as confidantes and supports.

5.2 Leaving a relationship is a potential risk factor for escalating abusive behaviour

Whilst there is no evidence to suggest a previously violent relationship, there were indicators of coercive and controlling behaviour that may have been intensified by Jenny's determination to leave the relationship with Philip.

5.3 Coercion and control as risk factors

The review believes that Philip demonstrated coercive and controlling behaviour in his relationship with Jenny. Whilst this was not perceived as domestic abuse by family members, colleagues or friends (because they saw Jenny as a stronger and more confident personality than Philip) the panel felt strongly that coercive and controlling behaviour should be recognised as a risk factor and therefore felt it was important to include a recommendation in relation to coercion and control in this report.

The panel considered whether Jenny was at increased risk due to separation from Philip, taking into account the national body of evidence relating to separation as a risk factor in abusive relationships. The panel concluded that although Jenny and Philip planned to separate they were still living together at the time of the fatal incident. It is therefore not possible to say with certainty whether the impending separation posed greater risk to Jenny.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

The CSP should work with employers to encourage them to develop and promote workplace domestic abuse policies that are inclusive and are tailored to specific features of the particular workplace (i.e. schools).

Recommendation 2

The CCG should ensure that all appropriate staff in General Practice are IRIS trained and confident in making safe enquiry into domestic abuse where clinically indicated.

Recommendation 3

The CSP should ensure that domestic abuse training focuses on coercive and controlling behaviour as a form of domestic abuse.