

London
SW1P 4DF



Home Office

Interpersonal Abuse
Unit Tel: 020
7035 4848
2 Marsham Street

www.homeoffice.gov.uk

****REDACTED INFORMATION****

13th January 2026

Dear ****REDACTED INFORMATION****

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Agnes) for Cumberland Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Board. The report was considered at the QA Board meeting on 3rd December 2025. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

Please find the QA Board's feedback in the form below. On completion of the changes suggested the DHR may be published.

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

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

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

Please also send a digital copy to the Domestic Abuse Commissioner at DHR@domesticabusecommissioner.independent.gov.uk

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

Yours sincerely,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Board

DHR QA Board Feedback for the Community Safety Partnership

TITLE OF DHR	Agnes
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP	Cumberland
DATE REVIEWED BY QA BOARD	3 rd December 2025
DECISION	Publish with amendments
GOOD PRACTICE COMMENDED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report is well written, detailed and well-ordered. • There has been significant progress towards positive change and improvement, particularly by Cumbria Constabulary, in response to the tragic death of Agnes, which was commended as good practice. Most recommendations have been actioned and completed, despite delays within the DHR process. • Previous DHRs were reviewed and informed learning in this case, which was positive. • A heartfelt pen portrait and tribute to Agnes from her family is provided, which is beautifully written. This reflects the voice of the victim. • The Chair is correct to note and include details outside the formal scope of the review where they demonstrate Graham's propensity for violence. Specifically, the previous background of offending behaviour involving Sue and her children provides important context for understanding risk and patterns of behaviour.
FEEDBACK FOR FUTURE DHRs	The report may have benefited from being a joint DHR and Safeguarding Adult Review.

	DHR SECTION	DHR QA BOARD FEEDBACK (improvements required before publication)
1	Title Page	The surname given to Agnes should be removed from the title page.
2	Contents Page	No amendments required.
3	Pen Portrait	No amendments required.
4	Condolences	No amendments required.
5	Confidentiality and Anonymity	No amendments required.

6	Terms of Reference	No amendments required.
7	Equality and Diversity	No amendments required.
8	Background Information	The phrase stating that “ <i>Agnes may have been ‘excusing’ Graham’s ‘volatile and dangerous nature’</i> ” should be removed, as it is speculative and not evidence based.
9	Combined Chronology	No amendments required.
10	Overview	No amendments required.
11	Analysis	In the overview report, at 17.1, it states that when Graham lived in the Nottingham area prior to 2005, he was reported to police for domestic related offences against his partner at the time and that these offences occurred before the implementation of the Domestic Abuse, Stalking, Harassment and Honour Based Violence Risk Indicator Checklist (DASH) across policing. Whilst it is correct that DASH was not implemented in 2005, it is possible that Nottingham Police were using a risk assessment tool for domestic abuse cases – it may have been SPECS (acronym for high risk factors Separation, Pregnancy, Escalation, Control, Sexual assault) as other police forces were using a variety of different risk assessments prior to the roll out of DASH in approx. 2010. Please therefore review this information and amend if appropriate.
12	Conclusions	No amendments required.
13	Lessons learnt and recommendations	No amendments required.
14	Timescales	No amendments required.
15	Involvement of family / friends / community	Please indicate if the Home Office leaflet was shared with the family.
16	DHR contributors	No amendments required.
17	DHR Panel	It is good to see participation from the Department for Work and Pensions. It would be helpful to indicate why a specialist domestic abuse charity was not part of the panel.

18	DHR Author	No amendments required.
19	Parallel Reviews	No amendments required.
20	Dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please add the Police and Crime Commissioner for the local area to the dissemination list. • Please indicate whether the family have been consulted about key dates to avoid publication and consideration given to support for them if needed.
21	Action Plan	No amendments required.
22	<p>Has there been a request to withhold publication?</p> <p><i>If Yes, include the reason for the request. Is it proportionate and appropriate?</i></p>	No request to withhold publication.
23	Any other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are some paragraphs in a different font to the majority of the report. Please ensure the same font is used throughout. • The phrase stating that the HM Coroner described the relationship as “<i>bizarre</i>” should be removed from the report. This language is inappropriate and subjective, and its inclusion does not align with the factual and respectful tone required for a DHR.