

Ms Parminder Sahota
Safer North Tyneside
c/o North Tyneside Council
Quadrant, The Silverlink North
Cobalt Business Park
North Tyneside
NE27 0BY

6 June 2023

Dear Parminder,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Michael) for North Tyneside Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 26th April 2023. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

The QA Panel is grateful for sight of your report on what is clearly a complex and challenging case. The report was noted as generally well-organised with clear references, and sympathetic. The Panel notes the attempts to engage with Michael's family and friends, and the helpful involvement of Mankind. There may be some overlap between the need for a DHR and the possibility of a Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) for cases of this kind.

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 final report should be protectively marked given the sensitivities involved. The cover should include the date of death (month & year only) and the date that the report was finalised.
- Given that the Panel decided on 'Michael' as a pseudonym, it may be helpful to provide pseudonyms for the three partners. Paragraph 3.1.53 is confusing in terms of which partners were involved. More generally, it may be helpful to draw out who the people involved in 'cuckooing' were, and their possible involvement in Michael's death (though it is accepted that this may not be clear).

- It would be helpful to move the terms of reference from the analysis section to section 1.6.
- It would be useful to have a table of the agencies involved and their specific involvement with Michael.
- At 1.5, dealing with protected characteristics, it would be helpful to say more about how Michael's disability and mental health may have affected his engagement with services.
- Given Michael's background in the armed forces, it would be helpful to know if there was any engagement, for example around support services for veterans.
- The 'Analysis' and 'Conclusions' sections are clear, but there is some repetition, and these could be condensed.
- The Action Plan will need updating, with clear target dates and milestones.
- Recommendation 8:3 is not clear about what actions should be taken to resolve the issue.

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. This is for our own records for future analysis to go towards highlighting best practice and to inform public policy.

Please also send a digital copy to the Domestic Abuse Commissioner at 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,

Lynne Abrams

Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel