



# **Hackney COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP Norfolk COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP**

## **DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW Overview Report into the killing of Bobo**

**March 2020**

**Independent Chair and Author of Report: Mark Yexley**

**Associate Standing Together Against Domestic Abuse**

**Date of Completion: June 2023**



Dedication from Bobo's family:

"Bobo was a daughter, mother, sister, nanny, great nanny, aunty, and friend to many, to know Bobo was to love her.

Our Bobo was the glue to our family. She was the go-to member of the family that would go the extra mile with supporting the other family members and friends, her door was always open and the kettle on. She was a loyal friend and very sociable. She was kind, caring and nothing was too much trouble when helping others. Bobo's priority in life was her children. She was a brilliant mother, sister, nanny and auntie.

What has happened to Bobo should never happen to anyone, the hole it has left in our family has been enormous. We have spent the two years adapting to a different norm.

This has had massive effect on her children, grandchildren, and family members, knowing that the traditions around birthdays, holidays and Christmases have now gone forever. Bobo was close to her sisters and brother, and they had a bond that was created from the love of each other. She would be the one to who would keep the peace, with 7 sisters and one brother this could be a full-time job. Her home was where all her friends and family would gather passing the time of day, drinking tea, and laughing about life. This was a tradition that had been going for many years but has now become too difficult to continue. Bobo made new friends wherever she went, she joined a local darts team, and it didn't take long before everyone knew when Bobo had arrived. She was truly loyal and an amazing friend.

Bobo liked socialising with people. She was always buying little gifts for people, she loved her dream catchers, candles, room sprays and perfumes, she loved her home to smell nice, and if she found an item of clothing, she liked she would buy it in every colour, which used to make us laugh.

This poem relates to how family, friends and those that knew Bobo feel":

I NEVER GOT TO SAY GOOD-BYE.

I never got the chance to say I love you.

I never got the chance to say I'll miss you.

Nobody told me you were going to die.

It hurts. I never got to say Goodbye.

Where are you now, please talk to me.

Show yourself and let me see.

I know that can't happen no matter how much I try.

All I want to do is say Goodbye.

I hope you are happy wherever you are.

I have you in my heart no matter how far.

To the heavens above, I wish I could fly.

Only to give you a warm Goodbye.

I will remember you each day that I live.

You were such a good person with so much to give.

Such a privilege to have known you, no one can deny.

I think it might be time to say Goodbye.

I will keep with me the good times we shared.  
I want you to know just how much I really cared.  
Till we meet again, on God we must rely.  
I love you; I will miss you and for now, Goodbye.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Preface.....</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1	The incident .....	9
1.2	Introduction .....	9
1.3	Timescales.....	10
1.4	Confidentiality .....	11
1.5	Equality and Diversity.....	122
1.6	Terms of Reference.....	14
1.7	Methodology .....	16
1.8	Contributors to the Review .....	18
1.9	The Review Panel Members .....	20
1.10	Involvement of the Victim's Family, Friends, Work Colleagues, Neighbours and Wider Community .....	24
1.11	Involvement of the Perpetrator and their Family, Friends, Work Colleagues, Neighbours and Wider Community .....	26
1.12	Parallel Reviews .....	27
1.13	Chair of the Review and Author of Overview Report.....	27
1.14	Dissemination .....	28
1.15	Previous Case Review Learning Locally .....	29
<b>2.</b>	<b>Background Information (The Facts).....</b>	<b>30</b>
2.1	The Homicide.....	31
2.2	Background Information on Victim and Perpetrator .....	31
<b>3.</b>	<b>Chronology.....</b>	<b>34</b>
3.1	Summary of Significant Events Prior to the Time Period Under Review .....	34
3.2	Time Period Under Review.....	38
<b>4.</b>	<b>Overview.....</b>	<b>57</b>
4.1	Summary of Information from Family.....	57
4.2	Summary of Information from Perpetrator and Friends, Work Colleagues, Neighbours and Wider Community .....	60
4.3	Summary of Information Known to the Agencies and Professionals Involved .....	60
4.4	Training and Domestic Abuse Policies.....	66
4.5	Any Other Relevant Facts or Information: .....	69
<b>5.</b>	<b>Analysis.....</b>	<b>72</b>
5.1	Domestic Abuse .....	72

5.2	Through the Eyes of the Victim .....	74
5.3	Analysis of Agency Involvement / Responding to the Terms of Reference.....	75
<b>6.</b>	<b>Conclusions and Lessons to be Learnt.....</b>	<b>89</b>
6.1	Conclusions .....	89
6.2	Key Themes and Learning Identified .....	90
<b>7.</b>	<b>Recommendations .....</b>	<b>93</b>
7.1	Single Agency Recommendations (Identified by Individual Agencies) .....	93
7.2	Multi Agency Recommendations (Developed by the Review Panel).....	95
	<b>Domestic Homicide Review Terms of Reference: Case of Bobo.....</b>	<b>97</b>
	<b>Appendix 2: Single Agency Recommendations – Action Plan Template .....</b>	<b>109</b>
	<b>Appendix 3: Multi Agency Recommendations – Action Plan Template .....</b>	<b>110</b>

This report uses the following terms and abbreviations have the meanings assigned to them below.

AAFDA	Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse
AP	Approved Premises (APs) are premises approved under Section 13 of the Offender Management Act 2007. They provide intensive supervision for those who present a high or very high risk of serious harm
ASC	Adult Social Care
Athena	Norfolk Police Crime and Intelligence System
BCU	Basic Command Unit – Metropolitan Police
CAD	Computer Aided Dispatch
CBT	Cognitive Behavioural Therapy
CCG	Clinical Commissioning Group <sup>1</sup>
CCR	Coordinated Community Response
CE	Central East (area of Metropolitan Police District covering the London Boroughs of Hackney and Tower Hamlets)
CMHT	Community Mental Health Team
CRHT	Crisis Resolution and Home Treatment Team
CRIS	Crime Reporting Information System – Metropolitan Police Service
CPI	Child Protection Investigation (Norfolk Police)
CPS	Crown Prosecution Service
CSC	Children's Social Care
CSP	Community Safety Partnership
DHR	Domestic Homicide Review
DA	Domestic Abuse
DASH	Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Honour Based Violence Risk Identification, Assessment and Management Model
DHR	Domestic Homicide Review
DNA	Did Not Attend (NHS appointments)

---

<sup>1</sup> The CCGs involved in the review transferred to Integrated Care Boards (ICB) during this review. City and Hackney CCG transferred to NHS North East London. Norfolk & Waveney CCG transferred to the Norfolk & Waveney (ICB) in July 2022.

DS	Detective Sergeant
DV	Domestic Violence
DVDS	Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme or 'Clare's Law'
DWP	Department of Work and Pensions
ECAT	Emergency Clinical Advice and Triage (ECAT)
EEAST	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust
EUPD	Emotionally Unstable Personality Disorder
GP	General Practitioner
HCA	Health Care Assistant
HMP	Her Majesty's Prison (at the time of events)
IDVA	Independent Domestic Violence Advisor
IMR	Individual Management Review
I.O.	Investigating Officer
IPV	Intimate Partner Violence
IRISi	Specialist domestic violence and abuse training, support and referral programme for General Practices
ISVA	Independent Sexual Violence Advisor
LAS	London Ambulance Service
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Agreements
MARAC	Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences
MIT	Major Investigation Team
MPS	Metropolitan Police Service
NCHC	Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust
NFA	No Further Action
NHS	National Health Service
NPS	National Probation Service
NSFT	Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust (Mental Health)
OM	Offender Manager
ORA	Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014
PSS	Post Sentence Supervision
SARC	Sexual Assault Referral Centre

SEA	Surviving Economic Abuse
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-Bound
ViSOR	Confidential national database that was developed to support the management of MAPPA and Lifetime Offender Management (LOM) offenders.
VS	Victim Support
VSHS	Victim Support Homicide Service



# **1. Preface**

## **1.1 The incident**

- 1.1.1 In March 2020 Mike contacted the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and reported that he believed his female partner had died from a drugs overdose at his home in the London Borough of Hackney. Officers went to the address and Mike allowed them into the flat. At the address police found Bobo dead. She had suffered a large amount of bruising and trauma to her head. She had died from her injuries. Mike informed police that he had found Bobo in that condition. He was arrested and later charged with Bobo's murder. Mike was subsequently convicted of Bobo's manslaughter.
- 1.1.2 Police established that Bobo had lived most of her life in Norwich, Norfolk and had started a relationship with Mike whilst he was a serving prisoner. After Mike left prison he lived with Bobo in Norwich, before moving to London. As the homicide was a case of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) the case was reported to the Hackney Community Safety Partnership (CSP). It was also reported the Norfolk Community Safety Partnership.
- 1.1.3 The Review Panel expresses its sympathy to the family, of Bobo for their loss and thanks them for their contributions and support for this process.

## **1.2 Introduction**

- 1.2.1 Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) were established under Section 9(3), Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004 and should be conducted in accordance with the December 2016 Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance for the Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews (hereafter 'the statutory guidance').
- 1.2.2 This Domestic Homicide Review (hereafter 'the review') examines agency responses and support given to Bobo, a resident of Hackney and Norfolk, prior to the point of her homicide, in Hackney, in March 2020.
- 1.2.3 The review will consider agencies contact/involvement with Bobo and Mike from January 2018 to the date of Bobo's death in March 2020.
- 1.2.4 In addition to agency involvement, the review will also examine the past to identify any relevant background or trail of abuse before the homicide, whether support was accessed within the community and whether there were any barriers to accessing support. By taking a holistic approach the review seeks to identify appropriate solutions to make the future safer.
- 1.2.5 The key purpose for undertaking DHRs is to enable lessons to be learned from homicides, where a person is killed as a result of domestic violence and abuse. In order for these lessons to be learned as widely and thoroughly as possible, professionals need to be able to understand fully

what happened in each homicide, and most importantly, what needs to change to reduce the risk of such tragedies happening in the future.

- 1.2.6 This review process does not take the place of the criminal or coroner's courts, nor does it take the form of a disciplinary process.

### **1.3 Timescales**

- 1.3.1 This review was jointly commissioned by the Hackney CSP and Norfolk CSP. The Hackney CSP having originally received notification from the MPS in March 2020, liaised with the Norfolk CSP. The Home Office was notified of the decision in writing by Hackney on 16<sup>th</sup> April 2020. Norfolk CSP formally agreed to jointly commission the review on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2021
- 1.3.2 Standing Together Against Domestic Abuse (hereafter 'Standing Together') was commissioned to provide an Independent Chair (hereafter 'the Chair') for this review in July 2020. The completed report was handed to the Hackney CSP and Norfolk CSP on 11 October 2023. On 24<sup>th</sup> November 2023, the Chair presented the report and its recommendations to the Hackney Domestic Homicide Review Implementation Group (a subgroup of the Community Safety Partnership's Violence Against Women and Girls strategic Board) where it was signed off. Bobo's family members requested a meeting with Panel members; this took some time to arrange, and family members were supported by AAFDA and Victim Support. The meeting was arranged and chaired by Norfolk and Hackney CSP on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2024. The report and accompanying documents were submitted to the Home Office Quality Assurance Panel on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2024. On 18<sup>th</sup> December 2024, the completed report was considered by the Home Office Quality Assurance Panel. On 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2025, the Hackney and Norfolk CSPs received a letter from the Home Office Quality Assurance Panel authorising the report for publication. The letter will be published by Norfolk and Hackney alongside the completed report.
- 1.3.3 Home Office guidance states that the review should be completed within six months of the initial decision to establish one. From the outset there was negotiation on establishing a panel to cover two CSPs. Bobo lived in Norfolk for most of her life and moved to Hackney in the months before she was killed. The panel were required to scope a large number of agencies across two regions. The review commenced during the COVID 19 Pandemic in 2020 and there were delays in processes to adapt to working remotely across two CSP areas. The operational demands resulting from the pandemic, on all services, also slowed the review process. There were initial delays due to the criminal trial and direct family engagement was delayed until after the requirement for them to be prosecution witnesses was considered. Further delays took place to offer opportunities to Bobo's son and wider family members to engage. The panel also sought to trace members of Mike's family but were unsuccessful and this was not resolved until May 2022. During the closing stages of the report there were delays on the completion of final actions. There were also issues of panel member illness affecting the final stage.

## 1.4 Confidentiality

- 1.4.1 The findings of this review are confidential until the Overview Report has been approved for publication by the Home Office Quality Assurance Panel. In the interim, information has been available only to participating officers/professionals and their line managers. Bobo had lived in one area of Norfolk for most of her life. She was well known within the community and her siblings, children and grandchild still live within the area. Due to the personal details included and confidential nature of the review, the panel viewed that the review should not be made public. Whilst pseudonyms can be used, the case could easily be compared to media reports and the families concerned could be identified. Consideration also needs to be given to the character of the perpetrator, Mike. He is a person who spent many years in custody and for crimes of violence. It would be a concern if the details of family support for the review were made known to a wider audience, as that could create risks. The panel considers that publication should be limited to recommendations only.
- 1.4.2 This review has been anonymised in accordance with the 2016 statutory guidance. The specific date of death has been removed. Both Bobo and Mike have children, they had all reached the age of 18 years when mentioned in this report. Only the independent Chair and Review Panel members are named.
- 1.4.3 The following pseudonyms have been used in this review to partially protect the identities of the victim, other parties, those of their family members, and the perpetrator:

Name	Relationship to victim
Bobo	Victim
Mike	Perpetrator/Partner of Victim
Stephen	Son of Victim
Julie	Daughter of Victim
Dawn	Sister of Victim
Molly	Sister of Victim
Anne	Sister of Victim
Natalie	Sister of Victim
John	Brother of Victim
Elaine	Ex-Partner of Mike

- 1.4.4 The pseudonym of Bobo for the victim was suggested by the family. This name is connected to the victim and used by the family. Whilst this does not protect the identity of the victim, the family felt that it would not be appropriate to use another name for Bobo and choosing an anonymised letter to represent the victim would not show sensitivity to her memory. The panel fully supports

the wishes of Bobo's family and supports the decision in the knowledge that it will be recommended that the full report is not published.

## 1.5 Equality and Diversity

1.5.1 The Chair and the Review Panel have considered the protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex and sexual orientation during the review process.

1.5.2 Throughout the review, the Review Panel identified that the following protected characteristics required specific consideration:

- **Sex:** Sex should always require special consideration. Analysis of domestic homicide reviews reveals victimisation of women across both intimate partner and familial homicides, with females representing the majority of victims and males representing the majority of perpetrators.<sup>2</sup> This characteristic is therefore relevant for this case as the victim was female and the perpetrator was male. In consideration of the links between domestic abuse and suicide in women, it is estimated that more women take their own life as a result of domestic abuse than those that are killed by their intimate partner. Studies have shown that almost 30 women attempt suicide every day as a result of experiencing domestic abuse. It is also estimated that every week three women take their own lives.<sup>3</sup>
- **Ethnicity:** Bobo was white British and Mike was black British. Mike was raised in London and lived at his mother's home in Hackney when he killed Bobo. Hackney has a diverse population and around 40% of the residents come from Black and Minority Ethnic groups, with the largest group, around 40%, being Black or Black British.<sup>4</sup> White residents of Norfolk make up nearly 93% of the County's population. Black or Black British residents account for a tiny minority in Norfolk, representing 0.5% of the population.<sup>5</sup> The panel gave consideration to the individual ethnicities of each party throughout the review process, with particular attention being paid to the bi-racial aspect of the relationship. The panel took particular care to ensure that domestic abuse services from the Hackney CSP, with

---

<sup>2</sup> "In 2014/15 there were 50 male and 107 female domestic homicide victims (which includes intimate partner homicides and familial homicides) aged 16 and over". Home Office, "Key Findings From Analysis of Domestic Homicide Reviews" (December 2016), p.3.

"Analysis of the whole STADA DHR sample (n=32) reveals gendered victimisation across both types of homicide with women representing 85 per cent (n=27) of victims and men ninety-seven per cent of perpetrators (n=31)". Sharp-Jeffs, N and Kelly, L. "Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) Case Analysis Report for Standing Together" (June 2016), p.69.

<sup>3</sup> SafeLives, How widespread is domestic abuse and what is the impact? <https://safelives.org.uk/policy-evidence/about-domestic-abuse/how-widespread-domestic-abuse-and-what-impact> (accessed 16 February 2021)

<sup>4</sup> <https://hackney.gov.uk/knowning-our-communities>

<sup>5</sup> [https://www.norfolkinsight.org.uk/population/#/view-report/63aeddf1d7fc44b8b4dfcd868e84eac/\\_\\_\\_iaFirstFeature/G3](https://www.norfolkinsight.org.uk/population/#/view-report/63aeddf1d7fc44b8b4dfcd868e84eac/___iaFirstFeature/G3)

experience in delivering services to a more diverse population, were key members of the review.

- *Age:* Bobo was aged 57 at the time of her death and Mike was aged 40. The panel acknowledged the 17-year age difference between the couple. Although Bobo would have been post-menopausal at the time of her death, the panel were aware of the impact that menopause can have on domestic abuse and access to services. Research on women's experiences suggest a two-way relationship between menopause and domestic abuse. Menopause impacts women's relationships, especially with their intimate partner/s, and domestic abuse may impact menopause symptoms; with negative symptoms or experiences compounding or obscuring one another. Women view menopause as a pivotal moment for making life changes, suggesting that menopause may be a key time when women are looking for support to escape domestic abuse. Women highlight a number of intersecting barriers in the way of adequate support in general practice settings. A clear lack of specialist support or sensitive routine inquiry means menopause-related appointments may be a missed opportunity for intervention.<sup>6</sup> The panel considered menopause particularly relevant to this review and that the medical and specialist domestic abuse services on the review could provide expertise in this area.
- *Disability:* The panel considered Mike's mental ill-health as a disability for the purposes of the review. Mike was referred to Prison Mental Health Services in July 2016. He was diagnosed with Emotionally Unstable Personality Disorder (EUPD) in 2018. For the period under review Mike was seen by commissioned Prison Health Services, and local NHS Mental Health Trusts in Norfolk and East London. Bobo had sought primary care services with regards to mental health, issues of anxiety, depressive illness, social phobia, panic attacks and for cannabis dependence to self-manage chronic pain. The panel gave consideration to the impact on disability throughout the review and were conscious of how Bobo's and Mike's healthcare needs were managed.

1.5.3 The following have also been identified as pertinent to the lived experiences of Bobo and Mike:

- Substance misuse
- Mike identifying as a carer
- Bobo's experience of adult family violence
- Economic abuse and coercive control
- Mike's history of violence

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://avaproject.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Research-briefing-Menopause-and-DA-2.pdf>

- Prison visiting and vulnerability

1.5.4 The Review Panel took an intersectional and ecological analysis approach to better understand the lived experiences of both Bobo and Mike. This means to think of each characteristic of an individual as inextricably linked with all of the other characteristics in order to fully understand an individual's journey and experience with local services and within their community. As stated by Kimberlé Crenshaw, "If you don't have a lens that's been trained to look at how various forms of discrimination come together, you're unlikely to develop a set of policies that will be as inclusive as they need to be."

- An ecological analysis considers someone's identity and lived experiences at an individual, relational, community, and societal level. It is about how individuals relate to those around them and to their broader environment.<sup>7</sup>
- An intersectional analysis considers the complex ways in which differing aspects of someone's identity and lived experience can combine or intersect in the context of structural discrimination to create heightened and persistent forms of inequality, marginalisation, disadvantage and powerlessness.<sup>8</sup>

1.5.5 Taking an ecological and intersectional approach can help identify the factors that create, sustain or exacerbate someone's risks and needs. An ecological and intersectional approach can also identify the barriers someone may have faced in recognising or reporting domestic abuse, their options for safety and the protection available to them, and considers any conscious or unconscious bias or privileging by agencies and/or society.

## 1.6 Terms of Reference

1.6.1 The Terms of Reference are included at **Appendix 1**. This review aims to identify the learning from this case and for action to be taken in response to that learning, with a view to preventing homicide and ensuring that individuals and families are better supported.

1.6.2 The DHR panel was comprised of agencies from Hackney and Norfolk, as the victim and perpetrator were living in Hackney at the time of the homicide and had recently moved from

---

<sup>7</sup> Further information on this approach can be found online, such as in EAW (2011) *A Different World Possible: A call for long-term and targeted action to prevent violence against women and girls*, [https://www.endviolenceagainstwomen.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/a\\_different\\_world\\_is\\_possible\\_report\\_email\\_version.pdf](https://www.endviolenceagainstwomen.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/a_different_world_is_possible_report_email_version.pdf):

<sup>8</sup> Intersectionality is a term rooted in Black feminism and Critical Race Theory and coined by Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw in the 1989 landmark essay "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics," and furthered in 1992 with "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color", these, amongst her other work can be accessed online for further information regarding this approach to analysis.

Norfolk. Agencies were contacted as soon as possible after the review was established to inform them of the review, invite their participation and request them to secure their records.

- 1.6.3 At the first meeting, the panel shared information about agency contact with the individuals involved, and as a result, established that the time period to be reviewed would be from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018 to the date of the homicide in March 2020. This timeframe was chosen because: at the first panel meeting it was not known exactly how long Bobo and Mike had known each other. Mike was a serving prisoner until April 2019 and he had been planning to move in with Bobo before his release. It was considered that a start date for a detailed chronology was appropriate from January 2018. Panel members agreed to include information on significant events before 2018.
- 1.6.4 In the meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2021 the terms of reference were reviewed. This was in light of information from Bobo's family that she received letters from Mike in prison from 2013. The panel decided that the existing lines of enquiry were still appropriate. All panel members were asked to review their records against the timing of the letters for significant events. It was decided that the agencies would not produce a detailed chronology for the period 2013 to 2018. It was agreed to include details of the letters from Mike to Bobo, as the letters supported an understanding of how coercive and controlling behaviour could be exerted from a serving prisoner.
- 1.6.5 *Key Lines of Inquiry:* The Review Panel considered both the generic issues as set out in the 2016 statutory guidance and identified and considered the following case specific issues:
- The communication, procedures and discussions, which took place within and between agencies;
  - The co-operation between different agencies involved with Bobo and Mike [and wider family];
  - The opportunity for agencies to identify and assess domestic abuse risk;
  - Agency responses to any identification of domestic abuse issues;
  - Organisations' access to specialist domestic abuse agencies;
  - Analyse the experience of Bobo as a woman in a bi-racial relationship and whether this would impact on her access to services.
  - Analyse whether substance misuse impacted on Bobo or Mike's access to services.
  - Analyse whether Bobo's vulnerability and starting a relationship with a prisoner, affected her and whether procedures should be adapted to consider this.
  - Analyse whether Mike's presentation as a carer for Bobo was considered as a factor by services that she was accessing.
  - Analyse whether Bobo's mental health impacted her ability to access to services.

- Analyse whether Bobo's experience of Adult Family Violence affected her access to services.
  - Analyse whether Bobo was subject to coercive control through economic abuse and if this impacted on her access to services.
- 1.6.6 To address specific issues in this case (including in relation to equality and diversity as identified in 1.5) the following agencies were invited to be part of the review due to their expertise even though they had not been previously aware of the individuals involved:
- Substance misuse - Change, Grow, Live.
- 1.6.7 The panel gave consideration to the involvement of specialist organisations on economic abuse at the drafting stage of the report. The CSPs balanced the cost of the involvement and the relevant experience of the DHR Chair and decided not to employ further specialists. It was acknowledged that the CSPs could benefit from working with economic abuse specialists, such as Surviving Economic Abuse (SEA), outside the DHR process.

## 1.7 Methodology

- 1.7.1 The term 'domestic abuse' is used interchangeably with 'domestic violence', and during the period under review the cross-government definition of domestic abuse, as issued in March 2013, was considered in all agency work prior to 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021. That definition is included here to assist the reader to understand that domestic abuse is not only physical violence but a wide range of abusive and controlling behaviours. The cross-government definition states that domestic abuse was:

*"Any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive or threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are or have been intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexuality. This can encompass, but is not limited to, the following types of abuse: psychological; physical; sexual; financial and emotional.*

*Controlling behaviour is: a range of acts designed to make a person subordinate and/or dependent by isolating them from sources of support, exploiting their resources and capacities for personal gain, depriving them of the means needed for independence, resistance and escape and regulating their everyday behaviour.*

*Coercive behaviour is: an act or a pattern of acts of assault, threats, humiliation and intimidation or other abuse that is used to harm, punish, or frighten their victim."* Controlling



*or coercive behaviour in an intimate or family relationship became a crime on 29<sup>th</sup> December 2015.<sup>9</sup>*

- 1.7.2 During this review the Domestic Abuse Act 2021 was enacted on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021. Under that act Domestic Abuse is defined as:-

*“Behaviour of a person (“A”) towards another person (“B”) is “domestic abuse” if—*

- (a) A and B are each aged 16 or over and are personally connected to each other, and*
- (b) the behaviour is abusive.*

*Behaviour is “abusive” if it consists of any of the following—*

- (a) physical or sexual abuse;*
- (b) violent or threatening behaviour;*
- (c) controlling or coercive behaviour;*
- (d) economic abuse;*
- (e) psychological, emotional or other abuse;*

*and it does not matter whether the behaviour consists of a single incident or a course of conduct.”*

This definition will be used when considering the analysis that took place by the panel in the latter part of this review process.

- 1.7.3 A total of 38 agencies were contacted to check for involvement with the parties concerned with this DHR. Of these, 8 had only limited contact and submitted a Summary of Engagement (SoE) / Short Report or Chronology only. However, 10 had more extensive contact and were asked to submit Individual Management Reviews (IMRs). A narrative chronology was also prepared.
- 1.7.4 *Independence and Quality of IMRs:* The IMRs were written by authors independent of case management or delivery of the service concerned.
- 1.7.5 Most IMRs/Short Reports received were comprehensive and enabled the Review Panel to analyse the contact with Bobo and Mike and to produce the learning for this review. Where necessary, further questions were sent to agencies and responses were received.
- 1.7.6 In some cases, IMRs/Short Reports reported changes in practice and policies over time and nine made single agency recommendations of their own (these are described in section 7).

---

<sup>9</sup> Section 76 of the Serious Crime Act 2015.

- 1.7.7 *Documents Reviewed:* In addition to the above information, the Review Panel and/or Chair reviewed a number of other documents during the review; where appropriate these are referenced in the report. These documents included: East London NHS Foundation Trust Patient Safety Serious Incident Review Report, R v Mike Sentencing Remarks, National Probation Service Pre-Sentence Report, and Norfolk Public Protection Support Group Report for Public Protection Forum on Thematic Learning from Review Activity 4 Oct 2016.
- 1.7.8 *Interviews Undertaken:* The Chair conducted interviews with five members of Bobo's immediate family. There were no other interviews conducted.

## **1.8 Contributors to the Review**

- 1.8.1 The following agencies were contacted, but recorded no involvement with victim or perpetrator:
- Barts Health NHS Trust
  - Change, Grow, Live (Substance Misuse Service Norfolk)
  - Claudia Jones Organisation
  - Community Rehabilitation Company
  - The Guinness Partnership
  - The Harbour Centre - Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC)
  - The Havens – SARC
  - Homerton University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (HUHFT)
  - London Borough of Hackney Adult Social Care
  - London Borough of Hackney Children's Social Care
  - London Borough of Hackney Domestic Abuse Intervention Service
  - London Borough of Hackney – Hackney Education
  - London Borough of Hackney Housing
  - London CRC
  - NIA Ending Violence
  - Norfolk County Council Adult Social Care (2016 referral for Son)
  - Norfolk County Council Children's Services
  - Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
  - Turning Point (Substance Misuse Hackney)

- Victim Support (Mike alleged assault by prison officers in 2015)

1.8.2 The following agencies and their contributions to this review are:

Agency	Contribution
East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST)	Chronology Only
East London NHS Foundation Trust (ELFT) Mental Health	IMR and Chronology
Department of Work and Pensions (DWP)	Summary of Engagement – request chronology
Hackney CCG for General Practitioner (GP)	IMR and Chronology
HMP Norwich	IMR and Chronology
HMP Rochester	Chronology Only
Leeway Domestic Violence and Abuse Services	Summary of Engagement – re contact with Bobo on her son in 2012
London Ambulance Service (LAS)	Chronology Only
London Borough of Enfield – Children’s Social Care	Summary of Engagement
L&Q (Housing)	Short Report

Metropolitan Police Service	IMR and Chronology
National Probation Service	IMR and Chronology
Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust (NCHC)	IMR and Chronology
Norfolk Constabulary	IMR and Chronology
Norwich City Council	IMR and Chronology
Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust (NSFT)	Chronology Only
Norwich GP	IMR and Chronology
Virgin Care	IMR and Chronology

## 1.9 The Review Panel Members

### 1.9.1 The Review Panel members were:

Name	Job Title	Agency
Latoya Alfred	Named Nurse Children's Safeguarding	Homerton University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
Justin Armstrong	Detective Sergeant – Independent Review Officer	Specialist Crime Review Group (SCRG), Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)

Matt Beavis	Detective Sergeant - Independent Review Officer	SCRG, MPS
Diane Bedwell	Senior Clinical Lead	Virgin Care
John Binding	Head Adult Safeguarding	Hackney Adult Social Care
Laura Bleaney	Service Manager	Hackney Children's Services
Saranna Burgess	Director for Patient Safety and Quality	Norfolk and Suffolk Foundation Trust (NSFT)
Kevin Clark	Deputy Governor	HMP Norwich
Daniel Dray	Safeguarding Specialist	London Ambulance Service NHS Trust (LAS)
Michelle Frazer	Refuge Coordinator	Leeway Domestic Violence and Abuse Services, Women's Aid Norwich.
GP - Hackney	General Practitioner GP from Hackney Practice	Hackney GP Practice
Heather Harvey	Director of Research and Development	NIA Ending Violence
Andy Hill	Detective Inspector	Norfolk Constabulary
Kathryn Hunt	Head of Service, Brent PDU	National Probation Service (NPS)
Wayne Hylton	Anti-Social Behaviour and Estate Safety Manager	Hackney Council

Zahid Iqbal	Named Professional for Safeguarding Adults	East London NHS Foundation Trust (ELFT)
Maria Karretti	Named GP for Adult Safeguarding	Norfolk & Waveney CCG
Lucy Kennedy	Implementation and Transformation Manager	Turning Point
Graeme Malcom	Services Manager	Change, Grow, Live
Susan Mason	Deputy Safeguarding Lead - Adults	Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust (NCHC)
Jim Mitchell	Detective Inspector, Safeguarding Central East BCU (Hackney & Tower Hamlets)	MPS
Bernice Molyneaux	Domestic Abuse Specialist	Claudia Jones Organisation (CJO)
Amanda Murr	Head of Community Safety	Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk
Daniel Newbolt	Assistant Director	Norfolk Children's Services
Rachel Omori	Independent Living Manager	Community Safety, Norwich City Council
Mary O'Reardon	Adult Safeguarding Lead	North East London CCG
Mark Rowlands	Deputy Safeguarding Lead for Adults	Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust (NCHC)

Cathal Ryan	Service Manager and VAWG	Hackney Domestic Abuse Intervention Service, Community Safety, London Borough of Hackney
Timothy Samwell	Head of Offender Management Services	HMP Rochester
Jo Sapsford	Early Intervention and Community Safety Manager	Norwich City Council
Eleonora Serafini	VAWG Specialist Practitioner	Hackney Community Safety
Claire Sidney-Jenkins	Safeguarding Officer	LAS
Andrea Walton	Interim Safeguarding Adult Lead (First four meetings)	Homerton University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
Ben Wayland	Safeguarding Specialist	LAS
Beverley Williams	Detective Sergeant	Serious Crime Review Group, MPS
Irene Willie	Named Nurse	Homerton University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
Jenny Wood	Lead Nurse for Safeguarding (from fifth Meeting onwards)	Homerton University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
Jessica Woods	Primary Care MARAC Liaison Nurse	Hackney
Gary Woodward	Adult Safeguarding Lead Nurse	Norfolk and Waveney CCG
Lovevita Wright	Regional Housing Manager	L&Q Group

Mark Yexley	Independent Chair	Standing Together Against Domestic Abuse
-------------	-------------------	--

- 1.9.2 *Independence and expertise:* Review Panel members were of the appropriate level of expertise and were independent, having no direct line management of anyone involved in the case.
- 1.9.3 The Review Panel met a total of five times, with the first meeting of the Review Panel on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2020. There were subsequent meetings on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2021, 20<sup>th</sup> April 2021, 19<sup>th</sup> October 2021 and 25<sup>th</sup> May 2022.
- 1.9.4 The Chair wishes to thank everyone who contributed their time, patience, and cooperation to this review.

## 1.10 Involvement of the Victim's Family, Friends, Work Colleagues, Neighbours and Wider Community

- 1.10.1 The Review Panel sought to involve the family, friends, work colleagues, neighbours, and the wider community.

### *Victim's Family*

Name <sup>10</sup>	Relationship to Victim	Means of Involvement
Julie	Daughter	Video Interview
Anne	Sister	Video Interview
John	Brother	Video Interview
Molly	Sister	Video Interview
Natalie	Sister	Telephone Interview
Dawn	Sister	Not Interviewed
Stephen	Son	Not Interviewed

---

<sup>10</sup> Not their real name



- 1.10.2 Once the decision to conduct the DHR had been confirmed in Hackney and Norfolk, the Hackney CSP notified Bobo's daughter, Julie, of this decision in August 2020: a letter was sent via Victim Support Homicide Service, along with the Home Office leaflet, information on Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse (AAFDA)<sup>11</sup> and the Victim Support Homicide Service (VSHS).<sup>12</sup> In October 2020, the Chair also wrote to Julie including additional information on the DHR process. Following the trial of Mike, the Chair also wrote to a brother and sister of Bobo. These letters were sent directly with prior notification to the VSHS.
- 1.10.3 All those invited to contribute were able to do so using the medium they prefer. All letters made clear that the family's participation in the review was voluntary, and that they could contribute in different ways: for example, through a face-to-face meeting with the Chair of the review, making a statement, through a telephone conversation, and online video conferencing. The letter emphasised that their contributions could take place at a time and place of their choosing, and that their involvement in the review would not be rushed.
- 1.10.4 At the outset of the review, it was considered important to offer Bobo's son, Stephen, an opportunity to contribute to the review. There was an offer of support to the panel from local adult social care to support the interview. The approach for interview was made through VSHS, with the offer of independent support. Stephen declined to be interviewed and the panel respects his wishes.
- 1.10.5 The Chair made an offer of interviews to the wider family of Bobo through VSHS. The offer was initially taken up by Bobo's brother and one of her sisters. The Chair wrote to Bobo's brother and sister in August 2021.
- 1.10.6 It was decided that the Chair would meet the family via video conferencing. This was in September 2021. Present at the interview were Bobo's daughter, two sisters and a brother, and VSHS. During the interview the family agreed the terms of reference to assist with the scope of this review. Bobo's family also informed the Chair that they had supplied the homicide investigation team with a number of letters, from Mike, that were in Bobo's possession. Information from the letters was obtained by the Chair, the contents of the letters provided crucial information evidencing some of Mike's coercive and controlling behaviour.
- 1.10.7 During the review it became apparent that Bobo's sister, Natalie, may be able to assist the review, as she had direct dealings with the police in reporting Bobo missing and reporting domestic abuse. In May 2022 VSHS were able to support the Chair in contacting Natalie. The

---

<sup>11</sup> AAFDA provide emotional, practical and specialist peer support to those left behind after domestic homicide. For more information, go to: <https://aafda.org.uk>.

<sup>12</sup> The Victim Support Homicide Service supports bereaved families to navigate and know what to expect from the criminal justice system and providing someone independent to talk to. For more information, go to: <https://www.victimsupport.org.uk/more-us/why-choose-us/specialist-services/homicide-service>.

Chair spoke to Natalie by telephone, and she was happy to focus on the circumstances of the missing person's report.

- 1.10.8 The family were provided with a copy of the draft report in October 2022 and asked for their views on the report and the process. The family asked for further time to consider the report before speaking to the Chair.
- 1.10.9 A meeting was held February 2023 to go through the report in detail. The family had met to go over the report and were represented by Bobo's sister and sister-in-law. The family were supported by their VSHS worker. The Chair included the views of the family in the report. There were some amendments made in line with the feedback provided by the family. In addition, a new recommendation was made for the Ministry of Justice to ensure that families were provided with sentencing comments after a trial.
- 1.10.10 The family were given the opportunity to meet the DHR panel and a meeting was arranged for the end of June 2023. The family then asked for the meeting to be postponed. The family were in general agreement with the report, and it was now complete. It was suggested by Standing Together that the CSPs take over responsibility for future meetings with the family and liaison from that point. It is asked that the CSPs update the Home Office on the progress of any future family contact.
- 1.10.11 The panel would like to extend thanks to the family of Bobo for their valuable contribution to the review.

#### ***Victim's Friends, Work Colleagues, Neighbours and Wider Community***

- 1.10.12 The panel were unable to establish details of friends of Bobo to support the review. Bobo was unemployed and had not worked for many years.

### **1.11 Involvement of the Perpetrator and their Family, Friends, Work Colleagues, Neighbours and Wider Community**

#### ***Perpetrator***

- 1.11.1 After Mike's conviction enquiries were made to establish his location within the HM Prison system and the most appropriate method of communication. On 18<sup>th</sup> August 2021 Mike was sent a letter from the Chair via his Probation Officer with a Home Office leaflet explaining DHRs and an interview consent form to sign and send back. On 26<sup>th</sup> August 2021 the Probation Officer attempted to speak to Mike about the DHR, but he was not willing to engage.
- 1.11.2 It is confirmed that the invitation to contribute to the review was seen by Mike. However, there has been no personal acknowledgement from Mike.

- 1.11.3 It became apparent during the review that the perpetrator had contact with his sister during the period under review and may have stayed with her. The panel decided that that it was important to attempt to interview her. Enquiries were made with three agencies: NHS mental health trust, Police, and Probation Service but the panel were unable to establish an address for her. The panel agreed to keep the matter under review throughout the process.

## **1.12 Parallel Reviews**

- 1.12.1 *Serious Incident Review:* East London NHS Foundation Trust conducted a review and it was completed on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2020, before the first meeting of this DHR. This was not considered a parallel review, but the report was shared with the Chair of the DHR.
- 1.12.2 *Criminal trial:* Mike was charged with Murder in March 2020. He later appeared before Wood Green Crown Court in July 2021. Mike pleaded guilty to manslaughter. He was sentenced to an Extended Sentence of 10 years, comprising of six years imprisonment and four years on licence. The 471 days on remand would automatically count towards the sentence.
- 1.12.3 The Senior Investigation Officer (SIO) was invited to the first meeting of the Review Panel to share information about the criminal investigation and address issues in relation to disclosure.
- 1.12.4 *Judge Sentencing Summary:* There were no sentencing comments available, but the Probation Service noted “*Under the Criminal Procedure Rule 13.4, the defendant poses a risk to others, the dangerousness provisions apply and, in the past, has assaulted prison officers.*”
- 1.12.5 Bobo’s family stated that they had applied for sentencing comments from the judge. They were initially told by the court that they could have a copy of the comments but have now been denied a copy. It was agreed that an additional recommendation would be made to ask that families of victims should be entitled to be given a copy of sentencing comments after the trial.
- 1.12.6 *The Coroner’s Inquest:* The death of Bobo was referred to the HM Coroner, and an inquest was opened and adjourned. A verdict of Unlawful Killing was made following the trial without re-opening the inquest.
- 1.12.7 The MPS conducted enquiries into complaints made concerning the conduct of the criminal investigation after Bobo’s death by her family. The circumstances of that investigation do not run parallel to the events of this case. The Chair of this review has liaised between the family of Bobo and the Homicide Investigation team of the MPS.

## **1.13 Chair of the Review and Author of Overview Report**

- 1.13.1 The Chair and author of the review is Mark Yexley, an Associate DHR Chair with Standing Together. Mark has received Domestic Homicide Review Chair’s training from Standing Together

and has chaired and authored 19 DHRs. Mark is a former Detective Chief Inspector with 39 years' experience of dealing with domestic abuse and was the head of service-wide Strategic and Tactical Intelligence Units combating domestic violence offenders, head of Cold Case Rape Investigation unit and Partnership Lead for sexual violence in London. Mark was also a member of the Metropolitan Police Authority Domestic and Sexual Violence Board and Mayor for London Violence Against Women Group. Since retiring from the police service, he has been employed as a lay Chair for NHS Health Education England Services in London and the South East. This work involves independent reviews of NHS services, training and selection for foundation doctors, specialty grades.

- 1.13.2 Standing Together is a UK charity bringing communities together to end domestic abuse, and aims to see every area in the UK adopt the Coordinated Community Response (CCR). The CCR is based on the principle that no single agency or professional has a complete picture of the life of a domestic abuse survivor, but many will have insights that are crucial to their safety. It is paramount that agencies work together effectively and systematically to increase survivors' safety, hold perpetrators to account and ultimately prevent domestic homicides and deaths in circumstances of domestic abuse. Standing Together has been involved in the Domestic Homicide Review process from its inception, chairing over 100 reviews across England and Wales.
- 1.13.3 *Independence:* Mark Yexley has no connection with the Norfolk area or CSP or any of the local agencies involved in this case. Mark's only previous contact with the Hackney area came as commissioner for the post of an Independent Sexual Violence Advisor (ISVA) for Sex Worker service run by City and Hackney and Homerton Hospital. Mark retired from the MPS in 2011 and has had no operational involvement with the service since that time. Mark's Health Education England work is not linked to any NHS Trust mentioned in this report.

## **1.14 Dissemination**

- 1.14.1 Once finalised by the Review Panel, the Executive Summary and Overview Report will be presented to the Hackney and Norfolk CSPs for approval and thereafter will be sent to the Home Office for quality assurance.
- 1.14.2 Once agreed by the Home Office, the Executive Summary and Overview Report will be shared with:-
- All agencies contributing and represented on the panel.
  - London Borough of Hackney Community Safety Partnership
  - London Police and Crime Commissioner
  - Norfolk Adult Safeguarding Board

- Norfolk Community Safety Partnership - Chair and all partner agency member
- Norfolk Integrated Domestic Abuse Service
- Standing Together DHR Team
- Family members who have contributed to the Review

- 1.14.3 The wider publication of the Overview Report and Executive Summary will be considered by the CSPs taking into account the views of the family and need for confidentiality.
- 1.14.4 Bobo's family expressed a wish to have the Overview Report published in full. The Chair expressed concerns that the report referred to dealings with Bobo's son and grandchildren who still live in the area. It was agreed that the family would support the publication of recommendations only, this would not refer to the detail of the case. There will be a range of dissemination mechanisms to share learning this allows the patronship to utilise as many methods as possible to share learning.
- 1.14.5 The Executive Summary and Overview Report will also be shared with the Commissioner of the MPS and the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk.
- 1.14.6 The recommendations will be owned by the Hackney and Norfolk CSPs, being responsible for monitoring the recommendations and reporting on progress.

## **1.15 Previous Case Review Learning Locally**

- 1.15.1 This is the sixth DHR commissioned locally in Hackney. To access previous Hackney DHRs see here<sup>13</sup>. There are 12 published DHRs, and a number ongoing, in the Norfolk CSP Area. To access the previous Norfolk DHRs see here<sup>14</sup>.
- 1.15.2 The Review Panel considered the learning and recommendations from other reviews in the analysis and the development of recommendations for this DHR. These have identified the following learning and/or recommendations as relevant to this DHR: The Norfolk DHR into the death of "April" in 2017 contains a specific recommendation that publicity on the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme (DVDS) or 'Clare's Law' Right to Ask scheme was reviewed.

---

<sup>13</sup> To access published Hackney DHRs, go to: <https://hackney.gov.uk/domestic-abuse-support/#professionals> .

<sup>14</sup> To access published Norfolk DHRs, go to Published Domestic Homicide Reviews for Norfolk County ([norfolk-pcc.gov.uk](http://norfolk-pcc.gov.uk))

## 2. Background Information (The Facts)

The Principal People Referred to in this report						
Referred to in report as	Relationship to the victim	Age at time of homicide	Ethnic Origin	Faith	Nationality & Immigration Status	Disability
Bobo	Victim	57	White European	N/K	British	None
Mike	Perpetrator	40	Black British/Mixed Heritage	N/K	British	None
Stephen	Son	29	White European	N/K	British	N/K
Julie	Daughter	38	White European	N/K	British	N/K
Dawn	Sister	N/K	White European	N/K	British	N/K
Natalie	Sister	N/K	White European	N/K	British	N/K
Anne	Sister	N/K	White European	N/K	British	N/K
Molly	Sister	N/K	White European	N/K	British	N/K
Elaine	Ex-Partner of Mike	N/K	N/K	N/K	N/K	N/K

## **2.1 The Homicide**

- 2.1.1 *Homicide:* In October 2019 Mike's mother passed away, and following her funeral Mike and Bobo moved to London and began to live at Mike's mother's flat in Hackney. Bobo's family were concerned for her safety and reported her missing to Norwich Police, Norfolk Constabulary. They were worried because they had seen bruises on Bobo's face in the past and suspected that Mike was the cause, although this was never disclosed by Bobo. Bobo contacted the MPS herself by telephone on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2019 to say that her family had reported her missing but that she was safe and well living with her partner. This was the only direct contact MPS had with Bobo prior to her death.
- 2.1.2 One afternoon in March 2020 at around 16:00 hours Mike attended Stoke Newington Police Station, Hackney, and stated that he believed his partner, Bobo, had died from a drug overdose. Officers attended the flat where Mike and Bobo had been staying. They discovered Bobo on a bed covered with a duvet, she was dead. Bobo had a laceration to her head and bruising to her body. Mike was arrested on suspicion of murder. When he was searched, Mike was found to have Bobo's bank card and a lock of her hair in a self-sealing bag. A homicide investigation commenced, led by the MPS Major Investigation Team (MIT). Mike was interviewed and made no comment to all questions put to him. Three days after his arrest Mike was charged with Bobo's murder.
- 2.1.3 *Post Mortem:* Bobo's body was taken for a CT scan and a Special Post Mortem was conducted by a Home Office Pathologist. The cause of death was subsequently recorded as a "head injury, in an individual experiencing the intoxicating effects of alcohol and cocaine".

## **2.2 Background Information on Victim and Perpetrator**

- 2.2.1 *Background Information Relating to Victim:* Bobo was born in 1962, she was a white woman aged 57 at the time of her death. She was her parent's fourth child and had eight siblings, seven sisters and one brother. Bobo's parents divorced at a young age but her father and mother were always present in her life. Bobo had a daughter and a son. Her daughter aged 38 and son aged 29, at the time of her death. Bobo had four grandchildren. Bobo was born and raised in Norfolk and had always lived in Norwich within a two-mile radius until shortly before her death. Bobo and her siblings lived with her grandparents and her family had happy memories of this time.
- 2.2.2 Bobo loved junior school but did not like high school. She left school aged 16 years and worked in a factory for two years. Bobo gave birth to her daughter Julie when she was 19, in 1982, but did not live with Julie's father. Bobo had no further employment from that time. Bobo had a few relationships and then met the man who would be the father of her son, Stephen, who was born in 1990. Bobo's family described the relationship as being quite long and violent. After one 'altercation', her son's father left and did not return. Bobo did not have another relationship for

at least 15 years after and that relationship was with Mike, the perpetrator. Bobo had lived with her children in a three-bedroom council house and held the tenancy for at least 30 years.

- 2.2.3 *Background Information Relating to Perpetrator:* Mike was born in Hackney in 1979. He stated that he was the youngest of all his siblings. He had three sisters and four brothers. He had been known to the police since the age of 16 years. He had spent the majority of his life in prison from the age of 20. Mike had a previous relationship with a woman, Elaine, and she had two children. It is believed that Mike was engaged to Elaine in 1999. Mike was not the biological father of Elaine's children.
- 2.2.4 Mike was originally sentenced to 12 years for armed robbery, and then sentenced to a further eight years for trafficking drugs into prison. Whilst in prison Mike attempted to hang himself in 2006. When Mike was due for prison release in 2012, Children's Social Care raised concerns for Elaine's children, as Mike was going to move into their house. It was suspected that Mike was manipulative and controlling of Elaine. The children were placed on a Child Care Plan in Enfield and later removed from the plan in 2013. Mike was released for short periods in 2012 and 2014 but was recalled to prison due to his violent behaviour. Mike was made a ViSOR subject in January 2013.<sup>15</sup> Elaine was known to visit Mike up until 2012. Mike was known for his violent behaviour in prison, assaulting prison staff and other inmates. He later told his psychologist that he spent a lot of time alone and would smash items up when he became angry. He was known to have seen psychology services. He was referred to mental health services for Emotionally Unstable Personality Disorder (EUPD) by the prison nurse in February 2018.
- 2.2.5 Mike had involved his, then 57-year-old, mother in the trafficking of drugs into prison. On Mike's instructions, she forwarded three parcels to an address in Manchester and to Mike in prison. She later said that she was unaware they contained drugs. She reported that she did this as she was afraid of Mike. She received a prison sentence and that was her first offence.
- 2.2.6 It is believed that Mike may have known Bobo from 2012. Correspondence recovered from Mike after his arrest suggests he was in contact with Elaine and two other women, in addition to Bobo from 1999 onwards. Mike was released from prison on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2019.
- 2.2.7 Mike later told his psychiatrist that he found everyday activities difficult to manage outside prison. He stated he would only leave his house with Bobo or his sister. He stated that the loss of his mother in late 2019 affected him as she was something positive. Mike also stated that, after leaving prison, he had refrained from being physically violent towards anyone for quite some time at that point and how he was well aware that his demeanour/stance can be threatening at times. Mike also expressed thoughts of suicide at the start of 2020. He said that his sister had discovered him with a ligature.

---

<sup>15</sup> ViSOR – a confidential national database that was developed to support the management of MAPPA and Lifetime Offender Management (LOM) offenders.



- 2.2.8 *Synopsis of Relationship with the Perpetrator:* It is believed that Bobo first met Mike in 2012. They met through Bobo's nephew, who was a prison inmate with Mike. Mike wanted a pen pal, and started a relationship with Bobo whilst he was a serving prisoner. Bobo would write to Mike, speak on the telephone and visit him in prison. It is believed that visits were as often as once a week. It appears that in 2016 Bobo and Mike became engaged to be married. Bobo's family suspected that she was taking drugs into prison on her visits to Mike, and that she was being coerced and controlled by Mike. Police suspect that Bobo was taking drugs and mobile phones into prison for Mike.
- 2.2.9 When Mike was released from prison in April 2019 he moved in with Bobo, at her Norwich home. Bobo's son, Stephen, was also resident at the address. It appears that Mike manipulated Bobo to apply for a new property. In July 2019 Mike and Stephen had a fight and Stephen was arrested.
- 2.2.10 In October 2019 Mike's mother died. Her three-bedroom flat in Hackney was unoccupied. Mike moved to the address and Bobo left her home in Norwich to stay with him. Mike had no right to tenancy at the address, he had unsuccessfully applied for tenancy and was due to vacate the flat. Bobo stayed with Mike until she was killed by him.
- 2.2.11 *Members of the Family and the Household:* During the period under review Bobo's son, Stephen, was living at the family home in Norwich where Mike stayed after he left prison. Stephen was 29 at the time of his mother's death. When Bobo moved into Mike's deceased mother's home in Hackney, they were the only occupants.

## 3. Chronology

### 3.1 Summary of Significant Events Prior to the Time Period Under Review

- 3.1.1 **Imprisonment of Mike** - In November 1999 Mike was sentenced to 12 years imprisonment for 10 offences, Robbery and having an intimation firearm with intent to commit an indictable offence. Seventeen offences were taken into consideration. The key features of these being several robberies of betting shops in the east end of London committed by Mike and his co-defendant.
- 3.1.2 **Mike's mother smuggled drugs into prison** – In 2003 Probation Service report that Mike's mother was sentenced to three years imprisonment for smuggling heroin into prison.
- 3.1.3 In 2004, whilst a serving prisoner, he was further sentenced to eight years imprisonment for Possession with intent to Supply (heroin) this offence occurred around the same time as the Robberies.
- 3.1.4 **Release and recall to Prison** - Mike was released from prison to an Approved Premises (AP) on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2012 and subsequently recalled back to prison on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2012 for failing to adhere to his curfew and testing positive for Class A drugs.
- 3.1.5 From 2012 Bobo is believed to have started a relationship with Mike, as a pen pal, whilst he was a serving prisoner. A number of entries in this section are based on correspondence recovered by Bobo's family after Mike killed Bobo in 2020. These appear to be, mainly, letters sent from Mike to Bobo.
- 3.1.6 **At the start of 2013 Mike was in HMP Wormwood Scrubs, London.**
- 3.1.7 On 17<sup>th</sup> January 2013 Mike wrote a letter of 16 pages to Bobo. The letter contained sexual content. He told Bobo that he loved and missed her. He asked about family members and for money to be sent.
- 3.1.8 On 21<sup>st</sup> January 2013 Mike wrote to Bobo. The letter contained sexual content. Mike talked of awaiting release on parole and how much he loved and missed her. He asked for money to be sent.
- 3.1.9 On 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2013 Mike was made a ViSOR subject.
- 3.1.10 On 4<sup>th</sup> February 2013 Mike was writing to Bobo from Prison. He sent her lengthy letters and a Valentines Card. Mike asked about the health of family members and asked Bobo to send him money.
- 3.1.11 On 18<sup>th</sup> February 2013 Mike wrote a six page letter to Bobo. The letter contained sexual content. Mike said he had been in the punishment block because Bobo had lied about money she sent him. He wrote how he loved and missed Bobo and asked her to send him money.

- 3.1.12 On 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2013 Mike wrote a five page long letter to Bobo. The letter contained sexual content. He said that he was on the Discipline Wing for fighting. He stated how much he loved and missed Bobo and asked for money to be sent.
- 3.1.13 On 1<sup>st</sup> March 2013 Mike wrote a six page letter to Bobo. The letter contained sexual content. He wrote about the prison system, how much he loved and missed Bobo. He asked about the health of her family and for Bobo to send him money.
- 3.1.14 On 7<sup>th</sup> March 2013 Mike wrote a four page letter to Bobo. The letter contained sexual content. Mike mentioned how much he loved and missed Bobo. He asked her to send him money.
- 3.1.15 On 13<sup>th</sup> March 2013 Mike wrote a letter 13 pages long to Bobo. It contained sexual content. He wrote about the prison system and how much he loved and missed Bobo. He asked her to send him money.
- 3.1.16 On 7<sup>th</sup> April 2013 Mike wrote to Bobo and stated that he had no credit and Bobo was making him feel fed up.
- 3.1.17 On 15<sup>th</sup> May 2013 Mike wrote a five page long letter to Bobo. It contained sexual content. He wrote how much he loved and missed Bobo. He asked about her family. Mike wrote of Bobo's son 'disrespecting her' by telling her not to lie in bed all day. Mike wrote that when he left prison he would build a bond with the son and would put him in his place because he never had a father figure. Mike asked for money to be sent.
- 3.1.18 On 30<sup>th</sup> June 2013 Mike sent a card to Bobo. The card contained sexual content. He stated how much he loved and missed her and mentioned the prison system.
- 3.1.19 On 4<sup>th</sup> July 2013 Mike wrote a four page letter to Bobo it contained sexual content. He mentions his plans on being parole. It notes that Bobo did not want to live at Mike's mother's house. He asked Bobo to send him £80 for his birthday.
- 3.1.20 On 24<sup>th</sup> September 2013 Mike wrote a five page letter to Bobo. The letter contained sexual content. Mike asked about Bobo's family, and in particular, her son. It suggests that the son is involved in drug dealing. Mike asked Bobo to "Do some homework and find out who his contacts are" in order for Mike to rob them when he was released.
- 3.1.21 On 8<sup>th</sup> February 2014 Mike sent a Valentines Card to Bobo and a three page letter. He wrote condolences on the death of Bobo's father. He suggests that Bobo had been seen by the police and he told her to give up her son. He wrote of living with Bobo on his release.
- 3.1.22 **Release from prison** - Mike was re-released from prison to an AP on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2014.
- 3.1.23 **Recall to prison** - On 6<sup>th</sup> April 2014 Mike was recalled to prison on repeated lateness and a high alcohol reading.
- 3.1.24 On 15<sup>th</sup> April 2014 Mike wrote a five page letter to Bobo. It was apparent that Mike had slept with an ex-girlfriend, Elaine, whilst out on parole and Bobo had discovered this. Mike apologised

and then told Bobo not to contact Elaine as her brothers were gangsters and would kill Bobo. Mike mentions being recalled to prison.

- 3.1.25 **On 21<sup>st</sup> July 2014 Mike was transferred to HMP Onley, Northamptonshire**
  - 3.1.26 **Assault on Prison Officer** - On 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2014 Mike assaulted a prison officer.
  - 3.1.27 **On 6<sup>th</sup> August 2014 Mike was transferred to HMP Lincoln**
  - 3.1.28 On 12<sup>th</sup> August 2014 Mike wrote a five page letter to Bobo. The letter contained sexual content. He asked of her family and for money to be sent.
  - 3.1.29 On 19<sup>th</sup> August 2014 Mike wrote a four page letter to Bobo complaining that when he does not call her, she does not write or send him money. He accused her of being spiteful and trying to control him, suggesting they should go their separate ways.
  - 3.1.30 **On 10<sup>th</sup> October 2014 Mike was transferred to HMP Leicester**
  - 3.1.31 On 20<sup>th</sup> November 2014 Mike wrote and thanked Bobo for the cards and photos and money. The letter contained sexual content and said that Mike was upset that he had not been allowed to keep the pornographic photos of herself that Bobo had sent. He suggested Bobo's son joins with Mike to 'earn a little something'. Mike then asked for money and new trainers.
  - 3.1.32 On 8<sup>th</sup> December 2014 Mike wrote a four page letter to Bobo. It contained sexual content. He said that he loved and missed her and asked about the health of her family.
  - 3.1.33 **Assault on Prison Officer** - On 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2014 Mike was sentenced to a further eight weeks custody for the assault on a prison officer in August 2014
  - 3.1.34 On 8<sup>th</sup> February 2015 Mike wrote a six page letter to Bobo containing sexual content. He also wrote of how much he loved and missed her and asked about health of her family.
  - 3.1.35 On 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2015 Mike wrote a six page letter to Bobo. There was a lot of sexual content and he declared his love to Bobo. He then wrote "I don't want to leave you as your all I've ever wanted in a woman so I'm not letting you go for "ANYTHING" Your stuck with me until you "DIE".'
  - 3.1.36 **On 25<sup>th</sup> March 2015 Mike was transferred to HMP The Mount, Hertfordshire**
- On 10<sup>th</sup> May 2015 Mike wrote to Bobo. It appears that there was a disagreement between Bobo and Mike's mother, Bobo was accused of being spiteful. "I'm scared Babe but I tell you now if you ever put my mum in danger like that again then "U will" lose me & you'll see the other side of me serious star..." the letter concludes with Mike telling Bobo how much he loved and missed her.
- 3.1.37 On 16<sup>th</sup> June 2015 Mike wrote a four page letter to Bobo. He wrote of his privileges being removed as he had been holding something for someone else. He discusses Bobo being the victim of Domestic violence in her previous relationship and reassures her that he would never

hurt her. He states, “I love you to death because I know your (sic) “True and Loyal” and that’s all I ask from a woman really...”

- 3.1.38 On 26<sup>th</sup> June 2015 Mike wrote a five page letter to Bobo. It contained sexual content. He complained about prison regime. Mike asked Bobo to send him money.
- 3.1.39 On 30<sup>th</sup> June 2015 Mike wrote to Bobo. The letter contained sexual content. He asked about family members, said that he loved and missed Bobo. He asked for money to be sent.
- 3.1.40 **On 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2015 Mike was transferred to HMP Belmarsh, London**
- 3.1.41 **On 6<sup>th</sup> July 2015 Mike was transferred to HMP Woodhill, Buckinghamshire**
- 3.1.42 On 25<sup>th</sup> November 2015 Mike wrote a four page letter to Bobo. It appeared that Bobo had become aware that Mike had a child with another woman. Mike denied having a child and told Bobo not to make enquiries and this had upset his family.
- 3.1.43 **On 11<sup>th</sup> December 2015 Mike was transferred to HMP Peterborough, Cambridgeshire**
- 3.1.44 **On 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2015 Mike was transferred to HMP Woodhill, Buckinghamshire**
- 3.1.45 On 10<sup>th</sup> January 2016 Mike wrote a two page letter to Bobo. It contained sexual content. He gave views on single mothers introducing children to their new partners.
- 3.1.46 **On 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016 Mike was transferred to HMP Peterborough, Cambridgeshire**
- 3.1.47 On 18<sup>th</sup> January 2016 Mike wrote a 10 page letter to Bobo. It contained sexual content and stated how he was devoted to and loved Bobo.
- 3.1.48 On 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2016 Mike wrote a four page letter to Bobo. He stated that he was nervous at meeting her sister and nephew and wanted to make a good impression. He commented on his assault on a prison officer. He said he was happy they were engaged and mentioned the ring he wanted to buy Bobo.
- 3.1.49 **On 11<sup>th</sup> July 2016 Mike was transferred to HMP Norwich, Norfolk**
- 3.1.50 **Mental Health Referral from prison** - In July 2016 Mike was referred to Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust (NSFT) mental health services. Mike was assessed but did not attend (DNA) group sessions.
- 3.1.51 On 11<sup>th</sup> July 2016 Mike wrote to Bobo, the letter included ‘All I ask of you is Loyalty, trueness. I know that I’ve got that in you as your (sic) one of the old skool (sic) which is a dying breed out there I swear.’ Mike then requests Bobo to send him clothes.
- 3.1.52 **On 12<sup>th</sup> August 2016 Mike was transferred to HMP Peterborough, Cambridgeshire**
- 3.1.53 On 12<sup>th</sup> October 2016 Mike wrote a two page letter. It contained sexual content. Mike expressed concern that he had not spoken properly to Bobo. He described her as being like a drug to him. He wrote that if he heard her voice he was happy but ‘when I can’t speak to you I’m proper

snappy and moody...' He asked Bobo to stop being afraid to share things with him. "Well Babe that thing with XXXX will sort things trust me & you have nothing to worry about believe me. I would never see no harm etc. done to you just trust me & I respect and appreciate that you don't want to talk to her again but please talk to her properly this time alright dumb head".

- 3.1.54 On 21<sup>st</sup> October 2016 Mike wrote a birthday card to Bobo.
- 3.1.55 On 16<sup>th</sup> November 2016 Mike wrote a four page letter to Bobo. He thanked her for letters, photos and money. He mentioned he enjoyed her visit for her birthday. He told her not to worry about the age difference between them.
- 3.1.56 On 17<sup>th</sup> November 2016 Mike wrote an eight page letter to Bobo. He asked her to send him £50 stating he was moody and snappy if he could not get his 'Doobies' (Cannabis). He said he needed the drugs more, otherwise he could fight people and get in trouble. He needs to stay out of crimes of violence. He talked of Bobo's last visit indicating they had a sexual encounter. He reassured her that he had always preferred older women. He wrote 'Well I'm so glad you wouldn't cheat on me because I'd kill you serious swear to God as I don't believe in dem (sic) things but even if you did I'd feel I'd have to let it go because wat (sic) I did & that's the guilt and fucked up part that I'll have to live with now'. He then wrote that he needed £150-200 to sort something important. He said that he would explain when he can use 'D-Brains phone'. The letter suggests that Bobo has been providing drugs from someone named XXXX and smuggling them to Mike.
- 3.1.57 **On 29<sup>th</sup> March 2017 Mike was transferred to HMP Brixton, London**
- 3.1.58 **On 5<sup>th</sup> May 2017 Mike was transferred to HMP Coldingley, Surrey**
- 3.1.59 **On 24<sup>th</sup> August 2017 Mike was transferred to HMP Wayland, Norfolk**
- 3.1.60 **On 31<sup>st</sup> August 2017 Mike was found in possession of a mobile phone and SIM card.**
- 3.1.61 **On 5<sup>th</sup> September 2017 Mike was transferred to HMP Highpoint, Suffolk**
- 3.1.62 On 10<sup>th</sup> September 2017 Mike wrote a four page letter to Bobo. He asked her to put photos of him around her house so that people knew they were serious about each other. He used the expression '*love you to death*' and '*till death do us part*'.
- 3.1.63 **On 6<sup>th</sup> November 2017 Mike was transferred to HMP Rochester, Kent**

## **3.2 Time Period Under Review**

### **2018**

- 3.2.1 At the start of 2018 Bobo was aged 55 and was living in her three-bedroom house in Norwich, with her 27-year-old son. Mike was aged 38 years and a serving prisoner in HMP Rochester, Kent.

- 3.2.2 **Parole Board decision** - On 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2018 Mike received a notification from the Parole Board on the decision not to release him from custody. The letter stated *"It is the view of the panel that in risk assessment terms your aggressive and violent behaviour in custody repeats a pattern of poor emotional management, risk taking behaviour and instability. It was the panel's view that you need to gain an insight into your use of illicit drugs and alcohol and instrumental and confrontational violence and develop relapse prevention strategies in custody before it could be considered that your risk had reduced. The panel also noted there was no support for your re-release from your Offender Manager. The panel considered that your risk to the public of the commission of violent offences could not be safely managed in the community."*
- 3.2.3 On 19<sup>th</sup> January 2018 Mike was served papers in relation to criminal proceedings for charges of assault on a Prison Officer.
- 3.2.4 On 19<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> January 2018 Mike was visited by his ex-partner Elaine and her two children. Visits planned for October 2018 with his ex-partner and children were cancelled and there were no further visits from them recorded.
- 3.2.5 On 10<sup>th</sup> February 2018 there was no contact from Bobo regarding a medical appointment. A further appointment was booked for 24<sup>th</sup> April 2018.
- 3.2.6 **On 13<sup>th</sup> February 2018 Mike was transferred to HMP Norwich, Norfolk**
- 3.2.7 A mobile phone was found in Mike's property when transferred in. No charge was proceeded with.
- 3.2.8 On 14<sup>th</sup> February 2018 he was seen by the Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust (NSTF) prison wellbeing service. It was noted that he had Emotionally Unstable Personality Disorder (EUPD).
- 3.2.9 **Bobo reported anxiety and depression** - On 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018 Bobo had a medical appointment at Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust (NCHC). Her mental health was discussed. She reported a history of anxiety and depression. She had her son aged 27 living at home. She rarely went out. She returned for a follow up on medical matters on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2018 and discussed diet.
- 3.2.10 On 28<sup>th</sup> February 2018 Mike wrote a six page letter to Bobo. He referred to her as his 'wife to be'. He complained that he was in lockdown and Bobo could not visit due to bad weather. He referred to someone setting up a fake Facebook account for Bobo's children to see. He said that he felt that Bobo's love was fading, and she seemed off. He asked Bobo what she wanted in a man. He wrote that he preferred 'overweight unattractive women because they have more substance to their character'. He said that he could be moved to another prison but put pressure on Bobo to visit. He stated it would kill him if Bobo hurt him.
- 3.2.11 On 13<sup>th</sup> March 2018 Mike wrote a six page letter to Bobo. It contained sexual content. He thanked her for money and could not understand why she did not get permission to visit. Mike asked after Bobo's daughter and grandchild.

- 3.2.12 On 14<sup>th</sup> March 2018 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich. Prison records show a mobile phone had been found in his transfer from HMP Rochester.
- 3.2.13 On the same day Mike wrote a six page letter, he referred to a recent visit from Bobo. The letter contained sexual content. He expressed concern that other people were able visit but she was not. He thanked Bobo for a postal order and spoke optimistically of Bobo's daughter and grandchild.
- 3.2.14 **Mike seen by prison wellbeing service** - On 15<sup>th</sup> March 2018 Mike was seen by NSFT Prison Wellbeing Service. Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) was discussed. He also mentioned his diagnosis of EUPD and suffering from anxiety and depression. Further meetings were discussed.
- 3.2.15 On 24<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> March 2018 Bobo visited Mike in Prison.
- 3.2.16 On 31<sup>st</sup> March 2018, after a social visit had been completed with no concerns, Mike made threats to prison staff, smashed a TV in his cell. He also covered cell floor with grease to make removal from cell difficult. He was placed in the Segregation Unit and the charge of breaking the TV was proved.
- 3.2.17 On 4<sup>th</sup> April 2018 Mike was due to be interviewed by NSFT Prison Wellbeing Service, this was cancelled as he was in segregation.
- 3.2.18 On 5<sup>th</sup> April 2018 a Multi-Disciplinary Good Order and Discipline (GOaD) meeting was held. Attendees were: Governor, Offender Supervisor (OS) and Mental Health Worker. Mike was spoken to via his cell door. His mental health and negative parole outcome were discussed.
- 3.2.19 Bobo visited Mike on 11<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup>, and 24<sup>th</sup> April 2018. No adverse occurrences were recorded.
- 3.2.20 On 27<sup>th</sup> April 2018 NCHC wrote to Bobo's GP concerning a recent medical appointment This was followed up with a phone call to Bobo on 11<sup>th</sup> May 2018.
- 3.2.21 On 15<sup>th</sup> May 2018 Mike appeared at Norwich Magistrates Court charged with Possession of Mobile Phones, and three assaults on prison officers. He pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 12 weeks concurrent to his existing recall.
- 3.2.22 On 17<sup>th</sup> May 2018 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.23 **Mike appeared at Crown Court** – On 12<sup>th</sup> June 2018 Mike appeared at Norwich Crown Court for an offence of 'Conveyance of List B (alcohol, mobile, camera etc) articles in or out of prison on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2017'. He was sentenced to Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014 (ORA) Adult Custody, Post Sentence Supervision (PSS) order to 26<sup>th</sup> July 2019.
- 3.2.24 On 14<sup>th</sup> June 2018 Mike had a meeting with Offender Supervisor (OS) to discuss re-categorisation. Mike told both members of staff that he had a female friend who resides in Norwich, so a local release would afford him the opportunity to utilise the time left for rehabilitation purposes.
- 3.2.25 On the same day Bobo visited Mike.



- 3.2.26 On 18<sup>th</sup> June 2018 the prison decided to move Mike to Open Conditions the following day. This was to help Mike seek employment.
- 3.2.27 On 21<sup>st</sup> June 2018 Bobo visited Mike.
- 3.2.28 **On 28<sup>th</sup> June 2018 Mike was transferred to HMP Hollesley Bay, Suffolk (Open Prison)**
- 3.2.29 Mike was returned to HMP Norwich on the 29<sup>th</sup> June 2018. The reason for return is unclear.
- 3.2.30 On 5<sup>th</sup> July 2018 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.31 On the same date Probation records show **Mike was transferred to HMP Chelmsford, Essex**
- 3.2.32 **Bobo reported suicidal thoughts and concerns for son** - On 10<sup>th</sup> July 2018 Bobo visited her GP and reported she 'Felt suicidal the other day, but safety net is her family, says would never do anything serious to herself, chronic verbal abuse from son is getting to her and had increasing concerns regarding the future of her relationship with a prisoner who is going to be released from prison next year and feels her son will not tolerate". Bobo was signposted to counselling services and offered follow up at the practice, if felt needed.
- 3.2.33 **On 27<sup>th</sup> July 2018 Mike was transferred to HMP Norwich, Norfolk**
- 3.2.34 On 29<sup>th</sup> July 2018 Mike declined medical screening from Virgin Care.
- 3.2.35 On 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2018 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.36 On 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2018 National Probation Service (NPS) note a consultation between Offender Manager and Psychologist. Mike had refused to engage with Personality Disordered Services and did not want to engage with Probation. He was due out on his sentence end date and intended on moving to Norwich.
- 3.2.37 On 6<sup>th</sup> August 2018 Mike was sent a letter of introduction to his Offender Supervisor.
- 3.2.38 On 9<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> August 2018 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.39 On 21<sup>st</sup> August 2018 Mike was seen by Virgin Care and a medication review was completed. He was booked in for anti-psychotic medication monitoring.
- 3.2.40 On 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2018 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.41 On 2<sup>nd</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> September 2018 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.42 **Mike assaulted a prisoner** - On 30<sup>th</sup> September 2018 Mike assaulted another prisoner. He was placed on violence reduction measures and the charge of assault was proved.
- 3.2.43 On 10<sup>th</sup> October 2018 the Offender Supervisor met with Mike. He talked about his frustrations. He said that he asked to be returned from Open Prison as he thought he may abscond. He said he struggled to manage his emotions and felt let down by the system. He talked of temporary housing with his partner in Norwich on release. The address provided was later considered by the DHR Chair with Bobo's family. It was confirmed that the address was not known to belong to any family member.

- 3.2.44 On 16<sup>th</sup> October 2018 Mike was sent a letter by the Parole Board to notify him of his annual review on suitability for release.
- 3.2.45 On 17<sup>th</sup> October 2018 Mike refused to take part in a meeting with National Probation Service Offender Manager (NPS OM) and HMP Offender Supervisor.
- 3.2.46 On 18<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> October 2018 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.47 **Mike reported concerns with mental health** - On 26<sup>th</sup> October 2018 Mike was seen by Virgin Care for a review of medication compliance. He was seen by a nurse as he had not collected his medication. Mike asked for his medication to be dispensed to him and taken 'in sight' of a healthcare professional. He said he was not in a good place with mental health due to 'problems outside the prison'. The prescription was changed as requested.
- 3.2.48 On 29<sup>th</sup> October 2018 HMP Offender Supervisor spoke to Mike. He did not want to meet with NPS OM. Mike appeared low in mood. He stated there was no point in speaking with NPS as he would be released at his Sentence Expiry Date (SED).
- 3.2.49 On 6<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> November 2018 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.50 On 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2018 NPS OM discussed Mike with line manager. A decision was made to try and locate Mike's new partner to establish if she had any children and if a Safeguarding Referral was required.
- 3.2.51 On 5<sup>th</sup> December 2018 Virgin Care reviewed medication compliance of Mike. This was because Mike was not attending medication provision consistently. Mike declined an invite to a medication review on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2018.
- 3.2.52 On 19<sup>th</sup> December 2018 correspondence was sent to Mike concerning his resettlement. He was provided with information of the NSFT Well-being Service. He would be subject to probation supervision upon release until 26<sup>th</sup> July 2019.
- 3.2.53 On 20<sup>th</sup> December 2018 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.54 **Mike was found with mobile phone in cell** - On 21<sup>st</sup> December 2018 Mike was seen to put a mini mobile phone, wrapped in clingfilm, down his prison cell toilet during a cell search. The charge was proved, and he was placed on a basic regime for 28 days.

## 2019

- 3.2.55 **Parole Board decision** - On 9<sup>th</sup> January 2019 Mike was informed by the Parole Board that he would not be released from prison before his sentence expiry date (SED).
- 3.2.56 On 10<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> January 2019 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.57 On 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2019 NPS OM reviewed Mike's risk. He remained as 'HIGH RISK'.
- 3.2.58 On 24<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> January 2019 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.

- 3.2.59 On 1<sup>st</sup> February 2019 NPS wrote to Offender Supervisor (OS) asking if Mike had provided a release address. The OS replied with details of the address initially given, this was Bobo's sister's address. The OS then stated that Mike had proposed to live at a different address on the same street.
- 3.2.60 On 5<sup>th</sup> February 2019 OS left a note for Mike to confirm the address he intended to be released to.
- 3.2.61 On 7<sup>th</sup> February 2019 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.62 On the same day Virgin Care conducted a medication compliance check with Mike in his cell. He had too many tablets, indicating he was not taking as prescribed. He later passed the check on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2019.
- 3.2.63 On 14<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> February 2019 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.64 On 27<sup>th</sup> February 2019 an Integrated Risk Management Meeting was held. Mike was noted as having a history of being a bully and his son was in a secure mental health hospital awaiting trial for murder. A Multi-Agency Public Protection Agreements (MAPPA) meeting was planned for the following week. NPS confirmed that this meeting did not take place.
- 3.2.65 On 1<sup>st</sup> March 2019 Virgin Care checked Mike's medication compliance and he passed.
- 3.2.66 On 8<sup>th</sup> March 2019 Bobo called Norwich City Council (NCC) Benefits Team to ask what her benefits would be when a non-dependent adult, her daughter was living in her home. Bobo reported her daughter being homeless and using her as a postal address. Her daughter was not living there. Records were updated.
- 3.2.67 On 13<sup>th</sup> March 2019 Mike declined to engage with the resettlement team.
- 3.2.68 On the same day Mike self-referred to Phoenix Futures Drugs Services but declined to complete the assessment.
- 3.2.69 On 14<sup>th</sup> March 2019 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.70 **Mike found under influence of drugs** - On 15<sup>th</sup> March 2019 Mike had an emergency medical review as he was found under the influence of an 'illicit substance'. He was incoherent and slurring. He was placed on report and OS informed NPS. He was still under the influence a day later. A charge was proved against him.
- 3.2.71 On 18<sup>th</sup> March 2019 Bobo telephoned NCC and enquired about housing benefit. She also made a new agreement to pay rent arrears.
- 3.2.72 On 21<sup>st</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> March 2019 Bobo visited Mike in HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.73 On 29<sup>th</sup> March 2019 HMP Norwich wrote to Norfolk Constabulary to check on police call outs to the address provided to OS (this was Bobo's address). The Probation Officer specified that a 'HIGH RISK' offender was seeking to relocate from London to Norfolk. Information was sought on reported domestic abuse at the address and safeguards that needed to be in place. The

police informed them that there was no reported abuse, but two cases of drug dealing were reported in 2018 at the address.

- 3.2.74 On 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 Bobo saw her GP and reported on-going low mood. The GP completed a mental health review and there was a discussion about changing Bobo's antidepressant medication. Her longstanding pain was reviewed after Bobo reported she had used a transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) machine to help with ongoing tingling sensation in the right hand. She was referred to the pain clinic.
- 3.2.75 On 4<sup>th</sup> April 2019 HMP Norwich noted a deterioration in Mike's behaviour. He was verbally abusive to a Key Worker.
- 3.2.76 **Mike threatened prison staff** - On 7<sup>th</sup> April 2019 Mike was extremely abusive to staff and smashed the observation panel in his cell door. He threatened to strangle a member of staff 'like a dog'. When staff were cleaning up broken observation panel, Mike threw hot water at staff and spat at them. The charge was proved.
- 3.2.77 On 8<sup>th</sup> April 2019 Mike was spoken to by staff the following day he was said to be upset with his forthcoming release approaching. OS was informed. The OS reported that Mike was distressed at leaving prison without support.
- 3.2.78 On 9<sup>th</sup> April 2019 the HMP OS emailed the NPS OM with concerns on Mike. The OM in turn requested an urgent discussion with Senior Probation Officer in Norwich Probation.
- 3.2.79 On the same day the Prison Resettlement Worker spoke to Mike. Mike said that Bobo was supportive of him living at her address, but he was concerned about living with her full time. A housing referral was made on his behalf. Mike denied having any issues with drugs or alcohol or being the victim of domestic abuse or sex work. The assessment was emailed to Mike's Probation Officer.
- 3.2.80 On 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019 Mike saw a Virgin Care Nurse Practitioner reporting new pain from a fall.
- 3.2.81 The same day NPS records show an email from the Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) to OM. Mike declined any assistance. Probation Services then liaised with Mike on the address for Bobo. His release address was an address in the same street as Bobo.
- 3.2.82 On 11<sup>th</sup> April 2019 an accommodation request was made by HMP Norwich on behalf of Mike. Mike stated he would like to live in Norwich as his partner Bobo lived there.
- 3.2.83 **Mike released from prison to visit probation** - On the same day Mike was released on a Post Sentence Supervision Licence to report to a Probation Office in North London.
- 3.2.84 On 12<sup>th</sup> April 2019 CRC Resettlement Team emailed OM asking that Mike were informed that the Norwich address was not suitable for him. Mike indicated that he would sleep on the street in Norwich but would not return to London.
- 3.2.85 On 15<sup>th</sup> April 2019 Virgin Care discharged Mike. He was advised to collect a week of medication on the morning of his release.

- 3.2.86 On 16<sup>th</sup> April 2019 the NPS OM telephoned Bobo. She confirmed that she was Mike's partner and that she met Mike via a friend and has known him and the family for many years. She has agreed for Mike to reside with her for three days a week as any longer than that will affect her statutory benefits. For the remaining three days she stated that the Mike has friends where he could sofa surf. It was reported 'Bobo informed me that she has 2 adult children and her 28-year-old son resides with her. She told me that her daughter has three children, but they reside in temporary accommodation due to a fire at their home. Bobo was reluctant to provide me with her grandchildren's details but said they are known to children services. I told Bobo that her address will be checked with the local police to ascertain whether there is any adverse intelligence. Bobo didn't appear to be aware that Mike would be on a Post Sentence Supervision (PSS) until July 2019, so did not say due to confidentiality'.
- 3.2.87 On 17<sup>th</sup> April 2019 Mike was informed by his OM that he needed to report to Probation in London and he became very angry. He covered himself in oil and wanted to fight.
- 3.2.88 On the same day NPS sent safeguarding notices to Norwich Police Intelligence Unit and Children's Services in Norwich on Mike's release and offending history.
- 3.2.89 Mike was provided with information on resettlement in Norwich by HMP Resettlement Team.
- 3.2.90 On 18<sup>th</sup> April 2019 Norwich Children's Services (CSC) informed NPS that they do not hold details of any children.
- 3.2.91 **Mike released from HMP Norwich** - On 18<sup>th</sup> April 2019 Mike was released from HMP Norwich.
- 3.2.92 Mike was subject to PSS for 3 months post release. There are standard conditions (see below) for **all** periods of PSS. Failure to comply could result in breach action through Court – who can either take no action, or impose a custodial term of 7 or 14 days depending on the length of the original custodial term. In Mike's case this would be 7 days but as prisoners cannot be released on weekends or bank holidays the likely maximum penalty for him if a breach had been actioned and proved would be 5 days custody. The conditions includes:
- Not to commit any offence;
  - To keep in touch with your supervisor in accordance with instructions given by your supervisor;
  - To receive visits from your supervisor in accordance with instructions given by your supervisor;
  - To reside permanently at an address approved by your supervisor and obtain the prior permission of the supervisor for any stay of one or more nights at a different address;
  - Not to undertake work, or a particular type of work, unless it is approved by your supervisor and to notify your supervisor in advance of any proposal to undertake work or a particular type of work;

- Not to travel outside the British Islands except with the prior permission of your supervisor or in order to comply with a legal obligation (whether or not arising under the law of any part of the British Islands);
  - To participate in activities in accordance with any instructions given by your supervisor.
- 3.2.93 That day, Mike reported to NPS in London. He said he needed an urgent medication review. He had no contact with his ex-partner and children. He stated he had known Bobo for seven years and met through friends. He was told that Bobo's address had not been approved for him to stay at. He was given a travel warrant and an appointment with an OM in Norwich.
- 3.2.94 On 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2019 Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) received Notice of Supervision Order detailing Mike's conditions of release to run from 18<sup>th</sup> April 2019 to 26<sup>th</sup> July 2019. This was entered on MPS intelligence systems.
- 3.2.95 On the same day NPS OM called Bobo by phone, when they asked for Bobo's sister's details the phone went down. The OM tried to contact via mobile phone but was unable to.
- 3.2.96 Mike then attended Norwich NPS with Bobo. It was stated that Mike would stay with Bobo's sister as the original arrangements would be too complicated. Mike said that he had not been in receipt of medication since release and was starting to feel low. Bobo was going to take him to register with a GP. It was noted that Mike did much of the talking and Bobo was quiet. NPS Norwich and London emailed, exchanging information.
- 3.2.97 On 25<sup>th</sup> April 2019 Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) record first contact with Mike.
- 3.2.98 On 26<sup>th</sup> April 2019 NPS OM telephoned Bobo's home. Bobo's daughter answered the phone and said Bobo and Mike were out. The daughter was asked if she stayed there. She said that she was there most days whilst children are at school, the call was made at 18:29.
- 3.2.99 On 29<sup>th</sup> April 2019 Mike attended a NPS supervision appointment with Bobo. Mike said he had registered with a GP and he was back on medication. He had a job poultry farming. Bobo gave full details of her grandchildren. After the meeting NPS emailed Norwich CSC to a social worker for Bobo's grandchildren. It noted 'Mike has served a substantial prison sentence for violent offences including armed robbery. He is assessed as high risk of harm to the public and is a MAPPA level 2 case'. Concerns were noted that Mike was at Bobo's house whilst her grandchildren were visiting.
- 3.2.100 On 7<sup>th</sup> May 2019 Mike phoned the NPS OM in London asking why he was prevented from moving to Norwich. He said he was employed and felt relaxed there. He said he enjoyed being with Bobo and her family he admitted sometimes he 'feels 'suffocated', so takes time out by taking a walk'. He said his ex-partner had called him, he explained he was in another relationship. She continued to call Mike so he blocked her number. The OM said he was concerned about the children being near him if he lost his temper. OM said they would discuss with manager.

- 3.2.101 NPS made attempts to call Mike between 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> May and eventually spoke to him at Bobo's home on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2019. Mike gave a long explanation for his loss of contact. The OM told him that Bobo's address was not suitable, and he supported this with a letter confirming this.
- 3.2.102 On 14<sup>th</sup> May 2019 Bobo attended her GP with a swollen finger, noted to be 'non-traumatic'. She was accompanied by her 'partner'.
- 3.2.103 On the same day Mike called his OM in London and provided a new address where he intended to stay, this was the home address for Bobo's sister Natalie. NPS in Norwich were updated. The address was one mile from Bobo's home. Safeguarding checks were actioned with Norwich CSC and Police.
- 3.2.104 On 17<sup>th</sup> May 2019 Bobo saw her GP with a painful finger and heel. She was sent to the Emergency Department (ED).
- 3.2.105 On the same day Mike failed to attend Norwich NPS, an enforcement letter was issued.
- 3.2.106 On 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2019 Mike attended his NPS appointment in Norwich. He was dismissive of the help NPS could provide. His behaviour was discussed 'Talked about his relationship and how supportive his partner has been throughout the sentence and how he wants to pay back that support on release.' A new Probation Officer took over Mike's case.
- 3.2.107 On 28<sup>th</sup> May 2019 Mike attended Norwich NPS with Bobo. He remained 'anti-probation'. Mike talked about feeling suffocated at home and ways of dealing with this were discussed.
- 3.2.108 On 29<sup>th</sup> May 2019 Mike registered with a new GP in Norwich. Medical conditions were noted as depression and bipolar. Medication was recorded as Quetiapine and Sodium Valproate. Bipolar affective disorder is a mental health condition where the person experiences episodes of depression (low mood) and mania (feeling very high and overactive) which can last for several weeks or longer. Quetiapine and sodium valproate are medications used in the treatment of bipolar affective disorder.
- 3.2.109 On the same day there was liaison between NPS London and Norwich. It was noted that Mike felt guilt for what he put his mother through. She was previously involved in smuggling heroin into prison and sentenced to three years in 2003. Mike's son was in a secure mental health hospital and had been calling Mike daily demanding to see him.
- 3.2.110 On 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2019 Mike had a supervision appointment at NPS Norwich. He reported to be looking for work. He still felt pressured at home and took the dog out for a walk to get time on his own. Motivation for not offending was discussed. Bobo attended the appointment, but she was asked to remain outside for the interview.
- 3.2.111 **Mike reported thoughts of self-harm to GP** - On 4<sup>th</sup> June 2019 Mike attended his GP for a repeat prescription and a painful knee. The GP notes indicate he was 'recently unsure of his own mental health stability, occasionally gets thoughts of self-harm that he may/may not act upon, admits to trying to hang himself in prison, says partner found him in room trying to put on ligature, but wouldn't elaborate'. Mike said he was drinking recently. The GP made a same day

referral to the Crisis Resolution and Home Treatment Team (CRHT) with a plan for Mike to be assessed by NSFT within 4 hours of referral. It was noted that this was discussed with partner.

- 3.2.112 NSFT recorded the referral as an 'emergency assessment requested, risk to self'. Suicidal plan and intent, partner Bobo confirms this. Not taking medication – Sodium Valproate and Quetiapine since leaving prison. Recent discharge from prison (two months). Initially aggressive and little eye contact but improved through appointment. Appearance; well dressed, kempt, well fed, however irritable. Alcohol use discussed; drug use not discussed. Mike states he may have Schizophrenia or EUPD.
- 3.2.113 Two referrals were made by the GP, to the CRHT and Community Mental Health Team (CMHT), and Mike did not attend.
- 3.2.114 On 5<sup>th</sup> June 2019 Norfolk Police received a call from Mental Health Crisis Team that they had a referral from a GP to see Mike but had been unable to contact him. Before police could arrange a joint visit, the mental health nurse called back and confirmed that they had contacted Mike and made an appointment.
- 3.2.115 The Crisis Team called the GP and informed them that they did not have enough information to see Mike the previous day and police intelligence on Mike's offending history suggested that it was not safe to see him one-to-one.
- 3.2.116 On the same day Bobo saw her GP with her painful finger and blood tests were ordered.
- 3.2.117 On 6<sup>th</sup> June 2019 the Crisis Team informed the GP that Mike had declined to be assessed. As he was not suicidal the case was referred to CMHT.
- 3.2.118 On 7<sup>th</sup> June 2019 Mike texted NSFT stating he could not attend his assessment. He spoke on phone it was noted 'Mike reports he is feeling better having commenced the Quetiapine, states he saw the prison psychiatrist and nurses regularly and was diagnosed as having EUPD. States he has been on medication for 10 years and has difficulty with impulse control and anger outbursts. Denied any psychotic symptoms, sleeping better. States his paranoia is due to being in prison and feeling others watch you in there. Spoke about Bobo says they have been together for 10yrs he was positive about their relationship, living with her but asked to move out by probation due to his history of violence and her having children, spoken to the council regarding his own housing. Seems to be managed by London Probation Service. Denied any suicidal thoughts or plans, denied any alcohol or drug use. Wants to get employment and a house. Speech in rate and tone were normal, calm not aggressive; does not require crisis intervention'. The case was closed to Crisis Team and referred to CMHT. Crisis numbers and Samaritans numbers were provided, and the GP was updated.
- 3.2.119 **Probation enforcement letter issued to Mike** - On 10<sup>th</sup> June 2019 Mike failed to attend Norwich NPS, enforcement letter was issued.
- 3.2.120 On 11<sup>th</sup> June 2019 Bobo saw her GP concerning her painful finger. She was referred to vascular surgeon.



- 3.2.121 On the same day Mike was seen by the GP concerning his painful knee. He was noted to still be struggling to readjust to the outside world.
- 3.2.122 On 14<sup>th</sup> June 2019 GP contacted HMP Norwich concerning Mike's medication in prison. This was chased up on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2019.
- 3.2.123 On the same day Mike was offered an appointment with NSFT CMHT.
- 3.2.124 **Probation enforcement letter issued to Mike** - On 17<sup>th</sup> June 2019 Mike failed to attend NPS Norwich, enforcement letter was issued.
- 3.2.125 On 18<sup>th</sup> June 2019 NPS OM London made numerous calls trying to contact Mike. It was established that Mike had failed to attend work for 14 days. Norwich OM was informed and agreed to contact police. Norwich OM attended Bobo's address, Mike was not present. An appointment slip was left, and Bobo agreed to give it to Mike when he returned.
- 3.2.126 On 24<sup>th</sup> June 2019 Mike attended his supervision appointment at NPS Norwich. He reported 90 minutes early, he was told to attend at the correct time. He said that he had an optician's appointment that was more important and walked out. A new appointment was set for 1<sup>st</sup> July 2019.
- 3.2.127 On 25<sup>th</sup> June 2019 the GP left a message for Mike for a follow up.
- 3.2.128 On 28<sup>th</sup> June 2019 NCC called and texted Bobo concerning nonpayment of rent arrears.
- 3.2.129 On 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2019 Mike attended NPS Norwich for a Supervision Appointment.
- 3.2.130 On 5<sup>th</sup> July 2019 Mike DNA a NSFT appointment. A letter was sent to his GP.
- 3.2.131 On 8<sup>th</sup> July 2019 Mike attended NPS Norwich for a Supervision Appointment. No issues were raised. He said having been in prison for so long he could behave in a juvenile manner and get twitchy when he had nothing to do.
- 3.2.132 **Mike reported being assaulted by Bobo's son** - On 14<sup>th</sup> July 2019 police were called by Bobo, via 999 service, to her home. She said that her son was trying to fight with her partner and there was glass and blood everywhere. On arrival of police Mike reported being assaulted by Bobo's adult son, Stephen, causing an injury to his head. It was also reported that Stephen had damaged the back door of the house. Stephen was arrested for assaulting Mike. Bobo and Mike would not engage with police. It was noted that Bobo's seven-year-old grandchild was at the address at the time. A notification was sent to CSC. Police noted that Bobo's daughter Julie was present, and she had a visible bump on her head. Julie signed a note in a police officer's notebook that she *'didn't want to make a complaint about the assault that took place tonight'*. It is not known how Julie sustained the injury.
- 3.2.133 At 00:59 East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST) also received a 999 call from Bobo's address. The call was from 57-year-old female who stated she had her front teeth knocked out and a large bump to the forehead. The call was triaged where the 'patient and partner' said that they did not need an ambulance. A call back was made to the house and police

were on scene. The Emergency Clinical Advice and Triage (ECAT) clinician spoke to the woman and her partner. The woman denied calling an ambulance and declined an assessment. The woman was advised that she could call back an ambulance at any time.

- 3.2.134 Following his arrest, Stephen was interviewed and made no comment. Mike declined to make a victim statement and No Further Action (NFA) was taken against Stephen.
- 3.2.135 Mike's role in the altercation is raised within a Child Protection Investigation (CPI) linked to the incident recorded on Athena, Norfolk's crime and intelligence system (a CPI was submitted due to a child relative being present). The CPI included information not referenced elsewhere in police reports that *"the victim (Mike) fought back and so the suspect (Stephen) took him in to a head lock and they continued to fight. It stated that Stephen then started to leave the address as Mike chased him out"*.
- 3.2.136 On 15<sup>th</sup> July Mike attended NPS Norwich for a Supervision Appointment. He recounted the assault by Bobo's son. Mike appeared to blame NPS for the circumstances. Housing options were discussed. The OM wrote 'I also spoke to Bobo as the behaviour Mike described her son exhibiting to her was very abusive and controlling, I discussed support she could seek about this generally. Bobo confirmed that Mike cannot return to her address at the current time due to the fact he would not be safe.' Mike was provided with an appointment for 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2019, that would be his last NPS appointment.
- 3.2.137 On 16<sup>th</sup> July 2019 NPS OM in London phoned Mike. Mike informed him of the assault by Bobo's son. Mike said Bobo was a victim of domestic violence, that her 29-year-old son had dictated to his mother for years and found it difficult to adjust to Mike's presence. He said that he was staying with Bobo at her sister's house. OM suggested that Bobo could downsize, and that the son move into a smaller flat. Mike was awaiting contact from his sister on accommodation. The following day the OM called Mike. He said that he was offered a place to stay with his sister in Essex. It was noted 'Mike told me that he is motivated to lead a law-abiding life but is ambivalent as to whether he wants to reside permanently with Bobo.'
- 3.2.138 On 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2019 Mike attended his last Supervision Appointment at NPS Norwich. Mike discussed his frustration and concerns around his relationship 'he feels that he has caused issues in Bobo's relationship with her family by encouraging her to go out and to be resistant to her son's behaviour, looked at the reality of these statements and how from what Bobo had said he was actually positive in these actions. He asked for some support service details for her at her request which I provided to him'.
- 3.2.139 On 24<sup>th</sup> July 2019 Bobo called the NCC Housing Options Team. She made enquiries about downsizing her home, her son would remain living with her. Information was supplied and Bobo made a rehousing application on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2019.
- 3.2.140 **Post Sentence Supervision Order Expired** - On 26<sup>th</sup> July 2019 Mike's PSS Order expired.
- 3.2.141 On 29<sup>th</sup> July 2019 NSFT wrote to Mike informing him that he DNA a second appointment.

- 3.2.142 The GP was informed that he had not attended his mental health appointment. Mike had been informed that he was now referred back to his GP.
- 3.2.143 The same day Mike phoned his NPS OM in London. He said he had been living on the streets as staying with Bobo's sister was untenable. Mike's housing options were discussed and he was going to Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) for help. Mike was informed that the OM had been contacted by his son's secure mental health trust, concerned that Mike was not in touch with his son. Mike said he had too much to cope with, with housing, and the OM agreed to call the hospital and explain.
- 3.2.144 On 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2019 NSFT wrote to Mike to inform him that the assessor was off sick and support telephone numbers were provided.
- 3.2.145 On 12<sup>th</sup> September 2019 Mike had a Mental Health Review with his GP. He talked of being out of prison after 22 years and was now struggling to leave the house as he felt people were talking about him and watching him when he went out. He reported suffering from anger outbursts. There was no mention of Bobo.
- 3.2.146 **Mike referred to mental health services NSFT** - On 16<sup>th</sup> September 2019 Mike was given a routine referral to mental health services for further assessment.
- 3.2.147 On the same day Bobo called NCC Housing Options and asked for information.
- 3.2.148 On 17<sup>th</sup> September 2019 Bobo reported to NCC that she had rats in her home. The details of services were provided. Bobo said she had no money to pay for this.
- 3.2.149 On 18<sup>th</sup> September 2019 NSFT recorded the referral from the Mike's GP.
- 3.2.150 On 25<sup>th</sup> September 2019 NSFT wrote to Mike providing a mental health appointment on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2019. A copy was sent to the GP.
- 3.2.151 **Mike reported as being Bobo's carer** - On 27<sup>th</sup> September 2019 NCC Housing Options spoke to Mike. He claimed to be Bobo's carer. Bobo gave verbal authority for Mike to discuss her during the call. Mike asked for Bobo's son to be taken off her application for a reduced size property. The officer insisted on speaking to Bobo and informed her that taking her son off the application would mean that she could no longer request a two-bedroom property. Bobo said she would think about it. She did not call back and her son remained on the application.
- 3.2.152 On 30<sup>th</sup> September 2019 Norfolk and Norwich Hospitals wrote to Mike at Bobo's home concerning an outpatient appointment.
- 3.2.153 **Mike's mother believed to have died on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2019.**
- 3.2.154 On 11<sup>th</sup> October 2019 NSHT CMHT wrote to Mike and asked if he wished to access services. A copy was sent to Mike's GP.
- 3.2.155 On 21<sup>st</sup> October 2019 Mike's sister contacted L&Q Housing to inform them that her mother had died on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2019. The sister told L&Q that her brother had been in prison for 12-14 years and had been living at his mother's flat with his girlfriend. No names were given. Mike's

sister asked that her daughter succeeded as the tenant in the property. Mike's sister was told that her daughter could not succeed the tenancy. Mike's sister then asked if Mike could take on the tenancy. She was informed that if Mike's application for housing was unsuccessful then he would be offered alternative accommodation as a single person.

- 3.2.156 On 31<sup>st</sup> October 2019 NCC Housing Options made an unsuccessful attempt to call Bobo and offer her an appointment to view another property. A letter was sent offering another property to view on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2019, Bobo did not attend the viewing. A further offer was sent by post on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2019, with the offer to view another.
- 3.2.157 On the same day Mike's sister called L&Q to state that she had seen the Notice To Quit her mother's flat. She informed L&Q that her brother would like to apply to succeed the tenancy. A contact point for the application at L&Q was agreed. L&Q were advised that the funeral for the tenant was due to take place on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2019.
- 3.2.158 **Mike registered with a new GP in Hackney** - On 13<sup>th</sup> November 2019 Mike attended a new GP in the London Borough of Hackney to register as a new patient.
- 3.2.159 On 14<sup>th</sup> November 2019 L&Q noted that Mike had submitted a claim for Universal Credit (UC). This was to enable Mike to claim use and occupation of the premises. Mike provided a copy of his Citizen Card and his mother's death certificate.
- 3.2.160 Bobo's sister Natalie had been aware that Bobo had moved to London with Mike. About a month after they had moved Mike phoned Bobo's sister, Dawn. He asked if Bobo had returned to Norwich as she was no longer with him. The family had not seen Bobo. Natalie was concerned and reported Bobo as a missing person to Norfolk Police.
- 3.2.161 **Bobo reported missing** - On 25<sup>th</sup> November 2019 at 23:41 Natalie called Norfolk Police to report Bobo as a Missing Person. It was reported that Bobo had been sofa surfing at her sister's house. Bobo had been in contact with her partner. Bobo told her sister that she was going to London to see her partner. The sister had been unable to contact Bobo since. The police call handler recorded *'there are unreported domestic issues. Mike has been seen with his hand over Bobo's mouth and is very controlling'*. The computer-aided dispatch (CAD) further stated information from Natalie that Bobo *'is at risk from him and knows she hasn't reported any incidents to police'*. The police supervisor requested that intelligence checks were made on previous domestic history; these were made on the Police National Computer and local databases. A missing person report was recorded. There was no incident of domestic abuse recorded.
- 3.2.162 Bobo's sister reported, through a further call to Norfolk police, that she'd had contact with Mike where he said he'd heard from Bobo who called from a phone box. The sister stated that Mike had told her Bobo had said she was lost in 'Strafford' area (sic).
- 3.2.163 On 26<sup>th</sup> November 2019 at 18:02 Bobo's daughter called Norfolk Police to inform them that Mike had called another aunty and told her that Bobo was with him in Stratford, London. It was clarified

that Mike was going to pick up Bobo at Stratford Station and take her by bus to his address. It was believed that Mike lived with his mum in Hackney.

- 3.2.164 On 27<sup>th</sup> November 2019 at 15:59 Bobo's sister Dawn called Norfolk Police to provide information. She reported that at 15:18 she had phone conversation with Bobo. Bobo said her phone was broken and she was using a payphone. She was still in London and was OK. She had got lost and did not know what to do. Mike had gone to pick her up. Dawn said that she had told other family members not to overreact and call police as she knows Mike through Wayland Prison.
- 3.2.165 **Bobo called the MPS** - On 27<sup>th</sup> November at 20:03 Bobo called the MPS to report that her family had reported her missing from Norwich, but she was safe and well staying in London with her partner. Norfolk Police were informed at 20:41.
- 3.2.166 At 20:51 Norfolk Police recorded that, two days after she was reported missing, Bobo's sister Natalie called to say that they had spoken to Bobo on the phone. She reported that Bobo said she had left Mike's home to look for him and got lost. Natalie reported that '*she has concerns Mike is controlling and has had previously unexplained bruises*'. Norfolk Police records show that a local patrol Sergeant had spoken to Bobo on the mobile phone. Bobo said that she wanted to be away from Norwich, she was staying in London and could not remember the address. The Sergeant recalled Bobo being quite evasive, and the phone being answered by a male. The report was kept open as Bobo had only been spoken to by phone. There was no record of a domestic abuse incident recorded. The Norfolk Police IMR does not state what risk grading was allocated to the missing person report.
- 3.2.167 On 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2019 a third sister of Bobo, Anne, contacted Norfolk Police. She reported that she thought that Bobo may have been staying at his mother's address in Walthamstow and that his mother had passed away on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2019.
- 3.2.168 On 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2019 at 03:55 the MPS received an email from a Norfolk Police Sergeant informing them that a 'MEDIUM RISK' missing person from Norwich was believed to be staying at an address in Hackney with a man with the same forename as Mike, different surname. It was requested that officers attend in person. It was reported that Bobo had been spoken to on the phone 'but her sister fears she is being prevented from contacting her family due to coercive and controlling behaviour'. A photograph was provided. Details of Bobo were circulated to officers patrolling at 04:17 but there were no officers available to carry out the request.
- 3.2.169 At 18:53 a sergeant from Norfolk Police called the MPS with the details of Mike's address, stating they would email the details. At 19:59 the email was received by the MPS giving Mike's address and identity. Request that officers see Bobo face-to-face and make sure that there are no offences as they are concerned about 'coercive and controlling behaviour'.
- 3.2.170 On 4<sup>th</sup> December 2019 at 08:57 MPS called at Mike's Hackney Address, there was no reply. A neighbour said that the previous tenant had passed away but someone else was there now. It

was noted that a woman sometimes visits with children. There was another note of a police call at 09:42. Then no further visits.

- 3.2.171 At 21:41 Norfolk Police records show that Bobo and Mike attended Stoke Newington Police Station. Bobo spoke to the Norfolk Police Control Room on the phone. The area Sergeant was informed and updated. The Sergeant asked for the CAD to be updated and advised of the need for the MPS to still carry out a safe and well check and see Bobo alone. There was no request for a Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Honour Based Violence (DASH) risk assessment. That decision was updated by another sergeant, stating that as Bobo had been seen safe and well in person that further visit would not be necessary.
- 3.2.172 On 5<sup>th</sup> December 2019 the MPS called Norfolk Police and informed that Bobo had been spoken to. Information received by MPS was that Bobo had made it clear that she was in London, safe with no intentions of meeting with police as she disliked police due to previous encounters. The case was marked as complete in the MPS at 19:04.
- 3.2.173 **Mike referred to mental health services in Hackney** - On 9<sup>th</sup> December 2019 East London NHS Foundation Trust (ELFT) received a referral from Mike's Hackney GP. The referral was triaged the following day and it was decided to discuss at the Referrals Meeting.
- 3.2.174 On 12<sup>th</sup> December 2019 ELFT sent Mike an appointment letter for 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2020. This offered Mike an assessment with the Consultant Psychiatrist.
- 3.2.175 On the same day L&Q Housing received a telephone call from Mike to discuss succession of tenancy and housing benefit for the Hackney address previously occupied by his mother. The manager was not available at the time. They later called Mike and left a voicemail.
- 3.2.176 On the same day Mike requested a medical certificate from his GP. An unfit to work certificate was issued due to mental health – depression and insomnia.

## 2020

- 3.2.177 On 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2020 Mike did not attend his ELFT appointment as planned. The Consultant Psychiatrist spoke with Mike on the phone who was apologetic and wanted to rearrange. Consultant Psychiatrist wrote a letter to the GP who made the referral to ELFT to update.
- 3.2.178 On 7<sup>th</sup> January 2020 the L&Q Case Manager attempted to contact Mike by phone. Contact was not made, and a voicemail was left for Mike to return the call.
- 3.2.179 On 15<sup>th</sup> January 2020 Mike telephoned the Hackney GP. It was reported that he was angry with the practice as he was unable to collect a repeat prescription. He was advised that they were unable to provide the prescription as Mike had not attended for a review appointment.
- 3.2.180 On 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 Mike attended ELFT for an assessment. He was accompanied by Bobo. The Consultant Psychiatrist was able to begin assessment, but Mike was only able to stay 15 minutes, as he had a housing appointment (the panel could not establish that Mike had a housing appointment on this date). The Consultant Psychiatrist offered a follow up appointment

following this to continue with his initial assessment and formulation. Bobo remained silent throughout most of the appointment.

- 3.2.181 On the same day the Consultant Psychiatrist emailed the Mental Health Team at HMP Norwich for information on Mike. He also wrote to the GP outlining the assessment and requested a change to Mike prescriptions, so that he could collect them from the pharmacy.
- 3.2.182 On 20<sup>th</sup> January 2020 the Consultant Psychiatrist noted a discussion at GP Liaison Meeting. GP confirmed prescriptions could be collected from pharmacy.
- 3.2.183 On 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2020 Mike did not attend a planned appointment at ELFT. Attempts were made to contact Mike by phone, without success. A letter was sent to the GP to update and to state that another appointment would be offered. It was stated that ELFT will work to refer Mike to agencies to support him adjust to life outside prison. The letter was received the same day.
- 3.2.184 On 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2020 Mike called L&Q requesting a call back. It was noted that he was 'very stressed' concerning his succession request and rent arrears. The Case Manager called back the following day, but Mike's phone was switched off with no voicemail facility.
- 3.2.185 On 7<sup>th</sup> February 2020 Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) wrote to Mike on his application for Personal Independence Payment (PIP). He was awarded payment for daily living but not mobility. Mike had reported difficulties in preparing food, managing therapy and monitoring health conditions, engaging with people face-to-face and making budgeting decisions.
- 3.2.186 On 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020 the L&Q Case Manager sent a letter to Mike advising that his request to succeed the tenancy has been declined. Mike did not meet the criteria to succeed to the tenancy. He had not been living at the address for the 12 months prior to his mother passing away. He was advised to give vacant possession within 28 days. He was advised to contact the local authority housing department to register for housing. The letter was found at Mike's home.
- 3.2.187 **Mike attends mental health appointment** - On 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020 Mike attended an appointment at ELFT as planned for the full 60 minutes. He was referred by Consultant Psychiatrist to Enhanced Primary Care (EPC) Service for low level support to be provided to Mike. Mike's GP received a letter from ELFT confirming a diagnosis for EUPD on the same day.
- 3.2.188 **Bobo registered with new GP in Hackney** - On 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2020 Bobo attended the Hackney GP practice to complete a face-to-face New Registrant Health Check.
- 3.2.189 On 4<sup>th</sup> March 2020 a referral for Mike was made by ELFT Consultant Psychiatrist to Specialist Psychotherapy Services (SPS), Mentalisation-Based Therapy (MBT) and Outreach.
- 3.2.190 On 5<sup>th</sup> March 2020 Bobo collected a repeat prescription from the Hackney GP.
- 3.2.191 On 9<sup>th</sup> March 2020 SPS, MBT and Outreach Team sent out an appointment letter to Mike for an initial appointment with them on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2020.
- 3.2.192 Seven days before Bobo was found dead, an unfit to work medical certificate was issued by the GP to Mike, due to mental health - depression and insomnia.

- 3.2.193 Six days before Bobo was found dead, Mike sent a message to DWP to confirm a telephone appointment five days later.
- 3.2.194 Three days before she was found dead, in March 2020, Bobo telephoned her daughter and told her that her head was hurting. Her daughter told her to go to hospital, Bobo refused, due to the COVID19 pandemic. Her daughter said that she was scared but Bobo said she was fine and loved her unconditionally.
- 3.2.195 Two days before Bobo was found dead, Bobo's daughter stated that she called the police to check on her mother.
- 3.2.196 On the day before Bobo was found dead Mike's referral to the ELFT Consultant Psychiatrist was closed. Mike was referred and allocated to the ELFT Enhanced Primary Care Team.
- 3.2.197 On the same day ELFT Outreach Practitioner telephoned Mike to rearrange an appointment, as face-to-face appointments were being cancelled due to COVID19. Mike hung up the phone and did not answer when ELFT tried to call back. Also on that day Mike failed to attend his DWP telephone appointment.
- 3.2.198 **Mike reported that Bobo has died** - On the day that Bobo was found dead, Mike attended Stoke Newington Police Station and stated that he thought his partner was dead due to an overdose of drugs. Police attended the flat in Hackney and found Bobo deceased in bed with a number of injuries. Mike was arrested on suspicion of murder.
- 3.2.199 **Coronavirus lockdown measures come in after Bobo's death.**



## 4. Overview

### 4.1 Summary of Information from Family

- 4.1.1 Some of Bobo's family took up the offer of speaking to the Chair via video interview. The interview was conducted with the support of the VSHS. The family preferred to be interviewed together. Present at the meeting were Bobo's daughter (Julie), sister (Anne), sister (Molly) and brother (John). The family provided background information on Bobo's life used to complete the earlier sections of this report.
- 4.1.2 Bobo was described as a person that people would always go to speak about their problems. Her door was always open.
- 4.1.3 They first knew of Mike as Bobo's nephew was in prison with him. The nephew was the son of Bobo's sister Dawn. The nephew knew someone who wanted a pen pal, Mike. Bobo's brother recalled her being told that she should speak to Mike but not to get into a relationship with him. The family believed that Bobo started a relationship with Mike because he gave her attention.
- 4.1.4 Bobo's daughter knew that her mum got engaged to Mike whilst he was in prison. Bobo's children expressed concerns to her about Mike. Her daughter said *'she believed that Mike loved her, and they used to fall asleep on the phone together. She used to send him money as well'*.
- 4.1.5 When Mike came out of prison, in 2019, the family made enquiries about Clare's Law (DVDS).<sup>16</sup> They wanted to find out about him and why he was in prison, they knew it was something substantial as he had been in for 20 years. Bobo's daughter recalled being told by her mother that if anyone asked if she brought Bobo's grandchildren to the house then tell them 'no'. That was what prompted her to enquire about Clare's Law. Anne confirmed that she made a telephone call to her local police station in Norfolk requesting information under Clare's law. She was told that family were not allowed to know, and it would have had to be Bobo making the request for information. They considered this wrong as Bobo was in an abusive relationship and Mike was controlling her.
- 4.1.6 The family made reference to letters that they had found sent from Mike to Bobo, whilst he was in prison. They had given the letters to the MPS. *"If you read the prison letters, it was a sandwich as he would be lovely, then violent then lovely again. He would also ask her for money."* The family went through the letters and it was clear to them that there was evidence of Mike's controlling and coercive behaviour. They said, *"He would start off nice, e.g. thanks for sending me writing paper, and then if you speak to my mum again you would see stars, and then but I do love you and don't forget to bring my phone and put money in my account."* They suggested that Bobo was taking benefit money from Stephen and sending it to Mike on a monthly basis.

---

<sup>16</sup>(DVDS) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/domestic-abuse-bill-2020-factsheets/domestic-violence-disclosure-scheme-factsheet>

Adding “*Mike would say if he didn’t get the money then she would get a hiding*”. Mike also said, *‘bring what your sister would give you, I want the good stuff’*. They did not believe the prisons were monitoring letters. Mike described himself as *‘Top Dog’*.

- 4.1.7 Bobo’s brother said that he knew Mike had two Facebook accounts and on one he would state that he had a wife and children (referring to Elaine). It appeared that someone else was taking visiting appointments with Mike ahead of Bobo. The family knew that he said he was engaged to Elaine since 1999 and some of the money that Bobo sent in, was used to buy Elaine a car and other stuff. When Mike was let out in 2014, they were supposed to be getting married. One time he was supposed to be with Bobo but he went to spend time with Elaine.
- 4.1.8 Bobo’s sister expressed concerns as to how Bobo was portrayed in court during which *‘they said that Bobo was an alcoholic and Mike was a substance misuser and so that’s why he received the lowest sentence of manslaughter, however she was never an alcoholic or substance misuser’*. Bobo’s daughter stated that she hated her mother drinking. She believed that Mike was trying to get her mother to take drink and drugs.
- 4.1.9 Anne stated that she had gone with Bobo to visit Mike in prison. She went to HMP Peterborough once. She saw Mike lose his temper with a prison officer. She also saw Bobo come out the prison following a visit, crying *‘because the drugs were short.’*
- 4.1.10 The family said Bobo would take drugs in hidden in her bra *‘They would cuddle each other and he would fiddle in her bra’*. This scared Bobo’s daughter as she was present with her son at the time, and they had been checked by sniffer dogs. Bobo’s sister said about Bobo that *‘she did plug it’* (hide internally). The visits would finish at 16:00 hours and Bobo would wait in the car park after until 19:00 hours, the family did not know what happened in that time period. The family told Bobo not to take drugs.
- 4.1.11 Bobo’s brother expressed concerns Mike was seen as a carer. He said that Mike presented himself to doctors as Bobo’s carer as part of his exploitation. Bobo was a carer for her own son.
- 4.1.12 The family had no concerns about Mike’s ethnicity or with Bobo being in an bi-racial relationship. Bobo’s daughter said that Mike believed the family did not like him because he was half-Jamaican.
- 4.1.13 When Mike came out of prison he stayed with Bobo in a hotel for three or four nights. Bobo asked her sister Anne if she could say that Mike was staying with her. The sister declined as she was a carer, had grandchildren and did not know Mike’s criminal history. She believed that Bobo coerced another sister to allow Mike to stay with them. Then for the first two weeks that Mike was out he stayed with Bobo. Bobo was described as being *‘so happy’*. Then *‘After those two weeks, the doors were locked, and he took her phone and bank card. He got a job with the cousin who connected them, and no one could get in touch with Bobo’*. Mike wanted to meet the family but was rude to them and ignored them. After the initial two weeks the family had difficulty in seeing Bobo. They could not get in the door of Bobo’s house, and she had previously been so welcoming.

- 4.1.14 Mike stayed with Bobo, but if the Probation Service called Bobo would always say Mike was out. Mike would also use Bobo's phone. They knew Mike was using Bobo's Facebook account as messages were not written in the style that Bobo used.
- 4.1.15 Mike and Stephen would fight. "*Stephen didn't like the fact that he had taken his mother away from him. He was 30 years old, lived with and was fully dependent on his mother to all of the sudden not being able to talk to her.*" After Stephen and Mike had a fight the family got involved, then Bobo and Mike moved away. Bobo had tried to get rehoused to a smaller place so that Stephen could get a place of his own.
- 4.1.16 In July 2019 there was a party that ended with Mike and Stephen having a fight. Bobo's nephews tried to get Mike. The following day Bobo moved out and lived in a shed.
- 4.1.17 In October 2019 they found out that Mike's mother was ill and then died. Bobo left with Mike and said that she would return to Norwich adding '*if I don't come back in 2 weeks come get me*'. They could not establish where Bobo was staying.
- 4.1.18 In November 2019 Mike messaged Bobo's daughter and said that Bobo was not with him. Bobo's sister Natalie was informed, by their sister Dawn, that Mike had also phoned her to state that Bobo was missing. He said he had left his mother's flat with Bobo in bed and when he returned, she had gone. The family believed Bobo was trying to escape.
- 4.1.19 Natalie telephoned the police and reported Bobo as a missing person. She told Norfolk Police that she was concerned about Mike's controlling behaviour. She said that Bobo was no longer herself and not allowed to do things. She was concerned because Mike was becoming more and more controlling. She said that her sister had become a different person. Natalie was asked if the police had asked her if she wanted to report a crime or domestic abuse, she said they did not.
- 4.1.20 The family wanted Bobo to hand herself in to the police. They received messages from Bobo's phone, but they could tell that Mike was sending them. The family did later speak to Bobo on the phone.
- 4.1.21 The family had limited contact with Bobo when she was in London. Her brother received a text message and a Facebook messenger video from her saying 'Happy Christmas'. Bobo's sister said, '*she had lost a lot of weight in the video, she was clearly standing there trying to deliver this message to the family and could see that she had been prompted what to say or reading what to say.*'
- 4.1.22 Bobo's brother said that he had asked the police to do a home visit and they said they would do it, but that happened on the day that Mike handed himself in. He said that it took the police two to three weeks to do a welfare check. Bobo sister said, '*She was murdered in less than 2 weeks, and she couldn't have got on the train because of covid.*'
- 4.1.23 When asked if the family had seen any evidence of physical assault. They said they had seen her with two black eyes. Her daughter saw her trying to cover up with foundation when Stephen

was due to visit, she asked Mike if he had hit her mum and he denied it. Bobo's brother witnessed Bobo out walking with Mike. Mike told her that she should always walk behind him. The last time he saw Bobo was in the city where she was walking behind Mike with her head down. He tried to speak to his sister about this but she ignored his texts. Anne remembered an occasion when Bobo's hand was black, Bobo said she would see the doctor about it.

- 4.1.24 Bobo's daughter recalled that her mother phoned her three days before she was found dead. She said that her head hurt. Her daughter told Bobo to go to hospital, but she did not because of fears of COVID. They told Bobo that she was scaring them, and Bobo insisted she was fine and loved her daughter unconditionally. The next day they called the police to check on Bobo.
- 4.1.25 When asked if they felt anything could have been done to help or prevent harm. The family said they had found a letter to Mike indicating he had breached his probation and he could have been recalled to prison, but he was not. They felt Mike was not chased up enough. He said that Mike was in Norwich, when his probation order said he should be in London. They also asked how Mike was allowed to stay in his mother's house from October 2019 to March 2020. There were also concerns that Mike's sister and niece were in the Hackney property when Bobo was dying. They were not held accountable. They also stated that Mike's sister delivered the news that Bobo was dead before the police did.
- 4.1.26 The family believed that the police and probation should have done more checks, *'If someone gets into a relationship with someone who has been in prison for that long, there should be more family involvement. They are a big family. He wasn't allowed to that property with her kids, services shouldn't just focus on the victim. There should be more information sharing and it should be more accessible'*. They felt that Clare's law should apply to the family being allowed to check on a new partner and not just the potential victim.
- 4.1.27 They were concerned that Mike took one of Bobo's grandchildren with him to a shopping centre whilst Mike was drug dealing. He made the grandchild sit in a stranger's car. They were worried that Mike had been in prison as a paedophile or for sex offences.
- 4.1.28 The family later expressed views to the Chair that they felt Mike was trying to prepare his position before he killed Bobo. They believed there was premeditation, and he was trying to get his mental health diagnosis in play for his defence.

## **4.2 Summary of Information from Perpetrator and Friends, Work Colleagues, Neighbours and Wider Community**

- 4.2.1 The perpetrator did not respond to requests to be interviewed. The panel made attempts to trace perpetrator's sister, but they were unsuccessful.

## **4.3 Summary of Information Known to the Agencies and Professionals Involved**

**4.3.1 East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST)**

4.3.2 EEAST provide emergency ambulance service for the area where Bobo lived in Norfolk. They received one call to Bobo's address to an assault, from a 57-year-old woman (Believed to be Bobo). The woman caller declined an ambulance. A call back established the police were on scene. Further offers of medical assessment were declined by the caller.

4.3.3 This was the only contact submitted for the chronology.

**4.3.4 East London NHS Foundation Trust (ELFT) Mental Health**

4.3.5 ELFT provided mental health services to Mike whilst he was living in Hackney. Mike was referred by his GP for community mental health services as he had previously received support in prison and would like similar in the community. An initial assessment was booked for January 2020 but Mike did not attend. A rescheduled appointment was held but Mike did not stay for the whole session. Mike said he felt trapped indoors and could only go out accompanied by his sister or Bobo. ELFT wrote to HMP Norwich for access to Mike's medical records. NSFT replied and stated that they did not provide services whilst Mike was in custody and referred ELFT to Virgin Care.

4.3.6 Mike did not attend a second appointment booked for January 2020 but did attend an appointment on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020. He attended with Bobo. Mike gave a history and referred to his son being in Broadmoor Hospital. He said that he had previously attempted suicide. The Psychiatrist made referrals to teams within ELFT and a benefits advisor. On the date before Bobo's death ELFT contacted Mike to inform him that face-to-face appointments were not being held due to COVID 19. Mike hung up the telephone.

4.3.7 There were 18 contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.

**4.3.8 Hackney CCG for General Practitioner (GP)**

4.3.9 The practice offers primary care services for an area in Hackney. Mike registered in November 2019 and Bobo registered 15 days before her death in 2020. Referrals were made to ELFT Mental Health Service and the Vascular Surgeon, for another health issue. During the review period two medical certificates were issued to Mike confirming he was unfit to work due to depression and insomnia. There was one letter of correspondence from ELFT Mental Health on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020 confirming patient diagnosis of EUPD. Bobo had two contacts with the practice. One for new registrant health check and the other to collect a repeat prescription issued to her. New registration service at the time did not include any routine enquiry into domestic abuse. That process has now changed.

4.3.10 There were eight contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.

**4.3.11 HMP Prisons**

- 4.3.12 During the period under review Mike spent a significant period of his sentence in HMP Norwich as he approached release. He spent a short period in HMP Rochester. HMP Norwich is described as a 'complex local prison'.
- 4.3.13 Mike arrived at HMP Norwich from HMP Chelmsford in July 2018. He was given a standard induction at the prison and located on the Local Discharge Unit on the Category C site. He was allocated an Offender Supervisor (OS) and was seen on a few occasions by his responsible officer or another OS prior to his release on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2019.
- 4.3.14 Mike's behaviour in prison was described as 'mixed'. He could show a good work ethic but he was also involved in assaults. He was involved in substance misuse and was found with prohibited items, such as mobile phones. The chronology suggests that on some occasions Mike was found in possession of these items following visits from Bobo.
- 4.3.15 Mike told staff that he planned to live with Bobo on release. Prior to his release he had refused to engage with his Offender Manager (OM) in the community. Mike was being released having served his full sentence and was not subject to any licence.
- 4.3.16 There were 97 contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.
- 4.3.17 **Leeway Domestic Violence and Abuse Services**
- 4.3.18 In July 2012 Bobo called the service concerning advice and support on the behaviour of her son. All information has since been deleted under Data Protection and Retention of Information policy. There was no further contact with Bobo after this date.
- 4.3.19 **L&Q Housing Association**
- 4.3.20 L&Q is a housing association who provide social housing for applicants on the local authorities waiting list. L&Q operate within London the home counties. L&Q is the freeholder of the building where Mike's mother was the sole tenant from July 2004. Mike was listed as a household member at the start of the tenancy. On 21<sup>st</sup> October 2019 Mike's sister informed L&Q that her mother had died. She stated that Mike had just been released from prison and had been staying at his mother's home with his girlfriend (not named). Mike's sister said that her daughter had been the main carer for her mother over the past year and wanted to take over the tenancy. This was declined as she was not in tenancy 12 months prior to her grandmother's death and had another tenancy. Mike's sister then asked if Mike could take over the tenancy. She was informed that he may be able to claim tenancy but not at his mother's two-bedroom property, as he was single.
- 4.3.21 L&Q then had a series of contacts with Mike to deal with his claim of tenancy to his deceased mother's flat. Mike's application was not successful. On 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020 Mike was sent a letter advising him to give vacant possession in 28 days. Mike's sister contacted L&Q twice in March 2020 and submitted a letter to appeal the decision on behalf of her brother. There were no reported incidents of domestic abuse until a neighbour notified L&Q of Bobo's homicide.

4.3.22 There were four contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.

**4.3.23 Metropolitan Police Service**

4.3.24 The MPS is the police service for London, including the Borough of Hackney. The first contact in relation to this review started in November 2019. Bobo telephoned the MPS to state that her family, in Norwich, had reported her missing. Bobo stated she was safe and well and Norfolk Police were updated. There were further requests from Norfolk Police for the MPS to see Bobo as a 'MEDIUM RISK' missing person. It was reported, in Norfolk, that Bobo's sister was concerned that Bobo was being prevented from contacting her family due to Mike's controlling behaviour. Enquiries were made and police called at Mike's address. Bobo eventually spoke to Norfolk Police from London and the case was closed.

4.3.25 The MPS were responsible for the investigation into Bobo's homicide in 2020.

4.3.26 There were six contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.

**4.3.27 National Probation Service (NPS)**

4.3.28 The NPS is a statutory criminal justice service that supervises high-risk offenders released into the community. On his release from prison on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2018 Mike was subject to three months post-sentence supervision until 26<sup>th</sup> July 2019. On release Mike wanted to live with Bobo.

4.3.29 Given that Mike was a ViSOR nominal and that he had a history of non-compliance in prison, a MAPPA meeting should have been convened by NPS London prior to release ensuring that relevant agencies in Norwich attended (police, prison, and probation as a minimum). Then, a multi-agency risk management plan could have been agreed and all information shared in one forum but this was never done.

4.3.30 Police and Safeguarding checks with CSC were made on Bobo's address prior to Mike's release and Probation in Norwich were also alerted. Mike was seen by Norwich Probation for those three months and as Bobo's address was deemed unsuitable. A further two Norwich addresses (sisters of Bobo) were offered; again, police and social services checks completed.

4.3.31 After Mike's release further checks were made by Norwich NPS specifically around any domestic abuse call outs. Children's Services were alerted that he was residing at Bobo's address and was having contact with her grandchildren who were known to Children's Services.

4.3.32 In July 2019, just before Mike's statutory supervision expired, he reported an assault on him by Stephen. Mike did not press charges. After his statutory supervision expired, Mike returned to London and reported that he and Bobo were homeless.

4.3.33 There were 44 contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.

**4.3.34 Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust (NCHC)**

4.3.35 NCHC provide over 70 healthcare services across Norfolk. From 2008 Bobo received services for Musculoskeletal physiotherapy, Phlebotomy Clinic (blood samples) and Continence Service.

In 2011 Bobo attended Continence Service, at this time she was with a support worker she described having problems with her son, who was possessive and aggressive.

4.3.36 In February 2018 Bobo was referred to the Continence Service. She discussed mental health, with history of anxiety and depression, she was low in energy. Her son, with ADHD, lived with her. She found going out to be a problem. Bobo declined the offer of counselling. Bobo continued to see the service until she was discharged in May 2018. She made no disclosures of domestic abuse.

4.3.37 There were five contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.

#### 4.3.38 **Norfolk Constabulary**

4.3.39 Norfolk Constabulary polices the county of Norfolk, where Bobo resided with her son, Stephen until November 2019. Mike also lived in the county, with Bobo, after his release from prison in April 2019 until he moved to London in November 2019.

4.3.40 The first contact with Mike came after NSFT called police on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2019 as there were concerns that Mike had missed appointments and he had a history of weapons use and suicidal ideation. NSFT later reported Mike as being safe.

4.3.41 On 14<sup>th</sup> July 2019 Bobo called Norfolk Police to report an assault on Mike by her son Stephen. Bobo's seven-year-old grandchild was in the house at the time. Stephen was arrested, but Mike would not provide a statement. NFA was taken and Stephen returned home. CSC were notified by police. No DASH assessment completed as Stephen was not a family member of Mike. Norfolk Police only record DASH assessments for intimate partner reports. The incident was recorded as a Domestic Abuse Investigation.

4.3.42 The final contact from Norfolk Police started on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2019 when Bobo was reported as being a Missing Person by her family. They told police that there were unreported domestic issues, Mike had been seen with his hand over Bobo's mouth and was 'very controlling'. The family felt that Bobo was at risk from Mike and had not reported previous incidents of domestic abuse to police. There was no record made of the allegation of assault or domestic abuse incident.

4.3.43 It was later reported that Mike and Bobo had gone to Mike's mother's address in Hackney and Norfolk Police liaised with the MPS. On 27<sup>th</sup> November 2019 Bobo's sister, Natalie, called Norfolk Police to report that she had spoken to Bobo in London. The sister also reported that she had concerns that Mike was controlling and Bobo had previously been seen with unexplained bruises. There was no record made of the allegation of domestic abuse.

4.3.44 Norfolk Police followed up enquiries with the MPS and spoke to Bobo on the phone. They requested that the MPS see Bobo on her own and conduct a welfare check. They did not notify the MPS of the need to conduct a DASH assessment.



- 4.3.45 Norfolk Police did not record a report of domestic abuse and no DASH assessment was completed.
- 4.3.46 There were nine contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.
- 4.3.47 **Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust (NSFT)**
- 4.3.48 NSFT provides inpatient and community mental health services. The Trust also provides a Wellbeing Service (access to psychological therapies) including an in-reach service within the local regional prisons.
- 4.3.49 The Trust had contact with Mike during his time in HMP Norwich and was referred to the service after release in 2019. His record recorded that in 2018 he was diagnosed with Emotionally Unstable Personality Disorder (EUPD). He also reported suffering from anxiety and depression.
- 4.3.50 Mike was referred to NSFT community services for an emergency assessment by his GP in June 2019 due to 'risk to self'. He reported that he had been on medication for 10 years and had difficulty with impulse control and anger outbursts. He disclosed that he had been with Bobo for 10 years. Mike denied suicidal thoughts and was discharged, having been provided with crisis numbers. In September 2019 Mike was referred as a routine case. Mike had reported Bi-polar disorder and depression. He was offered an appointment in October 2019 and DNA.
- 4.3.51 There were 12 contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.
- 4.3.52 **Norwich City Council**
- 4.3.53 The council provides all the services of a district council to the residents of Norwich. The council also provides landlord function to social housing properties in the area. The main contact with Bobo was through her council house tenancy, which started in 1984. Between 2015 and 2017 Bobo was referred to Norwich City Council's Family intervention project, primarily in relation to support for her to effectively manage her son's behaviour. There were also reports to eight repair requests for fixtures and fitting within Bobo's home between 2008 and 2015 due to damage reportedly committed by Stephen. During this period the council referred Bobo to Leeway domestic abuse services.
- 4.3.54 Bobo was in receipt of Housing benefit for her property. However, after the bedroom tax was introduced in 2013, Bobo started accruing rent debt as her rental property held three bedrooms when there was only a requirement for two bedrooms, as just Bobo and Stephen were registered as living at the property. This resulted in a number of interactions with the council's Income team and budgeting service to make provision for Bobo to affordably pay the additional cost for rent, as well as having regular discussions with Bobo to consider downsizing to a smaller property.
- 4.3.55 In September 2019 Mike called the council claiming to be acting on behalf of Bobo, as her carer. He asked for Stephen to be removed from the tenancy. The council asked to speak to Bobo. Bobo received advice and information from the council's Housing Options team, to support Bobo

to have an affordable tenancy and scheduled viewings of alternative properties for her to attend in November and December 2019, which were not attended.

4.3.56 The council's Housing Options team has a full time Domestic Abuse Advisor. DASH assessments and Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC) referrals can be made within the team. The council did not identify domestic abuse during interactions that started with Mike's contact.

4.3.57 There were 12 contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.

#### 4.3.58 **Norwich GP**

4.3.59 The practice offers primary care services for an area in Norwich. Bobo was a long-standing patient of the surgery. Prior to 2018 Bobo historically sought primary care services with regards to mental health, issues of anxiety, depressive illness, social phobia and panic attacks, related partly to behavioural issues of her son and for cannabis dependence to self-manage chronic pain. It was known that she was in a relationship with a person in prison and that as his release approached her anxiety grew as she was worried about her son's response to this change in his life and routines. Support from the practice was sought and appropriately given in this regard. After Mike's release it was noted that he accompanied Bobo to GP appointments.

4.3.60 Mike was only known to the surgery for five months where his needs were mostly around management of his on-going mental health issues and the readjustment back into society after a very long prison sentence. He was supported to access specialist mental health services at NSFT.

4.3.61 The practice does not have a separate domestic abuse policy. However domestic abuse forms a whole chapter within the practice safeguarding policy. During the period under review there was no routine enquiry into domestic abuse.

4.3.62 There were 21 contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.

#### 4.3.63 **Virgin Care**

4.3.64 Virgin Care provides healthcare services within the HMP Norwich. This includes primary care, and substance misuse. Mike was known to the service intermittently between July 2016 and his release in April 2019. He was seen by the mental health team and it was documented that he suffered from Personality Disorder. He was on medication for his mental health.

4.3.65 There were 15 contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.

***There were a Total of 343 contacts recorded in the combined chronology for the review.***

## 4.4 **Training and Domestic Abuse Policies**

- 4.4.1 All agencies providing IMRs had policies in place that cover the area of Domestic Abuse. Many of the IMRs were submitted before the Domestic Abuse Act 2021 was made law. This review will recommend that all agencies ensure that policies are reviewed to ensure that they now encompass the new law.
- 4.4.2 ELFT have specific policies for Domestic Abuse, last reviewed in March 2020. Safeguarding training is delivered at appropriate levels.
- 4.4.3 The Hackney GP Domestic Abuse policy was reviewed in January 2020. All GP's in City and Hackney are required to train their staff via IRISi, this includes an initial two sessions and then refresher sessions. IRISi is a collaboration between primary care and third sector organisations that is commissioned by Public Health that specialises in Domestic Abuse. Core areas of the programme include on-going training, education and consultancy for the clinical team and administrative staff, care pathways for primary health care practitioners and an enhanced referral pathway to specialist domestic abuse services for patients with experience of Domestic Violence and Abuse. The practice concerned were aware of IRISi and the training but were unable to provide dates of when staff attended the training.
- 4.4.4 The Norwich GP does not have a specific Domestic Abuse policy, the subject is covered in the Safeguarding Adults Policy and this was last reviewed in April 2020. There is a named lead (and deputy). Clear pathways are embedded and training expectations outlined. However, it could be strengthened by being directly linked to the Safeguarding Intercollegiate documents on training and refreshing needs. In 2018 Leeway (local DA service) provided training for all practice staff. This is supported by E-Learning for Health elements on Domestic Abuse. The Practice now has a Domestic Abuse Champion and a Safeguarding Administrator. In May 2022 all GP practices within the region received a template Domestic Abuse policy for general practice developed by the CCG subject matter experts.
- 4.4.5 HMP Norwich had local safeguarding policies. The Probation Officer Offender Supervisor working with Mike was trained in working with perpetrators of Domestic Abuse.
- 4.4.6 The MPS has re-written the public protection guide for investigators in line with Approved Professional Practice (APP) dictated to by the College of policing.
- 4.4.7 Between July and September 2021, the MPS delivered Domestic Abuse (DA) Matters training to over 7000 frontline emergency response officers. DA Matters training is a programme of classroom-based learning designed specifically for UK police first responders. This one-day interactive learning package was designed to improve the MPS response to domestic abuse by increasing awareness of coercive and controlling behaviour in intimate relationships and its impact on victims and their willingness to engage with the police. The training used real-life footage, case studies and exercises to demonstrate how to identify and gather evidence of coercive controlling behaviour, recognise perpetrator tactics, and understand the dynamics of domestic abuse. It also covered the following topics: responding to vulnerable people, honour-

based violence, child protection, and adult abuse as well as how to deal robustly with perpetrators.

- 4.4.8 In November 2021 the MPS launched a new response to repeat domestic abuse offenders entitled "Dauntless +". Dauntless+ is new guidance that requires the MPS to look at domestic abuse differently in that the best way to protect victims is to focus attention on offenders to make sure the MPS identify, monitor, and disrupt individuals who (in a domestic abuse setting) pose an ongoing and immediate risk to others through their offending behaviour. Using data from crime reports and other intelligence sources, subjects will be identified as those in the top five percent most harmful domestic abuse perpetrators per Basic Command Unit (BCU) based on how recently and frequently they have offended as well as how much harm they have caused. Once identified and thoroughly researched, a number of mandatory actions will commence to make sure the highest priority offenders are monitored and dealt with appropriately.
- 4.4.9 The Dauntless+ guidance provides useful direction for anyone concerned with the response to, and investigation of, domestic abuse allegations including Risk Assessments and Associated Investigations, guidance for First Responders and Secondary Investigations, Roles and Responsibilities.
- 4.4.10 The NPS provided extensive information on Domestic Abuse policies. Staff have specific mandatory e-learning on Domestic Abuse. This core training is supplemented by more specialist briefings and effective practice guidance around stalking, female genital mutilation (FGM), honour-based violence and sexual offending. Staff are also actively encouraged to utilise training provided by the Local Authority in which they work.
- 4.4.11 Norwich City Council have a specific Domestic Abuse policy, last reviewed in October 2020. All staff having face-to-face contact or telephone contact with residents have mandatory Domestic Abuse training, and this is refreshed every three years. The council also holds a network of 12 Domestic Abuse champions to offer more detailed advice and information to officers that have concerns in relation to Domestic Abuse. These officers are also trained to undertake DASH risk assessments and refer cases to MARAC.
- 4.4.12 NCHC have a specific Domestic and Violence Policy, last reviewed in March 2022. Safeguarding Training is mandatory, with e-learning. This is supported by face-to-face training delivered by the NCHC, with specific training on Domestic Abuse. NCHC also promote the Domestic Abuse Champion role. Following the initial training. NCHC Domestic Abuse Champions will attend a yearly training day delivered by NCHC Safeguarding team
- 4.4.13 Norfolk Constabulary have a Domestic Abuse Force Policy Document, last reviewed in March 2020. Domestic Abuse is covered in initial training for all student officers. Additional training is provided to all frontline uniform and detective staff. There was no reference to the use of local or national specialist agencies in training. There is additional training for all supervisors, with bespoke training for specialist roles including the Force Control Room.

- 4.4.14 NSFT have a specific Domestic Abuse policy and this was last reviewed in January 2020. The Trust provides basic awareness and level 3 Domestic Abuse training. Basic awareness is delivered to all staff regardless of role, Level 3 is delivered to all mental health practitioners.
- 4.4.15 Virgin Care have a Domestic Abuse policy and this was last reviewed in April 2018. E-learning on domestic abuse is available for all staff, but this is not mandatory.

## **4.5 Any Other Relevant Facts or Information:**

### **4.5.1 Department of Work and Pensions (DWP)**

4.5.2 Bobo was known to DWP since 1990. There was no recent personal contact. Bobo was in receipt of a range of welfare benefits, Income Support, Carers Allowance and Personal Independence Payment.

4.5.3 Mike first had contact in April 2019. Mike was in receipt of welfare benefits, those being Universal Credit and Personal Independence Payment.

4.5.4 There were 89 contacts recorded in the submitted chronology.

### **4.5.5 HM Prisons**

4.5.6 The panel were informed of the process for managing finance for prisoners. Prisoners can have three accounts:- Private cash, Spending and Savings. They can have up to a maximum of £900 across the three accounts. All monies received go into private cash, with the exception of earnings, which go straight into Spending Account. Each week, a certain amount of money gets automatically transferred into Spends, depending on their status. For Mike as a serving prisoner, it would be at a standard rate of £18/week or an enhanced rate of £30/week.

4.5.7 Prisoners can make purchases such as:- food, pin credit, catalogue orders, and newspapers from their 'Spending Account'. Prisoners can apply to have money sent out, either, by cash, cheque, or electronic transfer. They must all come with an application stating why they are sending it and to whom. If over £50, Governor's permission must be obtained.

4.5.8 Money can also be sent into prisoners, with the electronic "Money to Prisoners" portal, being the preferred option, as the sender's details and bank details can be checked. Cash, postal orders and cheques can be sent in, if an exemption has been granted. They keep a spreadsheet of all those who have exemptions.

4.5.9 If prisoners are found with phones or drugs, they will be placed on Governor's report and an adjudication will take place. This is similar to a court case but using specific prison rules. In serious cases the adjudication will be referred to the Police for further investigations or actions. The security team will analyse intelligence to try and establish how the items entered the establishment and prevent further ingress. Visits for an individual prisoner will only be reviewed

where specific intelligence exists to indicate that it is an area that is being exploited by the individual or the visitor.

#### **4.5.10 London Ambulance Service (LAS)**

4.5.11 In March 2020 LAS were called by the MPS to a report that Bobo had collapsed behind locked doors. When Bobo was discovered LAS staff documented Recognition of Life Extinct.

#### **4.5.12 MPS**

4.5.13 Bobo had a criminal record and was known to police since 1985, her last conviction being in 2008, predominately for drug use and theft offences in the Norwich area for which she received fines, community orders and on one occasion an electronic tag. No offences resulted in a custodial sentence.

4.5.14 Mike has been known to the police since 1993. He has 23 convictions for 51 offences such as burglary, robbery, drug possession/supply, firearms offences and assaults. In 1999 he was convicted of armed robbery and sentenced to 12 years for entering a betting office, with others, armed with an imitation firearm. Whilst serving this sentence he was arrested and charged with conspiracy to supply HMP prisons with heroin and sentenced to a further 8 years imprisonment. He was conditionally released twice, in 2012 and 2014, but was recalled to prison for bad behaviour. Mike is reported to be a violent individual and whilst in prison he assaulted prison staff and had fights with other inmates. The Police National Computer (PNC) record has a warning signal for self-harm following an attempted hanging in HMP Nottingham in October 2006 and an information marker that records that Mike was a ViSOR subject since 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2013 his ViSOR record was last updated on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2015.<sup>17</sup> He was released from HMP Norwich on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2019 under a Supervision Order until 26<sup>th</sup> July 2019 managing the conditions of his release.

4.5.15 Stephen is known to police. He was arrested on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2019 after he assaulted Mike at their home address causing a one-inch gash to his head and placing him in a headlock. No further action taken in relation to this incident due to insufficient evidence.

#### **4.5.16 National Domestic Abuse Helpline**

4.5.17 A check was made of the National Domestic Abuse Helpline and there were no records that could be linked to Bobo.

#### **4.5.18 Norfolk County Council – Adult Social Care (ASC)**

---

<sup>17</sup> ViSOR – a confidential national database that was developed to support the management of MAPPA and Lifetime Offender Management (LOM) offenders.

- 4.5.19 In April 2016 a referral was made to the Norwich Mental Health Team for a carers assessment for Bobo, as she was caring for her son. Bobo confirmed that she had her own mental health issues. An assessment was booked for November 2016, Bobo DNA and did not reschedule.
- 4.5.20 On 27<sup>th</sup> November 2019 ASC were informed of a missing persons alert on Bobo.
- 4.5.21 **Victim Support**
- 4.5.22 In 2015 Mike was referred to Victim Support by Hertfordshire Constabulary concerning an alleged assault by prison officers.
- 4.5.23 **Other Panel Concerns**
- 4.5.24 The panel did give consideration to whether it was appropriate to approach Mike's ex-partner Elaine and his son. The terms of reference were focussed on the relationship between Bobo and Mike. Mike had spent nearly all of his time in prison between 1999 and 2019. Some panel members felt that it would have been helpful to know if there was unreported controlling behaviour towards Elaine or Mike's son. Bobo's family believed Mike was still in a relationship with Elaine and had spent Bobo's money on her. It should be noted that there were no prison visits from Elaine during the period covered by the Terms of Reference.
- 4.5.25 It was generally thought that it would be disproportionately intrusive to the privacy of the individuals to approach them when they had not lived with Mike for many years. Whilst it would have been desirable to know the details of the relationship, there was not sufficient information available to the panel to persuade them to expand the terms of reference to include wider family.
- 4.5.26 There were concerns that NPS could not speak to ex-partners when planning on release, but the DHR would help supplement information. It should be noted that is not the role of a DHR to gather evidence for consideration the management of potentially dangerous offenders.

## 5. Analysis

### 5.1 Domestic Abuse

5.1.1 It is clear that Bobo was victim of Domestic Abuse from Mike as defined in the cross- government definition of Domestic Abuse and now the legal definition under the Domestic Abuse Act 2021. From information gathered by the police as part of the homicide investigation, reports made to the police at the time, and the accounts of Bobo's family it is apparent that a pattern of abusive controlling behaviour was present for many years. Ultimately Bobo died from an act of violence at the hands of a man who was her intimate partner.

5.1.2 Tragically, it will never be possible to know the full extent of Bobo's experiences. However, as a minimum it appears Bobo experienced the following:

- ***Physical abuse***
- ***Coercion, threats, and intimidation***
- ***Emotional abuse and isolation***
- ***Economic abuse***

5.1.3 The panel gathered a catalogue of reported physical assaults and disclosures of emotional and economic abuse from agencies and Bobo's family:-

January 2013	Mike wrote to Bobo requesting money.
February 2013	Mike wrote to Bobo requesting money on three occasions. Then accused her of lying about money sent and requests more.
March 2013	Mike wrote to Bobo requesting money on two occasions.
April 2013	Mike wrote to Bobo telling her she was making him feel fed up.
July 2013	Mike wrote to Bobo requesting £80 for his birthday.
September 2013	Mike wrote to Bobo coercing her to involve her son in drug dealing and robbery.
February 2014	Mike wrote to Bobo coercing her to give up her son.
April 2014	Mike wrote to Bobo and threatened that she will be killed if she contacted his ex-partner's family.
August 2014	Mike wrote to Bobo complaining that she did not send him money, suggesting they should part.
November 2014	Mike wrote to Bobo thanking her for money and pornographic photos of herself. Suggests coercion of Bobo's son for financial gain.



March 2015	Mike wrote to Bobo telling her he would not let her go and to stick with him until he she dies.
May 2015	Mike wrote to Bobo accusing her of being spiteful and made threats to her.
June 2015	Mike wrote to Bobo requesting money.
July 2016	Mike wrote to Bobo demanding her loyalty and to send him clothing.
November 2016	Mike wrote to Bobo requesting £50 and that that he needed more drugs. He told her that he would kill her if she cheated on him. He then stated he needed £150 - £200 and suggested that Bobo had been supplying him drugs.
September 2017	Mike wrote to Bobo telling her 'till death do us part'.
February 2018	Mike wrote to Bobo and told her that he preferred overweight unattractive women because they had more substance to their character and puts pressure on her to visit him.
March 2018	Mike wrote to Bobo and thanked her for money.
March 2018	Bobo visited Mike and following visit he was found with a mobile phone.
December 2018	Bobo visited Mike in prison and the following day he was found in possession of a mobile phone.
March 2019	Bobo visited Mike in prison and the following day he was found under the influence of drugs.
April 2019	On his release from prison Bobo provided accommodation for Mike.
June 2019	Mike informed Probation that his partner found him trying to put on a ligature.
July 2019	Assault takes place between Mike and Stephen. Bobo's family felt Mike was pushing them apart.
September 2019	Mike informed housing department he was Bobo's carer and asked for her son to be taken off her housing application. Attempting economic control and sabotaging Bobo's living arrangements.
October 2019	Bobo missed appointments to view new accommodation.
November 2019	Bobo's sister reported her missing and told Norfolk Police that there is unreported domestic abuse.
November 2019	Further call to Norfolk Police from Bobo's sister stating she was concerned about Mike's controlling behaviour and unexplained bruising on Bobo.

December 2019      Norfolk Police contacted MPS and asked that officers see Bobo in person as her sister feared coercive and controlling behaviour.

March 2020      Bobo is killed by Mike.

- 5.1.4      Whilst he spent nearly 20 years in prison, Mike's propensity for exerting controlling and coercive behaviour towards women was clearly known early on. His own mother was sent to prison for smuggling drugs for him when she was 57 years old. It is apparent that Mike was prepared for Bobo to be put at risk of imprisonment too. It was clear that he planned to impose himself on Bobo's life outside prison and continue to be involved in drug dealing by exploiting her son.
- 5.1.5      Bobo was settled in an area of Norwich, where she had lived for most of her life. She had a secure home and tenancy, in the same neighbourhood as her family. Mike was released from prison and took Bobo away from that support network. Mike moved into Bobo's home and began the process of isolating her. He manipulated her to seek a move away from her son. Bobo went from living in her settled home, to living in a shed. When Mike's mother died he took the opportunity to move into her home, without permission. At this point Bobo's sister reported her missing and reported Mike's domestic abuse of Bobo.
- 5.1.6      At the start of 2020 Bobo was in London, in Mike's temporary home. She was communicating with her family through social media messaging. Her family believed that Bobo did not have enough money to travel home to Norfolk. As the COVID 19 pandemic hit the UK her isolation increased. At the same time Mike was starting appointments with a mental health trust in London. He had been known to mental health services and previously talked of suicide. Mike said that Bobo was aware of previous attempts at self-harm. Suicidality is a key indicator for the level of risk posed by perpetrators of domestic abuse.
- 5.1.7      At the time of her death Bobo had been socially isolated from her close family by Mike. She had been economically and emotionally exploited over years. She was alone with her partner in an area miles from where she had lived all of her life and her family were concerned for her welfare.

## **5.2      Through the Eyes of the Victim**

- 5.2.1      Bobo spent the majority of her adult life as a single parent. Bobo was a mother, sister, and grandmother. She was unemployed and her social circle was very much within her family and a small geographical area of Norwich. She had to support her son, with ADHD for many years. Bobo's mental well-being was affected by the pressures of caring for her son. She reported anxiety and depression. She had confidence issues and no motivation to carry out household chores. She expressed concerns that she could not have anything nice because her son would damage things. Whilst agencies were aware of some pressures on Bobo, they were not aware that she was being emotionally and economically exploited by Mike from prison. She was also criminally coerced into the trafficking of drugs into prison. The pressure on Bobo to carry drugs

could have been immense. It is clear from letters sent to Bobo that Mike alluded to the violent nature of his associates.

- 5.2.2 Bobo's daughter lived locally and had children. The introduction of Mike, a man with a history of violence, into the household put pressure on Bobo not to disclose that her daughter and grandchildren came to her home.
- 5.2.3 Bobo did not overtly present to agencies as a victim of domestic abuse and never made any reports of problems with Mike. Agencies were aware of problems with her son Stephen, and it appears that Mike exploited this situation. Bobo was isolated from her family by Mike. As a result she was briefly homeless. She then moved from the security of her long-term family home to Mike's dead mother's flat in another part of the country. Whilst living in the flat they were under threat of repossession. At the same time Bobo expressed fears of travel due to the growing COVID 19 pandemic. Bobo was progressively socially isolated by Mike during the time they spent together. Her isolation was demonstrated when Bobo called her family when she had left Mike's flat and could not find her way back. At the time of her death she was separated from her children, siblings and the security of her long-term home.
- 5.2.4 We do not know the true extent of the abuse experienced by Bobo. Her family expressed their concerns to the police regarding Bobo's welfare. There were opportunities that could have been taken with Bobo to discuss how safe felt with Mike, but these were not explored.

### **5.3 Analysis of Agency Involvement / Responding to the Terms of Reference**

- 5.3.1 Each agency has conducted their own analysis considering Bobo and domestic abuse. Bobo had a number of contacts with many agencies. All those agencies had established policies and protocols for reporting and managing domestic abuse. The agencies have been grouped into categories of:-
  - **Health**
  - **Housing**
  - **Police**
  - **Probation and Prisons**
- 5.3.2 **Health**
- 5.3.3 **East London NHS Foundation Trust (ELFT) Mental Health**
- 5.3.4 ELFT had a short period of contact with Mike after he moved to London with Bobo. Mike was referred into ELFT, by his GP, as Mike wanted community support for his mental health needs as a means of continuing the mental health support that he received in prison. His referral was dealt with in a timely manner. Mike met with a Consultant Psychiatrist on two occasions, although Mike did cut a meeting short. It was apparent that Mike was annoyed with his GP around access

to medication. The Psychiatrist took steps to engage with Mike by supporting him in resolving medication issues. The IMR author noted *'The Consultant Psychiatrist noted that Mike's wish was "for limited contact with services", so it feels all the more important that some work was done to build rapport, and trying to resolve this medication issue goes some way to doing that'*. This is an example of **Good Practice**.

- 5.3.5 Bobo was present with Mike for both appointments. Bobo would confirm what Mike was saying rather than answer for him. The IMR author interviewed the consultant *'The Consultant Psychiatrist also stated that both Mike and Bobo were clear that there was no relationship between them'*. Mike very clearly stated that Bobo was a friend, he had known for years. He said that she lived locally in Hackney, but they did not live together. He said he was not in a relationship. Given that the meetings took place in the presence of Bobo, it could be seen that, if in a non-abusive relationship, Bobo could have spoken up at that point regarding Mike's inaccurate reflection of their relationship. However, given Mike's previous letters to Bobo, commenting on her appearance, it seems more likely that this was an attack on her personal esteem and status. It appears that this evidences Mike exhibiting controlling behaviour, unbeknown to his Psychiatrist.
- 5.3.6 It appears that Bobo was presented as a form of carer for Mike. ELFT offered Bobo a referral for a Carer's Assessment or a referral to local carer's organisations. Bobo declined, stating she was happy just to come to the meetings. The offer of carer's support should be seen as **Good Practice**.
- 5.3.7 It was noted that Mike stated that he only went out if he was accompanied by Bobo or one of his sisters. This could be seen to reflect the level of reliance on women around Mike, or his level of control.
- 5.3.8 ELFT demonstrated a good level of professional communication in order to gather a full picture of Mike's past, in order to assess his risks going forward, but there was difficulty in getting timely information. The IMR author writes *'The Consultant Psychiatrist notes that there was difficulty in accessing Mike's history from his previous mental health team who supported him in prison. The delay in receiving this information also slowed down the Consultant Psychiatrist's ability to formulate a more clearer picture of his current needs. Whilst there were delays in receiving information from the previous mental health care provider for Mike'*. ELFT also contacted the police to obtain criminal records information. This revealed the *'dangerous nature of Mike's violence towards others'*. Mike did not express any intent to harm but he was scared of going back to prison. The Psychiatrist felt this was a motivating factor for Mike to take his medication and keep his temper under control.
- 5.3.9 The Psychiatrist did eventually receive approximately 800 pages of notes from Mike's previous mental health provider. The Psychiatrist said he was able to skim read the notes before seeing Mike and not read them thoroughly. With hindsight it was considered that Mike's appointment could have been delayed to allow for a more detailed assessment. It could be considered that a

more timely submission of case notes and history from the previous service at the point of transfer would have provided ELFT with a better evidence base to consider Mike.

- 5.3.10 It was considered that the Psychiatrist showed a real willingness to support Mike's mental, physical and social needs. He made referrals for low level outreach support and a referral for psychological support to develop Mike's confidence. He considered a referral for organisations to support ex-prisoners settling back into the community. There was a letter sent to Mike's GP confirming his diagnosis of Emotionally Unstable Personality Disorder.
- 5.3.11 The IMR Author concluded *'Throughout the notes, there is no mention of anything to suggest that Mike was asked about domestic abuse. There is also nothing of note that Bobo was asked about domestic abuse. Given that Bobo was there in a supportive role for Mike, it does not seem right that she be asked about any domestic abuse issues. There was also no reason to suggest that there was any domestic abuse taking place between Mike and Bobo and that Mike may have been a perpetrator of any'*.
- 5.3.12 ELFT have made a single agency recommendation for trust safeguarding supervision to be delivered to the Psychiatry Team
- 5.3.13 **Hackney CCG for General Practitioner (GP)**
- 5.3.14 Mike registered with the local GP practice in Hackney in November 2019. He had two face-to-face appointments with a GP, this included a new patient health check. Mike was provided with certificates confirming he was unable to work due to depression and insomnia. Mike was referred at an early stage to ELFT for mental health services. ELFT confirmed Mike's diagnosis of EUPD in February 2020.
- 5.3.15 Bobo had limited contact with the practice. She registered a short time before her death. She had a new patient health check and ordered a repeat prescription. The registration process for Bobo did not include a question on domestic abuse and there was no routine enquiry. The panel considers this a missed opportunity to engage with Bobo. This was at a time when Bobo was away from her family and socially isolated.
- 5.3.16 It should be noted that when the GP practice was reviewed for this DHR there was a Domestic Abuse prompt for new patients. The IMR Author stated *'The practice has recently updated their new patient registration form to include the question "Are you currently or in the past experienced domestic abuse". Following these forms being submitted by the new patient, they are reviewed by a HCA (Health Care Assistant) and/or Nurse the form is then stored in the patient records, any verbal information taken from the patient is saved in a consultation note and the record is coded for risk of domestic abuse if this is disclosed. If domestic abuse has been identified the patient will be added to the GP review list'*. This is **Good Practice. N.B. Bobo's family agreed that this was good practice and would like to see this applied to all GP practices.**
- 5.3.17 It was established that the domestic abuse policy was generic and did not include information on IRISi referral pathway for LOW/MEDIUM RISK and MARAC pathway for HIGH RISK. IRISi

is a specialist domestic violence and abuse training, support and referral programme for General Practices<sup>18</sup>.

- 5.3.18 The IMR Author identified concerns that on transfer, the previous GP does not hand over safeguarding information to the new GP. GP practices do not always receive the full health record form the previous practice. It was also identified that there was no formal process for handover of notes for patient care for those leaving prison. In this case there was a referral to local mental health services and a request for full notes from previous primary care services.
- 5.3.19 The GP practice is aligned to the IRISi training, but there was poor record keeping on the training dates of staff for the period under review. At the time of the IMR a structured process had been put in place to address the issue.
- 5.3.20 On one occasion Mike was noted as being aggressive to practice staff over dealings on a prescription. There is a process in place to remove patients from a practice list and add them to a Special Allocation Scheme. This means that patients would only be allowed to access GPs that are trained to deal with violence and aggression. Mike did not reach the threshold for referral to this scheme.
- 5.3.21 Single agency recommendations were made in areas of review of domestic abuse policies, handover of post-prison registrations, prompts to discuss substance misuse on registration and training.
- 5.3.22 **Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust**
- 5.3.23 Bobo accessed medical services within NCHC. Prior to the period under review there were recorded concerns around her son Stephen's behaviour. When she was seen at the start of 2018 it was noted that Bobo rarely went out and had a history of anxiety and depression. The IMR Author identified concerns on the recording that Bobo discussed 'mental health' and declined a referral to counselling services. There was no evidence of professional curiosity to discuss whether Bobo was experiencing domestic abuse from her son or from Mike in prison. There was no exploration as to why Bobo rarely went out. There was no mention of Bobo's relationship with Mike within NCHC.
- 5.3.24 Bobo disclosed to NCHC that she smoked cannabis. There was no enquiry into how long she had been using controlled drugs and whether support from Substance Misuse Services was offered.
- 5.3.25 There were no disclosures of domestic abuse concerning Mike. NCHC does have policies and referral pathways to local support agencies. The IMR author considered that there was a need for greater professional curiosity to understand more about a patient's needs. There was a

---

<sup>18</sup> <https://irisi.org/about-the-iris-programme/>

requirement to take a more detailed history, including home circumstances. It was also considered that documentation should be more descriptive. It is directed that staff seek support from managers and internal safeguarding team when required.

5.3.26 There are single agency recommendations on professional curiosity and the role of Domestic Abuse Champions.

#### 5.3.27 **Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust**

5.3.28 NSFTs contact with Mike started when they were commissioned to provide mental health services to HMP Norwich from April 2019. Previous care was under Virgin Health. The IMR does cover some referrals made in 2018 where his record shows a diagnosis of EUPD. Mike's history of violence was noted. In meetings with medical staff Mike told them that he suffered with anxiety and depression. The IMR author notes that Mike appeared to have been reviewed responsively. There was a period of segregation where Mike was no longer able to access the prison wellbeing team.

5.3.29 The main NSFT contact with Mike came through an emergency referral made by his GP after he had been released from prison. Mike was referred by a nurse practitioner, with concerns on suicidal planning that was confirmed by Bobo. It needs to be considered that threats of suicide are considered as a risk factor in domestic abuse. Mike spoke with NSFT on the phone. He discussed his difficulty with impulse control and anger. He discussed being in a relationship for the previous 10 years with Bobo. The IMR author considered that Mike was not presenting with mental ill-health symptoms or psychotic behaviour. The emergency referral was not deemed appropriate, but it appeared that Mike initially presented as aggressive, and the referral could have been made to appease him. The IMR author stated '*The interaction Mike had with the mental health nurse on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2019 was positive he appears to have engaged well with the conversation. The agreement to pass on to the community mental health team and step down from a crisis intervention was appropriate*'.

5.3.30 After the referral to the community mental health team, Mike did not respond to the offer of an assessment and despite being offered two appointments he did not attend for either and was discharged. Given there was no known history of Mike within NSFT and no evidence of risk to self or others, at that time, this was reasonable. The GP was appropriately communicated with to this effect.

5.3.31 Mike was later referred as a routine referral to NSFT by his GP. Mike was stating that he had bipolar disorder and depression. Mike was offered a timely appointment, he did not attend. This was appropriately managed and Mike's GP was informed. There was no further contact with Mike. He was next seen in London by Hackney services.

5.3.32 There were no single agency recommendations.

#### 5.3.33 **Norwich GP**

- 5.3.34 The IMR considered that there was no evidence of 'domestic abuse or discord' during the period under review. They recorded *'The victim had a history of mental health issues, namely anxiety, depression, social phobia and agoraphobia.... The victim was also self-treating chronic pain with cannabis'*. It is not apparent that any consideration was given to the referral of Bobo to substance misuse services. It is not clear what the referral pathways to the services are. However, it is apparent that the GP surgery referred Bobo to the pain clinic for help to manage her longstanding pain.
- 5.3.35 The practice were aware that Bobo was in a relationship with a serving prisoner and that her anxiety grew as she was worried about her son's response to the change in his life. The IMR author states that *'Support from the practice was sought and appropriately given in this regard'*. Bobo expressed concern specifically about how her son would cope when Mike was released from prison and if she would be able to continue her relationship with Mike once he was released if her son did not tolerate this. Bobo did not express concerns for her own safety or that of her son with respect to Mike being released from prison. There was no indication to make a safeguarding referral based on this information. The GP completed a risk assessment and established that Bobo was not actively suicidal and had no plan to end her life.
- 5.3.36 After Mike's release from prison, he was noted to have accompanied Bobo to appointments at the surgery. The IMR author considered *'whilst her demeanour was not recorded, nothing in the entries suggested she was distressed, or that the consultation should be conducted without him present'*. Given that Bobo had spent most of her life as a single parent and unaccompanied to previous appointments, this seems to be a significant change in her presentation to the GP. It was recorded that there were concerns before Mike's release and support was given. The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) considered that it was appropriate that Bobo had someone supporting her when she attended the GP. They did consider that all GP practices should ensure that they accurately record identity of the person accompanying.
- 5.3.37 Mike registered at the same practice as Bobo. It is not apparent that there is routine enquiry into domestic abuse when a new patient registered at the practice. It was noted that *'The perpetrator experienced mental health issues of bipolar affective disorder and depressive illness which may have been aggravated by his 20-year institutionalisation under the criminal justice system'*. Mike was referred to NSFT mental health services after concerns of potential self-harm and suicidal ideation. It is not apparent that the risk to persons sharing the same house were considered at the practice. Expressions of suicidal thoughts by partners are known to be a risk factor for domestic abuse.
- 5.3.38 The IMR raised concerns on the transfer of medical records from prison healthcare to primary care in the community – *'This should include registration at a new practice, timely transfer of medical records and communication regarding ongoing physical and psychological needs as well as repeat medication'*.
- 5.3.39 There is no specific domestic abuse policy within the practice. There is very detailed information, guidance and processes embedded within the wider adult safeguarding policy.



- 5.3.40 The CCG have made recommendations to cover the wider Norfolk and Waveney Primary care services.
- 5.3.41 **Virgin Care**
- 5.3.42 Virgin care were responsible for Mike's mental and physical health concerns whilst he was in the custody of HMP Norwich. He would have been seen by Virgin Care after an Emergency Response or Healthcare Application submission. His mental health concerns from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 to his release on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2019 would have been managed by NSFT. The majority of Mike's time in prison would have been under Virgin Care. When his record was later passed to ELFT it comprised of over 800 pages of notes.
- 5.3.43 Virgin healthcare carried out very limited analysis of Mike's time with them as a patient The IMR author recorded *'Mike was seen by healthcare predominantly due to his medication non-compliance. His inconsistency with his medications would have had a negative impact on his mental health. Mike was also seen on a number of occasions due to being under the influence of an illicit substance- the substance unknown'*.
- 5.3.44 When asked to consider the Equality and Diversity aspects of Mike's care, the Virgin Care IMR author recorded a very limited response.
- 5.3.45 The response of Virgin Care to this review has been poor and panel recommendations will reflect this. It should be noted that the recommendation will be focused on the commissioning agency as the HM Prison Service rather than Virgin Care as a provider.
- 5.3.46 The IMR Author made no single agency recommendations.
- 5.3.47 **Housing**
- 5.3.48 **L&Q Housing Association**
- 5.3.49 L&Q were the owners of the property where Bobo died, in Hackney. The sole tenant of the property, since 2004, was Mike's mother. Mike's sister informed L&Q that their mother had died on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2019. Mike's sister informed L&Q that since his release from prison Mike had been living at the property with his, unnamed, girlfriend. Mike was listed as a household member. On the death of her mother, Mike's sister requested that her daughter succeeded in the tenancy. This request was unsuccessful. Mike's sister then asked if Mike could succeed in the tenancy. L&Q were clear that even if Mike was seen to have a housing need, he would be offered alternative accommodation, not his mother's home, as he was single. Notice to quit was served on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2019.
- 5.3.50 From that point on Mike made unsuccessful attempts to secure tenancy of the flat previously occupied by his mother. Mike made a Succession Application but did not mention Bobo. He was considered as a single person. There was never any application to consider the housing needs of Bobo in London and L&Q would not have been made aware that she was there. There was

no evidence that Mike sought support from his NHS Mental Health team at ELFT in his housing application.

- 5.3.51 The learning that L&Q considered was on how the organisation could communicate a declined application and how they would support an applicant's next steps.

5.3.52 **Norwich City Council – Housing**

- 5.3.53 In the years before the period under review Bobo had received support from the City Council Family Intervention project to help manage her son's behaviour, between 2015 and 2017. She had a number of repairs at the property due to damage caused by her son.

- 5.3.54 During the period under review Bobo was accruing debt from the "Bedroom Tax" as she had excess room to accommodate her and Stephen. There was direct support for Bobo and help offered from the council's income team. Letters from Mike indicate that whilst Bobo was accruing debt with the council, she was sending money to Mike in prison. This indicates economic abuse.

- 5.3.55 The first date that Norwich City Council was aware of Mike's association with Bobo was when he called in September 2019 claiming to speak on Bobo's behalf. He requested her son, Stephen, be removed from Bobo's tenancy which initiated concern from the council officer that Bobo may not be aware of the impact of this action, so the council officer insisted on speaking directly to Bobo to ensure she was aware. This request to speak directly to Bobo should be considered as **Good Practice**. However, this was the only concern at this point and there was no recorded concern of domestic abuse. This can be seen as economic abuse, as Mike is attempting to sabotage Bobo's housing.

- 5.3.56 Bobo had informed the Council that she was happy for them to speak to Mike as her 'carer'. The IMR author noted *'A missed opportunity was when the Housing options officer was informed that Mike was Bobo's carer; I would suggest the council could have been better informed of Bobo's vulnerabilities if Bobo was asked at that point, what it was that she needed carer support for'*.

- 5.3.57 Where colleagues, partners or neighbours identify concerns for a Norwich City Council tenant, they can request a 'general access' visit to the property from the tenancy management team, who will meet with the tenant and ascertain risk within the home; making signposting referrals where relevant and safeguarding reports where appropriate. This is common knowledge amongst multi agency early help hub partners that meet weekly. Whilst this service is available it is not apparent that Bobo or her family were aware of this facility. The housing team do have access to domestic abuse champions across the services and this is highlighted as an area of **Good Practice**.

- 5.3.58 Single agency recommendations have been made in the area of support on tenancy, and tenant vulnerabilities. The panel makes recommendation on economic abuse.

5.3.59 **Police**

5.3.60 **Metropolitan Police Service**

- 5.3.61 The contact that the MPS had with Bobo before her death came as a result of the Missing Person report made in Norwich in November 2019. MPS were asked to carry out enquiries on behalf of Norfolk Constabulary. They were informed that there was fear that Mike was using coercive controlling behaviour. The IMR author stated, *'Norfolk Police initially explained that Bobo was a 'medium risk' missing person whose partner was 'unknown', that she had been spoken to on the telephone but that she needed to be seen in person before the report could be closed. The fact that Bobo had been spoken to and that she was adamant she had no intention of meeting with police was also highlighted'*. The second request from Norfolk Police requested a face-to-face visit to ensure that no offences were being committed.
- 5.3.62 The IMR author went on to state *'Had either of the requests for assistance specified that Mike was a violent offender, recently released from prison with 51 previous convictions then police attendance may have been made more of a priority and different action taken'* and *'Had the reasons for the families concerns for Bobo's safety, her vulnerabilities, and why it was suspected that offences had been committed, been included in the information provided this may have resulted in a crime or a non-crime domestic report being created and followed up as per Domestic Abuse policy guidance'*.
- 5.3.63 It is clear that at the time of the Missing Person's report, Norfolk Police had primacy for the investigation. The communication from Norfolk Police did make reference to controlling and coercive behaviour. This should have raised concerns and professional curiosity within the MPS as to what they were being asked to deal with. It can be considered that it was established quite early on that Bobo was not a 'Missing Person'. Norfolk Police were asking the MPS to follow up on concerns of domestic abuse, without taking the decision to record a reported crime and request a DASH assessment.
- 5.3.64 The MPS has made recommendation on the importance of using professional curiosity when prioritising and assessing requests to assist other police areas and to ask for more detailed risk assessments.
- 5.3.65 **Norfolk Constabulary**
- 5.3.66 Norfolk Police initial contact with Bobo and Mike resulted from the reported incident between Mike and Stephen at Bobo's Norwich home in July 2019. E EAST were also called from the premises, but the occupants then declined medical assistance. The police responded promptly and identified that Stephen had assaulted Mike. As there was limited engagement with the police from Mike and Bobo, they were unable to establish the cause of the tensions between the parties involved. Stephen was arrested. Stephen did shout to his mother that he did not want Mike in his house and referred to 'smackheads'. Stephen did make an allegation of assault against Mike when he was initially arrested but then made 'No Comment' in subsequent police interview.
- 5.3.67 Bobo's seven-year-old grandchild was present at her home during the incident. Norfolk Police completed a child safeguarding document for the incident.

- 5.3.68 Police officers did note that Bobo's daughter, Julie, had an injury to her head. Police took a signed note *'didn't want to make a complaint about the assault that took place tonight...'* It is clear that the officers suspected that Julie had been assaulted and they did not follow this up by making a record in a crime report. It is not known who assaulted Julie.
- 5.3.69 Police did record the incident as a 'Domestic Abuse Investigation' in line with force policy considering Mike and Stephen to be family members. The force only uses DASH assessments for reports between intimate partners, and was not completed. The IMR author Notes *'This process only relates to intimate partners and not incidents between family members so the force policy has been complied with'*. It is not clear that Norfolk Police have a formal risk assessment process for managing risk for cases between family members.
- 5.3.70 When Bobo was reported missing by her family in November 2019 there was a clear report of suspicions of domestic abuse of Bobo by Mike. Bobo's sister stated that there were unreported 'domestic issues and that Mike had been seen with his hand over Bobo's mouth'. This was followed up with Bobo's sister's (Natalie) concerns that Mike was controlling and Bobo's had previously unexplained bruising. The IMR author states that the 'domestic abuse concern' was picked up in the control room supervisor assessment of the missing person's report. Norfolk Police did record that another family member felt that Bobo's sister was overreacting. A risk assessment was completed on the missing person's report. Bobo's sister had made a third-party report of Domestic Abuse and a crime record was not created. Had a record of domestic abuse been made then this would have generated the need for a DASH risk assessment.
- 5.3.71 If a report had been correctly recorded at this time, checks on police databases would have revealed the violent events at Bobo's home in July 2019. More importantly they would have revealed the report to Norfolk Police in June 2019 from NSFT. That report recorded concerns about Mike's mental well-being, including a history of violence and suicidal ideation. Threats of suicide are a clear indicator of risk in domestic abuse investigations.
- 5.3.72 When liaising with the MPS on the Missing Person report Norfolk Police did request that Bobo was seen alone. It appears that Bobo did speak to Norfolk Police on the phone but it is believed that Mike and another woman were present with Bobo. The IMR author considers that *'There was a missed opportunity for police to engineer an opening to speak with Bobo away from Mike, even at the station, and to seek to understand if the concerns raised by her sister, Natalie were accurate.'* The clear missed opportunity was the failure of Norfolk Police to record a report of Domestic Abuse. This could have been clearly expressed to the MPS and the requirement to complete a DASH assessment.
- 5.3.73 The focus of the Norfolk Police IMR is on how the police responded to the 'domestic abuse concern' raised within the Missing Person report. There is a clear policy for a 'safe and well check' to be completed when a missing person is found. The policy is there to check for any indications that a person has been exposed to or suffered harm. There is no requirement for a safe and well check to be carried out with the person alone. The IMR author does go on to state *'Essentially, police received a third-party report of domestic abuse and the party alleged to be*

*victim of that abuse was not asked about it*. This is the key issue. Bobo was not subject to a DASH assessment, and she was not asked about the abuse reported by her sister.

- 5.3.74 The IMR author has identified recommendations for learning points with the organisation on domestic abuse concerns within missing person reports. There is also a recommendation to amend guidance on 'safe and well' checks for missing persons.
- 5.3.75 The panel makes recommendations to address the failure to record a suspected assault on Julie and a third-party report of domestic abuse on Bobo.
- 5.3.76 **Probation and Prisons**
- 5.3.77 **HMP Prisons**
- 5.3.78 HM Prison were represented on the panel by senior staff from HMP Norwich and HMP Rochester. Mike served in four prisons in the period under review and was in HMP Norwich for the nine months prior to his release. There was limited analysis on the interaction between Mike and Bobo and the focus was on Mike's behaviour whilst in prison. The representatives did provide information on how prisoners personal finances are managed.
- 5.3.79 The IMR details how Mike's behaviour in prison was mixed. He could show a good work ethic and be pleasant and on other occasions he acted negatively. He refused to engage with professionals and was involved in substance misuse and possession of 'prohibited articles' including mobile phones.
- 5.3.80 In the time leading up to his release Mike had an Offender Supervisor. The IMR author wrote *'It is noted that Mike had displayed reluctance on numerous occasions to engage with agencies preferring to hold a belief that there was no point as he did not feel agencies had anything to offer him or that he would reap benefit. He appears to have been focussed on settling with or near his partner on release. There is little detail that Mike had any leading parts in his resettlement and he appears that he was content relying on others to support him'*. HM Prisons did not offer support to Mike in his intended move to Norwich, as they were informed that Bobo's home was not a suitable address for him.
- 5.3.81 The IMR did not consider Mike's use of coercive control over women. It was known that NPS were aware that Mike had previously coerced his mother to smuggle heroin into prison. It is not clear that this information was aligned to Mike's records to consider his behaviour with women visiting. The panel are aware of the nature of Mike's letters to Bobo where he discusses drugs activity. HM Prisons have confirmed that communication is not routinely monitored.
- 5.3.82 Whilst HM Prisons may not have been aware of Mike's communications with Bobo, they did discover him under the influence of drugs and in possession of mobile phones. Whilst Mike was sanctioned for those incidents, there does not appear to have any investigation on how Mike was obtaining the items. Given Mike's history, the coercion of women outside the prison would appear to have been a line of enquiry. There was evidence that suggested Mike's system of smuggling on prison record. In March 2018 Bobo visited Mike and the following day he was

found with a mobile phone, the same thing happened in December 2018. In March 2019 Bobo visited Mike and the following day he was found under the influence of drugs.

- 5.3.83 We now know, through family, that Bobo was smuggling drugs to Mike during visits. Investigation and intelligence analysis at the time would have suggested that Mike's external visitors were involved. It appears that the HM Prisons also have access to the financial information to show who is supplying funds to prisoners. This is an area that could be utilised to establish if there is economic exploitation.
- 5.3.84 It is appreciated that there are demands on HM Prison resources, there appears to have been a missed opportunity identify domestic abuse. The panel recognises that this is not an issue for one prison alone and recommends that further action is taken at a National level.
- 5.3.85 The IMR author did not make single agency recommendations.
- 5.3.86 **National Probation Service**
- 5.3.87 As Mike had completed his sentence in prison the NPS had a short period of time to manage Mike's return to society. He was under Post Sentence Supervision from April to July 2019.
- 5.3.88 The Offender Manager was aware that Mike's mother had been coerced by her son, from prison, to smuggle drugs for him. His mother received a prison sentence at the age of 57 years for her first offence. She reported that she was acting on her son's instructions and was afraid of him. This was clear evidence of Mike's capability to abuse women close to him but was never considered in any NPS post sentence engagement with Mike.
- 5.3.89 The NPS IMR author considered that given Mike's risk level and history of non-compliance in prison, that a MAPPA meeting should have been convened in London before he was released from HMP Norwich in 2019. The minimum attendance at that meeting would have included police, prison and probation. A multi-agency risk management plan could have been agreed and all information shared in that forum. **N.B. It should be noted that the lack of a MAPPA meeting was of particular concern to Bobo's family.**
- 5.3.90 Mike met Bobo whilst he was a serving prisoner. The IMR author considers that the introduction of Bobo to Mike could suggest that others knew she was vulnerable and open to manipulation from Mike. Mike's release from prison provided an opportunity for NPS to explore the potential for domestic abuse and control. Mike was reliant on approval of NPS for his accommodation. There should have been professional curiosity in speaking to those intending to house Mike, rather than a reliance on checking police databases.
- 5.3.91 The NPS consider that the element of control for Mike was limited, there was no consideration given to taking action against his non-compliance. Other than focusing on Mike not living at an 'approved address' the NPS allowed him to keep offering alternative addresses. The NPS did make safeguarding checks with police, but they did not check to see if he was actually residing where he said he was. Bobo's family have said that they were told to say Mike was not at home if probation called.

- 5.3.92 There was no questioning on why Bobo was attending NPS appointments with Mike. Consideration should have been given as to whether this was an indicator of controlling behaviour. It is not apparent that there was any consideration of Bobo being subject to economic abuse from Mike. Mike appeared totally reliant on Bobo and her family for accommodation whilst he was under the supervision of NPS. There appears to have been no curiosity on whether Bobo was safe with a ViSOR subject or consideration of links to local domestic abuse services.
- 5.3.93 There were some areas of good practice. There were a number of attempts to engage with Mike, and when he did refuse NPS found Bobo's details in HMP logs and commenced pre-release checks. Norwich safeguarding police, borough intelligence and Probation were alerted to Mike's intent and release plans prior to release in line with policy. There was a good exchange of information between NPS in London and Norwich. There were also exchanges of phone calls and emails to keep each other updated. Prompt enforcement letters were sent to Mike and these were followed up with calls to police and a home visit. NPS also ensured that CSC were contacted when details of Bobo's grandchildren became known.
- 5.3.94 The NPS made recommendations on the use of MAPPA processes on prison release.
- 5.3.95 **Previous DHR recommendations**
- 5.3.96 In the Norfolk DHR into the death of "April", published in 2019 there was a recommendation that publicity on DVDS (Clare's Law) was reviewed. Whilst Bobo's family raised concerns, it appears that they were of the understanding that a family could not make an application for disclosure under Clare's law.
- 5.3.97 The Norfolk Police Website provides information that a member of the public could make a request for a disclosure under the DVDS if they considered another person to be at risk.<sup>19</sup> It is also clear that application may not result in disclosure of any risk to the person requesting and that the request for disclosure may be disclosed to the person considered to be at risk. If a disclosure would not have revealed past incidents of domestic abuse, risks from Mike's violent behaviour could have been considered. Norfolk Police could not provide a record of the enquiry made about Clare's law by Bobo's sister.

### **Good Practice Identified**

- 5.3.98 The work of ELFT in offering Bobo a referral for Carer's Assessment and referral to local carers organisations when she presented in London with Mike should be considered as good practice.
- 5.3.99 The Hackney GP practice has recently updated their new patient registration form to include the question "Are you currently or in the past experienced domestic abuse". Following these forms

---

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.norfolk.police.uk/advice/assault-abuse-threats/domestic-abuse-disclosure-scheme-clares-law>

being submitted by the new patient, they are reviewed by a HCA (health care assistant) and/or Nurse the form is then stored in the patient records, any verbal information taken from the patient is saved in a consultation note and the record is coded for risk of domestic abuse if this is disclosed. If domestic abuse has been identified the patient will be added to the GP review list.

- 5.3.100 The use of IRISi at para. 4.4.3 by City and Hackney GPs should be considered as Good Practice.
- 5.3.101 Norfolk and Waveney CCG have recently provided a template policy for domestic abuse to all GP practices in Norfolk and Waveney.
- 5.3.102 The Norwich City Council has 19 safeguarding champions and 12 domestic abuse champions across all service areas available to advise all council officers. The role of the safeguarding champion is to provide advice and information as to when and how to refer and report safeguarding concerns, when team members contact them with safeguarding concerns. Safeguarding champions also have wider and additional safeguarding training and meet six times a year to further their learning and share best practice. The domestic abuse champions are trained by a Norfolk County Council team in wider domestic abuse knowledge and trauma informed practices, as well as how to complete a DASH risk assessment.
- 5.3.103 In managing the call from Mike to Norwich City Council, where he claimed to speak on Bobo's behalf for housing matters. It is considered good practice that the council officer insisted on speaking to Bobo direct about her issues.



## **6. Conclusions and Lessons to be Learnt**

### **6.1 Conclusions**

- 6.1.1 The killing of Bobo resulted in the loss of a kind and loving sister and mother, and is devastating. Mike is the person responsible for this act.
- 6.1.2 Bobo had lived close to her family for majority of her life. She was a caring person who would support others and looked out for her children and grandchildren.
- 6.1.3 The Review Panel extends its sympathy to the family and friends of Bobo. Their involvement in the review process has provided a valuable insight on Bobo as a person, and some of her experience of agencies. This review aims to use their contribution and the work of the panel to bring improvements for other people and to help prevent future tragedy. Bobo's family have fully supported this review in the hope that it will somehow reflect her as a person. It is recognised that the family received support throughout this process from VSHS. The Chair would also like to extend thanks to VSHS for their support and professional communication.
- 6.1.4 This review is a learning process and the aim is to share that learning across all agencies to improve services in the future.
- 6.1.5 In this case Bobo's family brought to the panel's attention a series of letters from Mike, in prison, to Bobo that went back beyond the period originally under review. The letters give some insight on Mike's method of coercively controlling Bobo, economically and emotionally abusing her. Injuries to Bobo's face seen by Bobo's family would suggest the presence of physical violence long before her death.
- 6.1.6 Mike's propensity for controlling women outside prison was known for many years and does not appear to have been considered in intelligence, risk management or investigation processes between NPS and HM Prisons. Mike was known to have used his mother to traffic drugs. There was an apparent lack of curiosity and assertiveness in the management of a prisoner, who was a ViSOR nominal known to exploit women.
- 6.1.7 There were no links made between Mike's later drug use and possession of phones in prison and the timing of Bobo's visits. Bobo's family have disclosed that Bobo was taking drugs into her visits with Mike. The review has clearly shown that Mike 'groomed' women from the confines of his prison and exploited Bobo. He effectively targeted a vulnerable woman through the prison visiting system. It is of great concern that Mike was able to carry out a course of conduct over many years in prison without those managing him identifying this behaviour and the risks to others. Mike was sanctioned for his offending behaviour within prison but it appears that no consideration was given to his links in the community.

- 6.1.8 Controlling behaviour continued after Mike's release from prison. Mike isolated Bobo from her family before he eventually killed her. It is accepted that we will never know the full extent of Mike's abusive behaviour. Whilst agencies would not have been aware of what was happening to Bobo, there were areas where adherence to processes and improved communication could have provided opportunities to identify abuse and protect Bobo.
- 6.1.9 The economic abuse of Bobo was clear. Mike's demands for funds whilst in prison are evident in his communication with Bobo. When he left custody he effectively gained free accommodation from Bobo. He later went on in attempts to sabotage her housing, it appears with the intent to isolate her from family. Mike moved into his deceased mother's home and attempted to gain tenancy where he presented himself as a single person.
- 6.1.10 When Bobo went to London with Mike, her family had concerns for her. They made clear reports to Norfolk Police of their concerns for domestic abuse. It appears that these were incorporated into the Missing Persons Enquiry, but they were not recorded as separate third-party reports of domestic abuse. It is appreciated that Norfolk Police asked the police in London to check on Bobo's welfare but they did not request that a DASH risk assessment was conducted with her.
- 6.1.11 In the months leading up to Bobo's death it was apparent that Mike's mental ill-health was an issue. The NHS Mental Health Trust in London engaged with Mike in timely way. Mike's long-term healthcare had previously been provided in Prison. The NHS team requested access to Mike's long-term records, but the subsequent supply of years of notes without an effective handover summary highlights the need to change practice and service provision. A key area that was not highlighted, in prison medical notes, was any potential risk that Mike would have presented to women or to medical professionals dealing with him. The panel recognises that the medical professions may encounter patients who present risks to staff, and there are specialist practitioners to manage this. It is important that all medical professionals identify and highlight risks in clinical notes, so that it clear for all staff to see on handover.
- 6.1.12 It is disappointing that there was such poor engagement from the private healthcare, prison service, provider with the DHR. The poor standard of written submission, from the private provider to this review may reflect the challenges NHS services had to face when managing Mike's healthcare needs in the community.

## **6.2 Key Themes and Learning Identified**

- 6.2.1 This case shows that there needs to be a strong multi-agency partnership focus on tackling and preventing domestic abuse. It should also be recognised that the DHR process and homicide investigation have resulted in some immediate changes in the protocols and procedures. This demonstrates a willingness to implement change and improvements across the areas. There are some key areas that concern national services that require action elsewhere.

- 6.2.2 **Coercive control from persons detained in HM Prisons:** Mike clearly used coercive controlling behaviour from prison. The Prison Service, National Probation Service and other agencies need to be alert to the possibility that detainees can exploit or abuse others from within the confines of a prison. There should be a consideration of information held within prison and probation records and how that can be used to assess risks to those communicating with detainees. HM Prisons need to consider an intelligence led approach to preventing harm within the prison, and consider their wider responsibility, as a public authority, to prevent harm to the public.
- 6.2.3 This translates into Recommendations I, 1, and 5.
- 6.2.4 **Recording reports of third party reports of domestic abuse:** The review has established a failure of police to record reported third-party concerns of domestic for investigation. Police need to be alive to the fact that any missing person's report could contain allegations of abuse of some form. The recording of domestic abuse requires the consideration of risks in a formal DASH Risk assessment. There needs to be robust processes in place to ensure that all reported concerns of abuse, be they from victims or third parties, are correctly recorded. This should include enquiries under Clare's Law by victims and families. The correct recording of reported domestic abuse can ensure that the case is managed by specialist officers and links are made to Domestic Abuse agencies.
- 6.2.5 This translates into Recommendations H, 4, and 8.
- 6.2.6 **Handover of patients between HM Prisons and NHS:** When a person leaves prison health services it is essential that medical records are passed to the primary healthcare services covering their release address. Even when a medical professional is aware that a person had just been released from prison, it can take time to assess information held within records. It is also essential that prison healthcare records clearly highlight risk factors for people in contact with the for the area where they are living. It is also essential that records highlight any potential risk presented to healthcare staff encountering the person.
- 6.2.7 This translates into Recommendations C, D, I, Q, and 3.
- 6.2.8 **Routine Enquiry:** The use of routine enquiry, by primary care services, into a persons' relationships and safety at home features in many DHRs. This form of enquiry would sometimes be made on registration with a new GP. In this case Bobo had remained with the same GP in Norfolk for many years. It could be considered that a change in a person's home circumstances would trigger enquiry, this could include a new partner attending appointments with a person when they had always previously attended alone. There needs to be training in place to outline what constitutes domestic abuse if we want our healthcare professionals to recognise the presence of abuse. Bobo registered with a new GP two weeks before her death, at the time that GP did not routinely ask about a person's safety at home. This GP practice does now routinely enquire into abuse. The panel recognised that GPs should not be working in isolation and all opportunities for information between agencies should be used.

6.2.9 This translates into Recommendations D, E, J, K, and P.

6.2.10 **Economic Abuse:** It is clear from Bobo's family that there was economic abuse present early in the contact between Mike and Bobo, through her regular supply of funds. Whilst prison authorities were not aware of this, the release from prison and contact with probation services should consider the economic impact on those the prisoner intends to stay with. It is clear that Mike imposed himself on Bobo's housing status and initiated contact with the housing provider. We know that this all took place at a time when Bobo was in arrears in relation to her housing. Mike effectively sabotaged her living arrangements and housing, economically abusing Bobo. Economic abuse should be treated in the same way as any other form of domestic abuse, as opposed to treating it as a property crime. Training in awareness of economic abuse, with systems set to highlight concerns and professional curiosity can evidence economic abuse with the aim of protecting potential victims.

6.2.11 This translates into Recommendations E, R, 6, and 9.

6.2.12 **Substance Misuse:** It is apparent that substance misuse was a factor in the relationship between Mike and Bobo. It is known that Mike exploited his mother to bring drugs into prison and Bobo's family have told the review that he did the same to her. There were also mentions of Mike exploiting Bobo's family to supply drugs. It is known that Bobo reported her own use of cannabis to manage pain, but she was never referred to substance misuse services. It is known that Bobo had cocaine in her body when she died but there is no evidence that she had ever been exposed to Class A drugs before she met Mike. It is known that Mike exerted controlling behaviour in exposing Bobo to drugs. Agencies should be aware of abusers can exploit people either through involving them in criminality or risk from personal use of controlled substances.

6.2.13 This translates into Recommendations D, Q, and 3.

## 7. Recommendations

### 7.1 Single Agency Recommendations (Identified by Individual Agencies)

- 7.1.1 The following single agency recommendations were made by the agencies in their IMRs.
- 7.1.2 These recommendations are also presented by agency in the single agency recommendation action plan template in **Appendix 2**. These recommendations should be acted on through the development of an action plan, with each agency reporting on progress to the Hackney and Norfolk Community Safety Partnerships.
- 7.1.3 **East London NHS Foundation Trust (ELFT) Mental Health**
- 7.1.4 **Recommendation A:** The ELFT Safeguarding Adults Team to provide some form of safeguarding supervision to the team involved in this case to help offer practitioners there an opportunity to discuss safeguarding concerns and reflect on cases through the lens of safeguarding adults. The ELFT Safeguarding Supervision Policy is currently being drafted up but it is hoped that once this is published, the Safeguarding Lead for Hackney will have a conversation with the Service Manager to understand how best safeguarding supervision can be delivered to this service. This could realistically start to take place in the next 3 months once the policy has been ratified.
- 7.1.5 **Hackney CCG for General Practitioner (GP)**
- 7.1.6 **Recommendation B:** Review of Domestic Violence and Abuse Policies to ensure up to date information and correct local referral pathways reflected within the next three months.
- 7.1.7 **Recommendation C:** Review of safeguarding hand over in Primary Care specifically for post-prison registrations with a GP including history of violent offending, mental health and substance misuse.
- 7.1.8 **Recommendation D:** Registration form to be explicit in asking about illicit use of substances and offering onward referral to local services.
- 7.1.9 **Recommendation E:** All staff at the GP practice would benefit from a domestic abuse awareness update within the next three months.
- 7.1.10 **HMP Prisons**
- 7.1.11 **None**
- 7.1.12 **L&Q Housing Association**
- 7.1.13 **Recommendation F:** As a learning for L&Q further training is required to support our staff providing an empathetic approach when dealing with sensitive matters.
- 7.1.14 **Recommendation G:** A review will be undertaken of our Succession Application form as to the information gathered and whether this needs to include more about the applicant's history.

7.1.15 **Metropolitan Police Service**

7.1.16 **Recommendation H:** It is recommended that Central East (CE) Basic Command Unit Senior Leadership Team (SLT) remind all BCU Operations room supervisors of the importance of using professional curiosity when prioritising and assessing requests to assist other police areas to conduct missing person enquires and to ask for more detailed risk assessments if required.

7.1.17 **National Probation Service (NPS)**

7.1.18 **Recommendation I:** When high risk individuals are being released into community at sentence end date, good practice would be that there should still be a MAPPA meeting so that all agencies are aware of potential risks in the community even if there are limited mechanisms in place to manage risks.

7.1.19 **Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust (NCHC)**

7.1.20 **Recommendation J:** For staff to be professionally curious at all patient interactions. This will be done via training, the NCHC Safeguarding newsletter and Safeguarding Group Meeting will have a focus on Professional Curiosity. Re-circulate the Professional Curiosity Document of 2020 on an annual basis. There is also further support via phone calls, emails and TEAMs calls.

7.1.21 **Recommendation K:** Staff to be aware of the DA Champions role, how to access them and how to become a Champion. Guidance will be updated on the NCHC Safeguarding intranet page, this will include what champion is, what training and support is given and how the Champions are accessed. We aim to have a DA Champion in every locality by end of 2023. This will be communicated in Safeguarding newsletter and Group meeting, via DA lead and at Governance meetings. Registered staff to attend 3 yearly level 3 Safeguarding training day. As well as other subjects the training includes DA, professional curiosity, and the thematic framework. Training content is updated by Safeguarding team. Dates of training are advertised on Safeguarding intranet page, in newsletter and at Governance meetings, and take place approximately 3 times per month.

7.1.22 **Norfolk Constabulary**

7.1.23 **Recommendation L:** Norfolk Professional Standards Department produces a 'Learning Times' magazine of learning points such as this one. This learning point has been recommended for inclusion and circulation to all officers in the next edition. In this case the domestic abuse concern features on compact and a review of the missing circumstances and/or risk assessment by the supervisor before authorising closure of the missing person record could have led to a better understanding of the need for Bobo to be spoken with alone to address that concern. That aspect will be incorporated into the summary of the learning for the proposed magazine item.

7.1.24 **Recommendation M:** The Missing Person Force Policy Document section on completing 'safe and well' checks is recommended for amendment to include the following wording; "*where abuse or exploitation are considered to be a possible factor, extensive efforts should be made to speak with the person alone*".

7.1.25 **Norwich City Council**

7.1.26 **Recommendation N:** Remind colleagues and partners of opportunity to request general access visits from the tenancy management team and when they might do so.

7.1.27 **Recommendation O:** Update tenancy information to ask tenants to update the council of any additional support needs they have, as this occurs.

7.1.28 **Recommendation P:** Remind colleagues to capture on information management system any new information on vulnerabilities or support needs of customers.

7.1.29 **Norwich GP**

7.1.30 **Recommendation Q:** To improve communication and process between the criminal justice system and the general medical services in Norfolk at the point of release from prison including registration at a new practice, timely transfer of medical records and communication regarding ongoing physical and psychological needs as well as repeat medication.

7.1.31 **Recommendation R:** Norfolk and Waveney primary care services require access to bespoke domestic abuse training which includes an awareness of domestic abuse, how to recognise and respond effectively.

7.1.32 **Recommendation S:** A domestic abuse gap analysis on training and content in Norfolk and Waveney to ensure a consistent system wide appropriate response.

7.1.33 **Recommendation T:** Ensure primary care services have access to distinct guidance on the identification and response to domestic abuse.

**7.2 Multi Agency Recommendations (Developed by the Review Panel)**

7.2.1 The Review Panel has made the following recommendations during this review in response to learning identified.

7.2.2 These recommendations are also presented in the multi-agency recommendation action plan template in **Appendix 3**. The Hackney Community Safety Partnership and Norfolk Community Safety Partnership are responsible for overseeing then development and monitoring of an action plan.

7.2.3 **Recommendation 1:** That the Ministry of Justice review processes and implements policies within the prison service to ensure that where a prisoner has a known history of domestic abuse and/or violence and initiates further relationships with other parties this is processed through a Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme process with the local Constabulary to where the prisoner is located. This would ensure should the perpetrator be moved around the prison system this is managed appropriately. (To be monitored by Hackney CSP)

- 7.2.4 **Recommendation 2:** That the Ministry of Justice ensures processes are in place to ensure that families of victims of homicide are provided with a written record of the Judge's sentencing comments after a trial. (To be monitored by Norfolk CSP)
- 7.2.5 **Recommendation 3:** That the Ministry of Justice and HM Prison Service establish that all commissioned Prison Health Services are required to provide a timely written discharge report with a transfer of notes to community services and primary care prior to or on release from custody. There should also be a requirement that commissioned health services support statutory reviews with reports of an acceptable professional standard. (To be monitored by Norfolk CSP)
- 7.2.6 **Recommendation 4:** That Norfolk Constabulary commission a review of crime recording standards on cases of domestic abuse. This should include a review of calls to domestic incidents, and missing persons reports. Consideration should be given to the routine supervision of incidents, such as missing person reports to identify where abuse has gone unrecorded. The review should include dip sampling by representatives of the Norfolk CSP and local domestic abuse services to ensure transparency and public confidence.
- 7.2.7 **Recommendation 5:** That the HM Prison Service and National Probation Service actively monitor Mike whilst he is a serving prisoner. To assess communication and visits to manage potential risks on grooming and developing new relationships. The panel **STRONGLY** recommends that Mike's mail be monitored by HM Prisons in order to prevent harm and abuse. This should also be used to inform licence conditions. (To be monitored by Norfolk CSP)
- 7.2.8 **Recommendation 6:** That housing services involved in the DHR review their policies and develop new practice to consider economic abuse when assessing housing needs.
- 7.2.9 **Recommendation 7:** That Norfolk CSP review any targeting awareness campaigns arising from the DHR into the death of "April" in 2019 and consider whether learning from this review can be used to develop work in that area.
- 7.2.10 **Recommendation 8:** That Norfolk Constabulary review the progress on actions from DHR into the death of "April" in 2017 together with this case to ensure that all DVDS Right to Ask scheme enquires are recorded in a retrievable format. This should be supported by audit against incoming call data.
- 7.2.11 **Recommendation 9:** That all agencies review policies and procedures to ensure that they include the provisions of the Domestic Abuse Act 2021.



# Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

## Domestic Homicide Review Terms of Reference: Case of Bobo

This Domestic Homicide Review is being completed to consider agency involvement with Bobo and Mike following the death of Bobo in March 2020. The Domestic Homicide Review is being conducted in accordance with Section 9(3) of the Domestic Violence Crime and Victims Act 2004.

### Purpose of DHR

1. To review the involvement of each individual agency, statutory and non-statutory, with Bobo and Mike during the relevant period of time - 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018 to March 2020. To summarise agency involvement prior to 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018.
2. To establish what lessons are to be learned from the domestic homicide regarding the way in which local professionals and organisations work individually and together to safeguard victims.
3. To 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.
4. To apply these lessons to service responses including changes to inform national and local policies and procedures as appropriate.
5. To prevent domestic violence and homicide and improve service responses for all domestic violence and abuse victims and their children by developing a co-ordinated multi-agency approach to ensure that domestic abuse is identified and responded to effectively at the earliest opportunity.
6. To contribute to a better understanding of the nature of domestic violence and abuse.

7. To highlight good practice.

### **Role of the DHR Panel, Independent Chair and the CSP**

8. *The Independent Chair of the DHR will:*

- a) Chair the Domestic Homicide Review Panel.
- b) Co-ordinate the review process.
- c) Quality assure the approach and challenge agencies where necessary.
- d) Produce the Overview Report and Executive Summary by critically analysing each agency involvement in the context of the established terms of reference.

9. *The Review Panel:*

- a) Agree robust terms of reference (ToR).
- b) Ensure appropriate representation of your agency at the panel: panel members must be independent of any line management of staff involved in the case and must be sufficiently senior to have the authority to commit on behalf of their agency to decisions made during a panel meeting.
- c) Prepare Individual Management Reviews (IMRs) and chronologies through delegation to an appropriate person in the agency.
- d) Discuss key findings from the IMRs and invite the author of the IMR (if different) to the IMR meeting.
- e) Agree and promptly act on recommendations in the IMR Action Plan.
- f) Ensure that the information contributed by your organisation is fully and fairly represented in the Overview Report.
- g) Ensure that the Overview Report is of a sufficiently high standard for it to be submitted to the Home Office, for example:
  - o The purpose of the review has been met as set out in the ToR;
  - o The report provides an accurate description of the circumstances surrounding the case; and
  - o The analysis builds on the work of the IMRs and the findings can be substantiated.
- h) To conduct the process as swiftly as possible, to comply with any disclosure requirements, panel deadlines and timely responses to queries.
- i) On completion present the full report to Hackney Community Safety Partnership.
- j) Implement your agency's actions from the Overview Report Action Plan.

### *Hackney Community Safety Partnership:*

- a) Translate recommendations from Overview Report into a SMART Action Plan.
- b) Submit the Executive Summary, Overview Report and Action Plan to the Home Office Quality Assurance Panel.
- c) Forward Home Office feedback to the family, Review Panel and STADA.
- d) Agree publication date and method of the Executive Summary and Overview Report.
- e) Notify the family, Review Panel and STADA of publication.

### **Definitions: Domestic Violence and Coercive Control <sup>20</sup>**

10. The Overview Report will make reference to the terms domestic violence and coercive control. The Review Panel understands and agrees to the use of the cross-government definition (amended March 2013) as a framework for understanding the domestic violence experienced by the victim in this DHR. The cross-government definition states that domestic violence and abuse is:

“Any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive or threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are or have been intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexuality. This can encompass, but is not limited to, the following types of abuse: psychological; physical; sexual; financial; and emotional.

Controlling behaviour is: a range of acts designed to make a person subordinate and/or dependent by isolating them from sources of support, exploiting their resources and capacities for personal gain, depriving them of the means needed for independence, resistance and escape and regulating their everyday behaviour.

Coercive behaviour is: an act or a pattern of acts of assault, threats, humiliation and intimidation or other abuse that is used to harm, punish, or frighten their victim.”

This definition, which is not a legal definition, includes so-called ‘honour’ based violence, female genital mutilation (FGM) and forced marriage, and is clear that victims are not confined to one gender or ethnic group.”

---

<sup>20</sup> It should be noted that these terms of reference were drafted before the enactment of the Domestic Abuse Act 2021. The legal definition of Domestic Abuse established in 2021 was considered in the analysis and recommendations in this report.

## Equality and Diversity

11. The Review Panel will consider all protected characteristics (as defined by the Equality Act 2010) of both Bobo and Mike (age, disability (including learning disabilities), gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex and sexual orientation) and will also identify any additional vulnerabilities to consider (e.g. Bobo looking after a son with learning disabilities).
12. The Review Panel identified the following protected characteristics of Bobo and of Mike as requiring specific consideration for this case; age, disability, race, and sex.
13. The following issues have also been identified as particularly pertinent to this homicide substance misuse, mental health, Mike identifying as a carer, Bobo 's experience of adult family violence, economic abuse and coercive control, Mike's history of violence towards women, prison visiting and vulnerability, and bi-racial relationship between Mike and Bobo.
14. Consideration has been given by the Review Panel as to whether either the victim or the perpetrator was an 'Adult at Risk' Definition in Section 42 the Care Act 2014: "An adult who may be vulnerable to abuse or maltreatment is deemed to be someone aged 18 or over, who is in an area and has needs for care and support (whether or not the authority is meeting any of those needs); Is experiencing, or is at risk of, abuse or neglect; and As a result of those needs is unable to protect himself or herself against the abuse or neglect or the risk of it."

Abuse is defined widely and includes domestic and financial abuse. These duties apply regardless of whether the adult lacks mental capacity.

If it is the case that any party is an adult at risk, the Review Panel may require the assistance or advice of additional agencies, such as adult social care, and/or specialists such as a Learning Disability Psychiatrist, an independent advocate or someone with a good understanding of the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

The Care Act 2014 states; "Safeguarding means protecting an adult's right to live in safety, free from abuse and neglect. It is about people and organisations working together to prevent and stop both the risks and experience of abuse or neglect, while at the same time making sure that the adult's wellbeing is promoted including, where appropriate, having regard to their views, wishes, feelings and beliefs in deciding on any action. This must recognise that adults sometimes have

complex interpersonal relationships and may be ambivalent, unclear or unrealistic about their personal circumstances.”

The conclusion by the panel neither party was considered as an “Adult at Risk” but the matter will be kept under review during the DHR process.

15. *Expertise*: The Review Panel have invited substance misuse services to the panel from the outset of the process. Consideration will be given to working with economic abuse experts at the report drafting stage of the review.
16. If Bobo and Mike have not come into contact with agencies that they might have been expected to do so, then consideration will be given by the Review Panel on how lessons arising from the DHR can improve the engagement with those communities.
17. The Chair of review will make the link with relevant interested parties outside the main statutory agencies.
18. The Review Panel agrees it is important to have an intersectional framework to review Bobo’s and Mike’s life experiences. This means to think of each characteristic of an individual as inextricably linked with all of the other characteristics in order to fully understand one’s journey and one’s experience with local services/agencies and within their community.

### Parallel Reviews

19. There are no known parallel reviews.

*[Criminal trial disclosure dealt with in disclosure paragraph below]*

### Membership

20. It is critical to the effectiveness of the meeting and the DHR that the correct management representatives attend the panel meetings. Panel members must be independent of any line management of staff involved in the case and must be sufficiently senior to have the authority to commit on behalf of their agency to decisions made during a panel meeting.
21. The following agencies are to be on the Review Panel:
  - a) Clinical Commissioning Group
  - b) Community Health Services
  - c) General Practitioner for the victim and [alleged] perpetrator
  - d) Hospital
  - e) Housing Trust
  - f) Local Authority Adult Social Care Services

- g) Local Authority Children's Social Care Services (Norfolk only)
- h) Local Authority Community Safety
- i) Local Authority Housing services
- j) Local domestic violence specialist service provider
- k) Mental Health Trust
- l) NHS England
- m) Police – MPS and Norfolk (Borough Commander or representative, Senior Investigating Officer (for first meeting only) and IMR author)
- n) Prison Service
- o) Probation Service
- p) Substance misuse services
- q) Victim Support

22. As set out in paragraph 16 the following will contribute to the review as experts:

- a) Surviving Economic Abuse will be considered at report drafting stage.

### **Role of Standing Together Against Domestic Abuse (Standing Together) and the Panel**

23. Standing Together have been commissioned by Hackney CSP and Norfolk CSP to independently Chair this DHR. Standing Together have in turn appointed their DHR Associate Mark Yexley to chair the DHR. The DHR team consists of two Support Officers and a DHR Manager. The DHR Support Officer, Helene Berhane, will be the main point of contact and will coordinate the DHR and the DHR Team Manager, Hannah Candee, will have oversight of the DHR. The manager will quality assure the DHR process and Overview Report. This may involve their attendance at some panel meetings. The contact details for the Standing Together DHR team will be provided to the panel and you can contact them for advice and support during this review.

### **Collating evidence**

24. Each agency to search all their records outside the identified time periods to ensure no relevant information was omitted and secure all relevant records.

25. Chronologies and Individual Management Review (IMRs) will be completed by the following organisations known to have had contact with Bobo and Mike during the relevant time period:

Chronologies and IMRs

- a. Hackney CCG/Hackney GP
- b. East London NHS Foundation Trust (ELFT)
- c. Hackney Housing

- d. H.M. Prison Service (or Prison Service Provider)
- e. Metropolitan Police Service
- f. National Probation Service
- g. Norfolk and Waveney CCG
- h. Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust (NCHC)
- i. Norfolk Constabulary
- j. Norwich City Council

Chronologies Only at this stage

London Ambulance Service NHS Trust

Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust (NSFT)

The Guinness Partnership

And

Virgin Care will be approached to be involved in the DHR.

26. Further agencies may be asked to completed chronologies and IMRs if their involvement with Bobo and Mike becomes apparent through the information received as part of the review.

27. Each IMR will:

- Set out the facts of their involvement with Bobo and/or Mike;
- Critically analyse the service they provided in line with the specific terms of reference;
- Identify any recommendations for practice or policy in relation to their agency;
- Consider issues of agency activity in other areas and review the impact in this specific case.

28. Agencies that have had no contact should attempt to develop an understanding of why this is the case and how procedures could be changed within the partnership which could have brought Bobo and Mike in contact with their agency. These agencies are:

- a) To be confirmed during the review

### Key Lines of Inquiry

29. In order to critically analyse the incident and the agencies' responses to Bobo and/or Mike, this review should specifically consider the following points:

- a) Analyse the communication, procedures, and discussions, which took place within and between agencies.
- b) Analyse the co-operation between different agencies involved with Bobo or Mike [and wider family].
- c) Analyse the opportunity for agencies to identify and assess domestic abuse risk.

- d) Analyse agency responses to any identification of domestic abuse issues.
- e) Analyse organisations' access to specialist domestic abuse agencies.
- f) Analyse the policies, procedures and training available to the agencies involved on domestic abuse issues.
- g) Analyse the experience of Bobo as a woman in a bi-racial relationship and whether this would impact on her access to services.
- h) Analyse whether substance misuse impacted on Bobo or Mike's access to services.
- i) Analyse whether Bobo vulnerability and starting a relationship with a prisoner, affected her and whether procedures should be adapted to consider this.
- j) Analyse whether Mike's presentation as a carer for Bobo was considered as a factor by services that she was accessing.
- k) Analyse whether Bobo's mental health impacted her on access to services.
- l) Analyse whether Bobo's experience of Adult Family Violence affected her access to services.
- m) Analyse whether Mike's history of violence towards women was considered by services and how potential risks were considered.
- n) Analyse whether Bobo was subject to coercive control through economic abuse and if this impacted on her access to services.

*As a result of this analysis, agencies should identify good practice and lessons to be learned. The Review Panel expects that agencies will take action on any learning identified immediately following the internal quality assurance of their IMR.*

### **Development of an action plan**

- 30. Individual agencies to take responsibility for establishing clear action plans for the implementation of any recommendations in their IMRs. The Overview Report will make clear that agencies should report to Hackney and Norfolk Community Safety Partnerships on their action plans within six months of the Review being completed.
- 31. Hackney Community Safety Partnership to establish a multi-agency action plan for the implementation of recommendations arising out of the Overview Report, for submission to the Home Office along with the Overview Report and Executive Summary.

### **Liaison with the victim's family and [alleged] perpetrator and other informal networks**



32. The review will sensitively attempt to involve the family of Bobo in the review, once it is appropriate to do so in the context of on-going criminal proceedings. The Chair will lead on family engagement with the support of Victim Support Homicide Service.
33. Mike will be invited to participate in the review, following the completion of the criminal trial.
34. Family liaison will be coordinated in such a way as to aim to reduce the emotional hurt caused to the family by being contacted by a number of agencies and having to repeat information.
35. The Review Panel discussed involvement of other informal networks of the Bobo or Mike and agreed it was proportionate to the DHR to invite the following persons (to be established after discussion with family and SIO) to be involved in the DHR.

### Media handling

36. Any enquiries from the media and family should be forwarded to Hackney and Norfolk Community Safety Partnerships who will liaise with the Chair. Panel members are asked not to comment if requested. The Hackney and Norfolk Community Safety Partnerships will make no comment apart from stating that a review is underway and will report in due course.
37. The Hackney and Norfolk Community Safety Partnerships are responsible for the final publication of the report and for all feedback to staff, family members and the media.

### Confidentiality

38. All information discussed is strictly confidential and must not be disclosed to third parties without the agreement of the responsible agency's representative. That is, no material that states or discusses activity relating to specific agencies can be disclosed without the prior consent of those agencies.
39. All agency representatives are personally responsible for the safe keeping of all documentation that they possess in relation to this DHR and for the secure retention and disposal of that information in a confidential manner.
40. It is recommended that all members of the Review Panel set up a secure email system, e.g. registering for criminal justice secure mail, nhs.net, gsi.gov.uk, pnn or GCSX. Documents will be password protected.
41. If an agency representative does not have a secure email address, then their non-secure address can be used but all confidential information must be sent in a password protected attachment. The

password used must be sent in a separate email. Please use the password provided to you by the Standing Together team. They should be reminded that they should remove the password and only share appropriate information to appropriate front line staff in line with the DHR Confidentiality Statement and the specific Terms of Reference.

42. If you are sending password protected document to a non-secure email address, it must be a recognisable work email address for the professional receiving information. Information from DHR should not be sent to a gmail / hotmail or other personal email account unless in rare cases when it has been verified as the work address for an individual or charity.
43. No confidential content should be in the body of an email to a non-secure email account. That includes names, DOBs and address of any subjects discussed at DHR.

## Disclosure

44. Disclosure of facts or sensitive information will be managed and appropriately so that problems do not arise. The review process will seek to complete its work in a timely fashion in order to safeguard others.
45. The sharing of information by agencies in relation to their contact with the victim and/or the alleged perpetrator is guided by the following:
  - a) The Data Protection Act 1998 governs the protection of personal data of living persons and places obligations on public authorities to follow 'data protection principles': The 2016 Home Office Multi-Agency Guidance for the Conduct of DHRs (Guidance) outlines data protection issues in relation to DHRs(Par 98). It recognises they tend to emerge in relation to access to records, for example medical records. It states 'data protection obligations would not normally apply to deceased individuals and so obtaining access to data on deceased victims of domestic abuse for the purposes of a DHR should not normally pose difficulty – this applies to all records relating to the deceased, including those held by solicitors and counsellors.
  - b) Data Protection Act and Living Persons: The Guidance notes that in the case of a living person, for example the perpetrator, the obligations do apply. However, it further advises in Par 99 that the Department of Health encourages clinicians and health professionals to cooperate with domestic homicide reviews and disclose all relevant information about the victim and where appropriate, the individual who caused their death unless exceptional circumstances apply. Where record holders consider there are reasons why full disclosure of information about a person of interest to a review is not appropriate (e.g. due to confidentiality obligations or other human rights considerations), the following steps should be taken:

- The review team should be informed about the existence of information relevant to an inquiry in all cases; and
  - The reason for concern about disclosure should be discussed with the review team and attempts made to reach agreement on the confidential handling of records or
  - partial redaction of record content.
- c) Human Rights Act: information shared for the purpose of preventing crime (domestic abuse and domestic homicide), improving public safety and protecting the rights or freedoms of others (domestic abuse victims).
- d) Common Law Duty of Confidentiality outlines that where information is held in confidence, the consent of the individual should normally be sought prior to any information being disclosed, with the exception of the following relevant situations – where they can be demonstrated:
- i) It is needed to prevent serious crime.
  - ii) there is a public interest (e.g., prevention of crime, protection of vulnerable persons)

46. As there is a police criminal investigation, the police are bound by law to ensure that there is fair disclosure of material that may be relevant to an investigation and which does not form part of the prosecution case. Any material gathered in this DHR process could be subject to disclosure to the defence, if it is considered to undermine the prosecution case or assisting the case for the accused.
47. The DHR Chair will discuss the issues of disclosure in this case with the police Disclosure Officer if required. The SIO will be provided with copies of all papers submitted to the panel.
48. The Chair, police and CPS will be minded to consider the confidentiality of material at all times and to balance that with the interests of justice.



## Appendix 2: Single Agency Recommendations – Action Plan Template

Recommendation	Scope of recommendation i.e., local or regional	Action to take	Lead Agency	Key milestones in enacting the recommendation	Target Date	Date of Completion and Outcome

OR CAN USE

Recommendation 1: <i>(Insert Recommendation and desired outcome)</i>					
REF	Action (SMART)	Lead Officer	Monitoring Arrangements and Key Milestones	Target date for completion	Completion Date and Outcome
1.1					
1.2					
1.3					

## Appendix 3: Multi Agency Recommendations – Action Plan Template

Recommendation	Scope of recommendation i.e., local or regional	Action to take	Lead Agency	Key milestones in enacting the recommendation	Target Date	Date of Completion and Outcome

OR CAN USE

Recommendation 1: <i>(Insert Recommendation and desired outcome)</i>					
REF	Action (SMART)	Lead Officer	Monitoring Arrangements and Key Milestones	Target date for completion	Completion Date and Outcome
1.1					
1.2					
1.3					