



DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW

Executive Summary Only

Southampton

“TL”

Author – Anthony Wills

August 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Brief facts leading to this Domestic Homicide Review (DHR)

2. In the summer of 2015 TL¹, a white male was killed by CF, also a white male. The case was concluded at a Crown Court the following year when CF was convicted of murder and sentenced to life imprisonment with a minimum term in prison of 22 years.
3. TL was an acquaintance of CF and had an informal flat sharing agreement with him which was the main basis of the relationship. The murder took place in this flat. The cause of death was multiple blunt force trauma.
4. Both TL and CF came to this country from Poland over 10 years ago.

5. The Review Process

6. Following an unsuccessful appeal to the Home Office based on extremely limited contact with the statutory sector and existing development plans around the Southampton approach to domestic violence and abuse, this “proportionate” DHR was commenced. (The fact that this review was deemed necessary is the subject of discussion within the report and a recommendation.)
7. In the absence of any meaningful contact with the statutory sector the Southampton Safe City Partnership (SCP) sought to explore any potential issues or learning for the partnership in relation to wider concerns or learning which may be affecting the Polish community.
8. An independent chair was appointed. This was Anthony Wills an associate of Standing Together Against Domestic Violence and a police officer for 30 years. He has also been a DHR reader for the Home Office, DHR reviewer and as a consultant delivering improved responses to domestic violence. He has no connection with Southampton apart from as a previous reviewer into cases in the City and an adviser to the domestic abuse partnership many years ago.

9. The Panel

10. This was established to respond to the likely outcomes of the review process and included representation with links to the Polish community. The members came from the following organisations:
 - Hampshire Constabulary

¹ This report has been anonymised in order to avoid the identification of individuals involved. Family and friends chose not to participate in the process and random initials were therefore used to define those involved.

- Southampton City Council – Adult Social Care, Housing, Equality lead
- Southampton Safe City Partnership
- Strategic Lead for Domestic Abuse
- Southampton City Clinical Commissioning Group
- Integrated Commissioning Unit
- EU Welcome (an organisation supporting those who have migrated into Southampton from Eastern Europe).

11. Contact with family and friends

12. Much effort was expended to try to speak to the family of TL, his friends and acquaintances but this was to no avail. Letters asking them to participate were translated into Polish but this did not lead to contact. TL's family did not come to the UK for the trial. A letter was also sent to CF asking him to participate in this review but he has so far failed to respond to such a request.

13. Equalities

14. None of the protected characteristics apply in this case. The fact that both the victim and perpetrator were Polish males led to further consideration of issues facing this community.

15. The facts

16. On the night of the murder TL and CF had been at a party with friends. Some drinking and possible drug use had taken place. After leaving the party they made their way home to their shared accommodation where CF killed TL. No explanation has been given for this fatal assault.
17. There is extremely limited information about their relationship, the events leading up to the deadly assault and their lives in the UK. Both had been living in the UK for more than 10 years.
18. CF had a police caution from 2008 and TL was given a drink dispersal order in 2014. TL had no apparent contact with any NHS organisation whilst CF had a GP, but this contact was minimal. No other agency was able to discover any reference to either man in their records.
19. With such sparse information it was difficult to draw any conclusions based on their relationship. The review process did allow for other considerations and these are described briefly below. Where relevant recommendations have been made to address any findings.

20. Previous convictions in another country

21. Both men had significant convictions in Poland and these were unknown to the UK authorities. CF is actually wanted for a serious offence in Poland committed whilst apparently living in the UK and visiting Poland.

22. CF's contact with his GP

23. CF had visited his family doctor for injuries on two occasions. One visit was for an assault. The background to the assault was not investigated.

24. Issues for the "Polish" community

25. Contact was made with EU Welcome, an organisation that supports immigrants from Eastern Europe to Southampton, and a very successful focus group was held. Additionally this led to a conversation with a representative from the Roman Catholic Church. These meetings led to a more informed understanding of how those residents originally from Poland found the experience of living in Southampton and any concerns or suggestions about how things might change.

26. The whole issue of a "Polish" community is largely invalid as was demonstrated by the focus group. There was a large variety of views about each subject raised and the potential problems facing them were similar to any other resident of the City. Subjects touched upon were housing, relationships with the police and other agencies, language difficulties and drug and alcohol use.

27. Nothing of a specific nature was identifiable within the community that was significantly different from the general populace to bear comment. The possible exception to this is the issue of communication with agencies, hampered by a potential language barrier and cultural differences. This was not represented as a great concern but the high proportion of residents of Southampton that emanate from Poland makes it sensible to address these issues.

28. Conclusions and recommendations

29. This was neither a predictable nor preventable death. There are no lessons to be learnt from the specific circumstances of the relationship between TL and CF. A more proactive approach to the potential risk to individuals should be a beneficial aspect of this process but this was not a notable finding in relation to CF or TL

30. Recommendations

31. The breadth of the review has allowed consideration to be given to wider issues that may improve the communication and relationships within Southampton. The recommendations below also include recommendations beyond the Southampton SCP remit.

32. Recommendation 1

33. On the basis of the proportion of Polish residents in Southampton that the Safe City Partnership considers the development of an enhanced approach to this community. This should address issues of relationships with the police and more general communication (including language issues) with other agencies as highlighted within this report.

34. Recommendation 2

35. That Health and other agencies be given the tools to develop an approach to professional inquisitiveness that seeks to establish the potential risk to individuals and delivers an improvement to risk awareness, management of risk and subsequent communication processes.

36. Recommendation 3 (National)

37. That the Home Office consider the issue where those with serious previous convictions are entering the country and whether a process should be instituted to gather and risk assess such information.

38. Recommendation 4 (National)

39. That the Home Office consider allowing more flexibility in the guidance for DHRs to allow local Community Safety Partnerships to make a case for not completing such a review where the circumstance of a homicide do not fall within the spirit of the guidance, as for example in this case where the victim and suspect had not been in an intimate personal relationship, nor were they related in any way.