



**PENNINE LANCASHIRE
COMMUNITY SAFETY
PARTNERSHIP**

Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership

Domestic Homicide Review

Victim – Rose who was murdered in April 2022

Independent Author – David Mellor BA QPM

Report completed on 25th January 2024

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 Terms of Reference	4
3.0 Methodology.....	5
4.0 Views of Rose’s family.....	7
5.0 Chronology/Overview	12
6.0 Perpetrator views	24
7.0 Analysis	25
8.0 Conclusion.....	35
9.0 Lesson to be learnt and recommendations.....	36
References	44
Appendix A Single agency recommendations	45
Appendix B – Executive Summary	47
Appendix C – Multi Agency Recommendations.....	72
Appendix D – Response from the Home Office	76

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This report of a Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) examines agency responses and support given to Rose (a pseudonym), a resident of Burnley prior to her murder which took place in April 2022.

1.2 In addition to agency involvement the review will also examine the past to identify any relevant background or trail of abuse before the murder, 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.

1.3 Rose was murdered by her ex-partner Glenn (also a pseudonym) in April 2022. Their relationship began in July 2019 and appears to have continued for around eighteen months. When the relationship ended, Glenn embarked on a period of intense harassment and stalking of Rose between March and June 2021 during which he claimed that Rose owed him money and made threats to Rose if this supposed debt was not repaid, posted intimate images of her on social media, stalked her and she also suspected him to be responsible for criminal damage to her car. He also obtained a civil court order for the recovery of a what appears to be a fictitious debt of £4419 from Rose and used the lawful process for enforcing this debt as a means of coercing and controlling Rose which may have been a factor in her subsequently resuming her relationship with Glenn. The earlier intense period of harassment and stalking had resulted in a MARAC referral and IDVA support for a time following which Rose declined further support and made no further reports of domestic abuse in the ten month period between her case being heard at MARAC and her subsequent murder. Glenn murdered Rose after taking her to remote woodland and then burying her body in a grave he had dug the day before. After Rose's family reported her missing to the Police, Glenn was arrested on suspicion of kidnapping and murder. Following extensive police search activity, Rose's body was recovered. Glenn was charged and convicted of her murder and sentenced to life imprisonment with a minimum term of 32 years.

1.4 On 15th June 2022 representatives of Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership decided to commission a Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) following the death of Rose.

1.5 The review decided to consider agency contact with Rose between July 2019 when her relationship with Glenn appears to have begun and her murder in April 2022. Events of relevance to the review which occurred outside this timeframe have also been considered.

1.6 The key purpose for undertaking DHRs is to enable lessons to be learned from homicides where a person is murdered or apparently takes their own life 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 in order to reduce the risk of such tragedies happening in the future.

DHR Timescales

1.7 This review began on 13th January 2023 and was concluded on 25th January 2024. Reviews, including the overview report, should be completed, where possible, within six months of the commencement of the review. There was a slight delay in commencing this DHR as it was decided to await the conclusion of criminal proceedings before beginning the DHR. The timescales have also been extended by the need to fully engage and consult with agencies involved in the civil debt recovery process.

Confidentiality

1.8 The findings of each DHR are confidential. Information is available only to participating officers/professionals and their line managers. A pseudonym for the victim has been agreed with Rose's family and is used in the report to protect the identity of the individuals involved. At the time of her death, Rose was 33 years old and the perpetrator Glenn was 50. Rose was White British as is Glenn.

1.9 All Domestic Homicide Reviews involve the loss of a cherished life leaving devastation in its wake. In this case Rose leaves her mother and father, two sisters and two children. Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership wishes to express sincere condolences to the family and friends of Rose.

2.0 Terms of Reference

2.1 The terms of reference for the DHR are as follows:

To establish the circumstances surrounding the homicide.

To establish whether there are any lessons to be learned from the case about the way in which professionals and organisations worked together and carried out their duties and responsibilities.

To identify clearly what those lessons are, how they will be acted upon and what is expected to change as a result. Agencies will also identify good practice and how that enabled partners to work together in this case.

To establish whether the concerns and responses by professionals and their organisations were appropriate both historically and, in the time, leading up to the homicide.

To establish whether organisations have appropriate policy and procedures to respond to the circumstances identified in this case and to recommend any changes as a result of the review process, with the aim of better safeguarding victims.

All enquiries will commence from the point at which Rose's relationship with Glenn began until the date of the domestic homicide. However, any historical information or convictions of domestic abuse, outside of this timeframe should be included.

To provide details of additional records concerning Domestic Violence and Medical Issues including Mental Health or Physical Injury or Disability that may have a relevant impact on the review.

How, if at all, did the prevailing Covid-19 regulations impact on the effectiveness or otherwise of agency intervention to manage the risks to the victim.

3.0 Methodology

3.1 On 4th May 2022 Lancashire Constabulary referred the case to Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership for consideration of holding a DHR. As stated, on 15th June 2022 representatives of Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership decided that the circumstances of the death met the criteria for a DHR.

3.2 The DHR was conducted in accordance with the Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance for the Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews (December 2016). Individual Management Review (IMR) reports were requested from all agencies who had had relevant contact with Rose, her family and the perpetrator Glenn.

3.3 The IMRs were scrutinised by the DHR Panel and further information was requested where necessary.

Contributors to the DHR

3.4 The following agencies provided Individual Management Reviews to inform the review:

East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
HCRG Care Group (0-19 service)
Lancashire Children's Social Care
Lancashire Constabulary
Lancashire Victim Services (Victim Support)
College 1
Lancashire and South Cumbria Integrated Care Board (Burnley)

The following agencies provided short reports or other written information to inform the review:

Burnley County Court
Debt collection agency A

3.5 The authors of each IMR were independent in that they had had no prior involvement in the case.

The DHR Panel Members

3.6 The DHR Panel consisted of:

Representative	Organisation
Head of Safenet Support Services.	Safenet (provider of support to victims of domestic abuse)
Designated Safeguarding Lead.	College 1
Community Safety Officer.	Community Safety Partnership - Burnley
Senior Operations Manager	Lancashire Victim Service (Victim Support/IDVA)
Review Officer.	Lancashire Constabulary
Community Safety Partnerships Manager.	Pennine Lancs. Community Safety Partnership
Named Nurse for Safeguarding Children.	Health Care Resourcing Group (HCRG) (0-19 services)
Senior Probation Officer.	Probation Service
Specialist Safeguarding Practitioner for Children and Adults.	Lancashire & South Cumbria Integrated Care Board (ICB)
Senior Manager Safeguarding, Inspection and Audit Service.	Lancashire Children's Social Care
David Mellor	Independent Chair and Author
Safeguarding Children Nurse.	Health Care Resourcing Group (HCRG) (0-19 services)
Safeguarding Lead.	East Lancashire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust

3.7 DHR Panel members were independent of the line management of any staff involved in the case. The Panel met on five occasions; 13th January, 20th March, 23rd May, 25th September and 13th November 2023.

3.8 Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership wrote to Rose's mother and her two sisters to advise them that a DHR had been commissioned and to invite them to contribute to the review if they wished to do so. The Home Office leaflet which explains the DHR process was also sent to them. Supported by their Police Family Liaison Officer, Rose's mother and sisters met with the independent author and shared their account of Rose's life and her relationship with Glenn. The independent author subsequently revisited the family to update them on the progress of the DHR. The family did not wish to avail themselves of the support offered by a Victim Support Homicide worker, nor did they wish to meet with the DHR Panel. The family chose the pseudonym 'Rose'. Arrangements were made to enable the family to read and comment on the final draft DHR report.

Author of the overview report

3.9 David Mellor was appointed as the independent author and chair of the DHR Panel established to oversee the review. David is a retired police chief officer who has eleven years' experience as an independent author of DHRs and other statutory reviews.

Statement of independence

3.10 The independent chair and author David Mellor was a police officer in Derbyshire Constabulary, Greater Manchester Police and Fife Constabulary between 1975 and 2005. He retired as a Deputy Chief Constable.

3.11 Since 2006 he has been an independent consultant. He was independent chair of Cheshire East Local Safeguarding Children Board (2009-2011), Stockport Local Safeguarding Children Board (2010-2016) and Stockport Safeguarding Adults Board (2011-2015). Since 2012 he has been an independent chair/author/lead reviewer of a number of Serious Case Reviews, Local Child Safeguarding Practice Reviews, Safeguarding Adults Reviews and Domestic Homicide Reviews.

3.12 He has no connection to services in Pennine Lancashire.

Parallel reviews

3.13 No inquest is to be held in respect of the death of Rose.

Equality and diversity

3.14 The protected characteristics relevant to Rose are addressed in Paragraphs 7.46 – 7.48.

Dissemination

3.15 In addition to the DHR Panel members, the report will also be sent to:

UK Domestic Abuse Commissioner
Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership
Lancashire Police and Crime Commissioner
Lancashire Domestic Abuse Commissioner
All agencies contributing to this review
Family members

4.0 Views of Rose's family

4.1 Rose's mother and her two younger sisters met the independent author in Rose's mother's home. They were supported by their Police Family Liaison Officer.

4.2 The family described Rose as a person who was always out and about, who loved walking outdoors and camping. They said that she particularly enjoyed waterfalls, sunrises and sunsets and took her children and 'every other kid off the street' and the family dog up onto the moors.

4.3 The family said that Rose generally was in good health. At the time of her murder she was working as a care assistant in a residential nursing home for adults from a wide age range who had significant needs. She had previously worked for a domiciliary care provider, visiting people in their own homes. Her family described her as 'the caring sort'.

4.4 Her family said that she met Glenn through their children who attended the same school and took her elder child and Glenn's youngest child – who were similar ages - to stay in a caravan during the school summer holidays in 2019. Glenn did not accompany them but sent Rose some money towards the cost of the holiday. She was expecting him to send £100 but he actually sent £300. Her family felt that Rose had been impressed by this act of apparent generosity.

4.5 After their relationship began, Rose's family said that Glenn told her that he was in the process of purchasing a house in Wales for £1.3million which he planned to run as a bed and breakfast hotel. He said that the house also had a campsite attached.

4.6 The family said that he took Rose to see where the property was in Wales, and she became involved in planning the move. She booked the removal company, applied for school places for her children and Glenn's younger two children and gave notice to the landlord of her family home. The family recalled that Rose had difficulty in obtaining a school place for her younger child and Glenn told her not to worry about this as he would fund a place for the child at a private school.

4.7 The family estimated that this sequence of events took place in late 2019 or early 2020 – certainly prior to the onset of the pandemic.

4.8 However, just before the move to Wales was due to take place, her family said that Glenn told Rose that the woman who owned the property in Wales had withdrawn from the sale. Rose's family said that she appeared to be convinced that the move to Wales had been a reality and was 'heartbroken' when it fell through. They said that Rose talked about getting in touch with the woman selling the property but eventually decided not to.

4.9 Rose's family said that this sequence of events 'did not sit right' with them and caused 'alarm bells' to ring. Rose's family said that Glenn later told Rose that he planned to move them and their children into a large property he said he owned but when Rose rang the Estate Agents they said that they had never heard of Glenn.

4.10 Her family said that when Rose and Glenn were together they never went out or did anything together as Rose would plan things and Glenn would always back out. They never went on holiday apart from a weekend in Spain when her family said that Glenn proposed to her.

4.11 Rose's family said that on one occasion Glenn drove Rose all the way to Scotland for a holiday only for Glenn to say that he had lost his bank card and so they would need to turn around and go home. Her family said that he always had a reason for backing out.

4.12 The family said that Rose's children eventually became 'fed up' with Glenn. They also recalled Glenn making false promises to buy Rose's elder child a mountain bike. In the end Rose had to 'scrimp and save' to buy the mountain bike for the child. Rose's family also recalled that one Christmas Rose's children woke up without presents because Glenn had promised to buy them. They say he then 'spun a yarn' to claim that the parcel delivery company had not delivered them.

4.13 Rose's family said that they arrived at the conclusion that Glenn was a person who presented himself as far wealthier than he actually was and continually told lies to maintain this image. They said that he told Rose that he and his father owned numerous properties from which he derived a good income from tenants. However, the reality was that he was a builder who lived in a two bedroomed property with his children. The family said that the image he tried to create and the reality of his life 'didn't add up'.

4.14 The family felt that Rose was a person who tended to believe what people told her. They described her as quite a spiritual person who converted to Buddhism around 2019. Rose's family felt that the religion was very suited to her personality with an emphasis on healing and kindness. They felt that Glenn exploited Rose's innate kindness and her tendency to place trust in others. Rose's family felt that she was in love with Glenn and seemed to want to understand him and change him for the better. Additionally the family felt that Rose may have perceived her relationship with Glenn to be a route to financial security, in other words she may have wanted to believe that the lies that Glenn told her were true.

4.15 The family said that Rose split up with Glenn and later resumed the relationship. They added that they began to notice a pattern that when she resumed her relationship with Glenn, Rose would become distant from her family. The family also felt that he isolated her from them. For example, they said that Glenn 'guilt tripped' her after she spent Christmas with her mother - after he initially agreed to this - and then complained that he had spent Christmas on his own.

4.16 Rose's family went on to describe Glenn's behaviour when Rose ended their relationship in 2021. They said he would bombard her with messages.

4.17 The family went on to state that Glenn twice managed to freeze Rose's bank account by ringing her bank to say that she had sold him something, but he had not received the item. Whilst her account was 'frozen', Rose was unable to use her bank account which caused her financial hardship. Her youngest sister described how she helped her to set up a new bank account with a different bank as an alternative.

4.18 Rose's family then discussed the claim that Glenn made through the civil court for £4419 which he said she owed him. Rose's youngest sister helped her to check her bank statements and established that the £4419 related to payments he made into Rose's bank account during their relationship. Rose's youngest sister said that Rose often gave him cash when he was short of money and then he would pay her back by transferring money into her bank account. These payments - which the family say were actually repayments of cash Rose had loaned to Glenn - formed the basis for his claim which the civil court granted. The

family explained that Glenn would often tell Rose he was short of money because he was unable to access one of his savings or investment accounts.

4.19 Rose's family felt that it was a little too easy to make the sort of claim that Glenn made against Rose. They said that all that is required is a small fee. The family felt that Judges needed to do their 'homework' before granting the orders.

4.20 The family said that bailiffs started coming round to Rose's home to enforce the Court Order as Glenn wouldn't accept a payment plan. He said that Rose had assets which should be seized. The family said that in order to protect Rose's assets, her mother put Rose's car into her name and that Rose began parking the car at her mother's house. Rose also moved her elder child's mountain bike out of the family home so that it could not be removed.

4.21 Rose's family recalled her approaching Burnley Solicitors to try and put a Non-Molestation Order in place. However, they said that Rose's female solicitor told Rose that she could no longer continue with the case after Glenn emailed the solicitor and threatened her.

4.22 Rose's family said that they believed that the bailiffs remained involved up until around March 2022. They said that Rose found the granting of the Court Order and the involvement of the bailiffs to be very stressful. They said that she was suffering with severe anxiety and her hands became flaky and sore as a result of constant anxiety and she began drinking more alcohol.

4.23 Glenn eventually told Rose that he was going to get the bailiffs paid off. The family said that she then moved her car back to her home around March 2022 and they believe that Rose resumed her relationship with Glenn at this time also, adding that Rose wouldn't let her family know when she was back with Glenn as she knew that her family held a low opinion of him.

4.24 Rose's family said that they did not think Glenn was capable of physically hurting Rose, adding that they didn't think 'he had it in him' to be violent. They were very clear that he abused Rose mentally, emotionally and financially but, to their knowledge, he had never physically abused her prior to the murder. However, her family felt that Rose was scared of Glenn.

4.25 Reflecting on the murder, the family have come to the view that Rose had finally made her mind up to end her relationship with Glenn and that he may have realised that he was losing her and understood that she had had enough. The text messages which the family know Glenn had drafted several weeks before the murder suggested to the family that, in the knowledge that Rose had decided to end the relationship for good, he eased the pressure from the bailiffs to persuade her to resume the relationship so that he could go ahead with his plan to kill her.

4.26 Rose's family said that there were two things that they had learned since Rose's murder which they wish they had known earlier. Firstly they were not aware that they could make a Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme (DVDS) application on Rose's behalf. Secondly

they didn't report Rose missing to the Police immediately because they believed that it was necessary to wait for 24 – 48 hours before making a missing person report for an adult.

4.27 They said that they hoped that the account they had provided to the DHR might help to save someone else's life.

4.28 Rose's sisters are both now working with Lancashire Constabulary in a voluntary capacity to help raise awareness of issues relating to the victims of domestic abuse.

4.29 Rose's mother and two sisters have read the final draft DHR report and expressed themselves satisfied with the report. Once again they were supported by their Police Family Liaison Officer.

5.0 Chronology/Overview

Background information (Paragraph 5.1 to 5.3)

5.1 Rose was born in 1988 lived with her two children in a privately rented property in the Burnley Council area. Her family describe her as a spiritual person, who was always ready to help others and loved walking with her children and 'every other kid off the street' in 'the outdoors'. She had been employed for a number of years as a carer for a domiciliary care agency and later at a residential home for adults with high care needs. She was in generally good health.

5.2 The Police attended a number of incidents of domestic abuse between 2011 and 2013 which related primarily to verbal arguments involving Rose and her then partner when he had consumed alcohol. The Police arrested and charged this partner for an offence of battery of Rose although ultimately no further action was taken.

5.3 The perpetrator Glenn was born in 1971 and was therefore 17 years older than Rose. He was known to the Police as result of disclosures of domestic abuse from his former wife who is the mother of their three children. His former wife was referred to MARAC in 2010 and in 2019. The Police investigated two assaults disclosed by Glenn's former wife, but the cases were dismissed by the Court on one occasion and on the second occasion the Police were unable to proceed as a result of evidential difficulties. Glenn's other prior intimate relationships were also characterised by physical violence, emotional abuse, controlling behaviour and harassment which did not result in convictions. Glenn has three convictions and a caution for acquisitive crime, criminal damage and attempting to pervert the course of justice. One aspect of these prior non-violent offences was a tendency towards dishonesty and sometimes quite elaborate deceptions. He was a self-employed builder and handyman.

2019

5.4 In April 2019 the Police received information that Glenn was defrauding people out of large amounts of money. He had previously run a building company in respect of which it is understood that he had applied for bankruptcy - or the company had become insolvent - but he continued to trade. He is understood to have asked customers for cash 'up front' and begun the agreed work but often appears not to have completed it. The information received by the Police in April 2019 was treated as intelligence in the absence of any formal complaints which disclosed conduct which could be investigated as a crime. The DHR has learned that on one occasion Glenn made threats to a person who had paid him in advance for works he did not complete and for which the customer did not receive a refund.

5.5 Rose and Glenn's relationship began in July 2019. At that time Rose was living with her two children and Glenn was living separately with his three children. Glenn's former wife had left their family home and moved out of the area. Rose's children and Glenn's younger

two children attended the same school (College 1), and Rose's elder child and Glenn's youngest child were of a similar age. Rose took Glenn's youngest child away on a holiday with her children during the summer of 2019. Glenn did not accompany them but contributed £300 to the cost of the holiday when her family say that Rose was expecting only £100. This act of apparent generosity was well received by Rose and her family feel that it was part of Glenn's attempt to present himself to Rose as a person of more substantial means than was actually the case. Their relationship began shortly thereafter. Rose and Glenn appear to have continued to live largely separately throughout their relationship.

5.6 During July 2019 Rose was experiencing persistent pain in her left side and back which was thought to be being caused by kidney stones¹ but did not attend several Urology appointments and in November 2019 was discharged into the care of her GP.

5.7 On 30th July 2019 the Police received an allegation of theft from a person who stated that they had engaged Glenn to carry out a kitchen refurbishment which had not been completed despite making prior payment for the work. The caller also alleged that Glenn had stolen cans of paint. The Police referred the matter to Trading Standards who conducted a separate investigation. No further Police action was taken.

5.8 On 27th November 2019 the Police received a report from a person who had engaged Glenn to carry out work on their home and later sought to recover £9000 from Glenn through the Civil Court. The person subsequently received a letter from a Loans Company indicating that they had agreed to electronically sign a document to be a guarantor for Glenn. It is assumed the person claimed that they had not signed the document. The police passed the case to the fraud department of the loan company to investigate and took no further action.

2020

5.9 On 23rd March 2020 the first England lockdown in response to the Covid-19 pandemic began.

5.10 8th April 2020 Glenn contacted the Police to report harassment of his children by his former wife – and mother of their children - who he said was ringing the children at inappropriate times of night. The Police spoke to both parties and the children and concluded that Glenn's former wife's actions were reasonable and proportionate and documented that Glenn appeared to be unhappy that his former partner was speaking to their children.

5.11 From 4th July 2020 Covid-19 restrictions began to be eased although local lockdowns were introduced from this date. However, partner agencies continued to operate according to the exceptional delivery models they had adopted at the outset of the pandemic.

¹ Kidney stones can develop in 1 or both kidneys and most often affect people aged 30 to 60. They are usually found in the kidneys or in the ureter and can be extremely painful, and may lead to kidney infections or the kidney not working properly if left untreated.

5.12 On 4th September 2020 Glenn contacted the Police to report that Rose – who he described as his ex-partner - had entered his property uninvited and removed property belonging to him. The incident was initially recorded as a burglary but was later reclassified as a dispute over property following the end of a relationship. No further action was taken.

5.13 On 5th November 2020 the second England Covid-19 lockdown began.

2021

5.14 On 6th January 2021 England entered the third Covid-19 lockdown. Restrictions began to be eased on a stepped basis between 8th March 2021 and 19th July 2021.

5.15 On 25th March 2021 Rose contacted the Police to report that after her 18 months long relationship with Glenn had ended he had made a list of all the things that he had purchased for her during the relationship and demanded his money back. The Police attended and advised Rose that this was a civil dispute and that no criminal offence was apparent. Rose was advised to seek legal advice.

5.16 On 7th April 2021 Rose again contacted the Police to report receiving unwanted contact from her ex-partner Glenn over several months. She stated that he had ‘frozen’ her bank account – which contained £700 - and told her that if she did not make regular payments of £100 by the end of the month, he would send people to her home to collect the money. Rose also stated that Glenn had informed her that he had access to her phone and social media accounts, but Rose said she did not believe this to be true. Rose further stated that Glenn was sending her images of messages he received from women but that she believed he was creating these messages himself and sending them to her to ‘wind her up’. When the Police attended, Rose asked them to log the incident and take no further action as she had contacted her bank who had released her funds.

5.17 On 28th April 2021 Rose contacted the Police to report further unwanted contact from Glenn who she said was demanding money he alleged she owed him, accompanied by threats in which Glenn stated that he would get his money ‘one way or another’. The investigating officer noted that this was the third in a series of unwanted contacts by Glenn and completed crime reports for offences of Stalking /Harassment and Blackmail. A DASH risk assessment was completed which identified a ‘standard’ risk although Rose did not consent to her information being shared as she did not feel that she needed further support at that time. The officer identified that Glenn was engaging in coercive and controlling behaviour which was also recorded as a crime. The officer documented that they checked for any previous reported incidents between Rose and Glenn and concluded that there were no grounds to support any heightened risk or threat assessment. Rose said that she had spoken with her solicitor who had sent a letter to Glenn advising him to cease contact with her. Rose did not provide a witness statement or support a prosecution. Glenn was not arrested or interviewed by the Police.

5.18 On 6th May 2021 Victim Support received a General Crime Referral from Lancashire Women on behalf of Rose for ‘stalking and harassment and malicious behaviour’. The dates of six incidents between 25th March and 29th April 2021 were documented but no further

details of the incidents were included. The referral documented 'mental health difficulties' as a risk factor for Rose - further details of which were also not provided. (The DHR has been advised that Rose had initially been referred into the Lancashire Women counselling service in relation to her 'mental/emotional health' in December 2020 and subsequently attended five counselling sessions between 26th April 2021 and 21st June 2021).

5.19 Victim Support rang Rose's mobile phone number the following day (7th May 2021) and received no reply. Expected practice is for three calls to be made to the person within 48 hours but Victim Support did not make a further call until 19th May 2021.

5.20 On 8th May 2021 the Police were contacted by an ex-partner of Glenn reporting that he had been harassing her. She said that they had a brief relationship in 2015 and lived together for two months before separating in August 2015. At that time Glenn left items at her house which he told her she could keep. However, in March 2016 Glenn made application to Burnley County Court for the recovery of a debt in relation to electrical items to the value of £904.84. This case had been dismissed by the court in July 2016 although Glenn continued to contact the ex-partner thereafter and was warned by an officer from Greater Manchester Police (GMP). The ex-partner went on to say that she had been contacted in March 2020 via a Facebook account she did not recognise to say that she had some mail at her old address, one piece of which was a County Court Judgement. She believed the person contacting her was Glenn. This had prompted her to check her credit history and she discovered that there was in fact a County Court Judgement claim against her from Glenn relating to the same electrical appliances. This case had been heard by St Helens County Court and dismissed. A Sergeant reviewed the case, and it was considered that the case did not meet threshold for criminal charges and Glenn's ex-partner was advised.

5.21 On 18th May 2021 Rose informed the Police that Glenn had created fake Facebook and Instagram accounts and posted photographs of her wearing her underwear online. Rose stated that the images had since been taken down, but she just wanted Glenn out of her life. Rose reiterated that her solicitor had previously sent Glenn a warning letter in relation to his previous demands for money he claimed to have spent on her during their relationship. When the police attended Rose asked them to tell Glenn to stop his behaviour towards her. She did not support a prosecution. The Police completed a crime report in respect of malicious communication.

5.22 On the same date the Police phoned Glenn to advise him, and he denied posting the images. He then separately contacted the Police to state that it was Rose who had set up a fake Facebook account which had led to him receiving nuisance calls for which he said Rose had apologised. He went on to say that his image had been posted on several gay dating websites which had led to unwanted approaches from males including males visiting his address. He said that 14 men had visited his address before the images were taken down. He suspected that Rose was responsible. Glenn went on to say that he and Rose had ended their relationship by mutual agreement three months earlier although they had since met again and gone out together before the relationship cooled again. He added that Rose had mental health problems and that he had suggested to her that she ought to take time to put her life back in order.

5.23 Glenn declined to support an investigation saying that he had only wished to 'counter the allegations made by Rose'. The Police then re-contacted Rose who denied creating fake accounts relating to Glenn, adding that she was more than happy to stay out of Glenn's life and would not contact him by any method. Glenn subsequently said that he was satisfied with this outcome. No further action was taken.

5.24 Also on 18th May 2021 Rose had a telephone consultation with her GP to review her pre-menstrual syndrome (PMT)². Rose said that she had not taken Citalopram³ since 28th February 2021 and felt that she was making really good progress and that her anxiety and moods had improved. She was receiving therapy from a private provider and preferred to continue with this rather than resume the medication. The GP agreed with this approach.

5.25 On 19th May 2021 Victim Support made a second call to Rose and explained that they were calling in response to the referral from Lancashire Women. Rose said that she was confused as she had so much going on with her ex-partner and said that she was unable to talk at that time. When Victim Support rang her again the following day Rose said that she was OK and feeling supported by the Police. She said that the National Centre for Domestic Violence (NCDV)⁴ were helping her apply for an 'emergency injunction' and she was waiting for them to call her back that day. It appears that the NCDV may have supported Rose to apply for a Non-Molestation Order⁵ which was heard by Burnley Family Court on 9th June 2021 but later withdrawn by Rose. She said that she had suffered harassment from Glenn since splitting up with him in February 2021. She said that not knowing 'what was next' was making her feel nervous and she had seen Glenn driving past her property yesterday. Victim Support advised Rose to keep a log of incidents. Rose said that she felt well supported and safe at the moment and that she would call Victim Support if she needed further support.

5.26 On 25th May 2021 Rose contacted the Police to report that the windscreen of her car had been smashed and her tyres slashed overnight. The Police established that an unknown male wearing a hood and dark clothing had been seen running away from the scene around 1.00am. Rose told the Police that she believed Glenn to be responsible but following an investigation the crime report was closed undetected.

5.27 On the same day Rose's elder child's school noted the child to be 'distraught' over the damage to Rose's car. The child (then aged 13) was said to be very protective of their mother. Pastoral support was offered.

² Pre-Menstrual syndrome (PMT) is the name for the symptoms women can experience in the weeks before their menstrual period. Most women have PMS at some point, but help is available if it affects your daily life (NHS Website 2023)

³ Citalopram is a type of anti-depressant medication known as a selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI). It is often used to treat low mood (depression) and sometimes for panic attacks. (NHS website 2023)

⁴ The NCDV state that they provide a free, fast emergency injunction service to survivors of domestic abuse and violence regardless of their financial circumstances, race, gender or sexual orientation.

⁵ A non-molestation order can protect victims of domestic abuse against behaviour that by itself may not be a criminal offence or in situations where the police have responded to a 999 call but then taken the view that there is insufficient evidence to charge the abuser with a criminal offence such as assault. If a non-molestation order is in place the police can arrest the abuser for the offence of breaching that order. A non-molestation order is usually granted for six to twelve months.

5.28 On 26th May 2021 Rose re-contacted Victim Support and said that she was feeling 'scared and vulnerable' after her car was damaged. She said that she had been expecting further contact from the Police the previous night but they had not called and so she felt that they didn't care. She added that the incident had distressed her elder child. She said that Glenn had copies of her passport and driving licence and so she had contacted Action Fraud and paid £25 for insurance protection for two years to protect herself from any fraud in which her personal details were used for loans and parking fines. She had contacted the DVLA to advise them that Glenn had a copy of her driving licence. She went on to say that her solicitor had obtained an emergency Non-Molestation Order which had been served the previous day. The Non-Molestation Order does not appear to have been heard until 9th June 2021. (The DHR has written to the Head of Family Law at Rose's Burnley Solicitors to seek information about their contact with Rose and been advised that they cannot assist the DHR as the duty of confidentiality is 'forever enduring'). Rose added that the Police had placed a vulnerable marker on her address – which Victim Support later confirmed with the Police. Victim Support discussed safety planning with her including installing CCTV at her home and putting a camera in her car and said that they would arrange for an independent domestic violence advisor (IDVA) to contact her. Rose also said that Glenn had posted photographs on Instagram on an 'X rated' profile. She said that she had reported this to Instagram six times. Victim Support signposted her to the 'report harmful content' website.

5.29 Later the same day (26th May 2021) Victim Support emailed a police officer in the Lancashire MASH (multi-agency safeguarding hub) to request information in respect of the victim and Glenn who Victim Support stated was subjecting the victim to 'extreme harassment'. Victim Support stated that they needed this information to understand the chronology of incidents and clarify 'escalation' and risk level. Later in the day the officer shared information about the 25th March and 7th April 2021 contacts when Glenn claimed money was owed, the 18th May 2021 contact in relation to the posting of images on Facebook and the 25th May 2021 criminal damage to car.

5.30 After reviewing the information provided by the Police, Victim Support allocated Rose's case to an IDVA on the grounds of numerous risk factors including victim fear, recent separation, escalation relating to stalking, criminal damage and the sharing of intimate images on social media. The IDVA was requested to complete the triage checklist, a MARAC referral and arrange for an initial assessment. The IDVA contacted Rose the following day and made an appointment to see her on 1st June 2021. Victim Support had created an individualised safety and support plan (ISSP) which was to be reviewed by the IDVA on that date. Victim Support also advised Lancashire Women – who had referred Rose to them - that Rose was receiving support from an IDVA.

5.31 On 28th May 2021 Rose contacted the Police to report that Glenn had telephoned the school which her elder child and Glenn's youngest child attended to report that Rose's elder child was going to 'beat up' Glenn's child. The school advised Rose of the allegation. After speaking to her elder child and checking the child's phone, Rose concluded that there was no evidence that her elder child had threatened Glenn's child and believed that Glenn had contacted the school to 'get at her'. Officers visited Rose and provided her with

safeguarding advice. A crime was recorded and closed – ‘no further action’. Rose advised the Police that she was seeking a Non-Molestation Order.

5.32 On 1st June 2021 the IDVA emailed the Police safeguarding team in the MASH to advise that she had completed a DASH risk assessment (score of 14) and would be referring the case to MARAC as the victim was at potential risk of serious harm from the perpetrator (The MARAC referral was submitted by the IDVA the following day). She asked whether the perpetrator had a history of violence. The IDVA also requested the Police to add the registration of Glenn’s car to the automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) system.

5.33 The Police safeguarding team initially advised the IDVA that they were unable to disclose this information requested as this would be shared at MARAC and asked the IDVA why the information was being requested. The IDVA replied that it was required for extensive safety planning which needed to be completed without waiting for information to be shared at the MARAC meeting which would not take place for several weeks (When Rose’s family read the final draft of this DHR report they commented that they did not think it was appropriate for the Police safeguarding team to initially decline the IDVA request for information).

5.34 The Police safeguarding team later (21st June 2021) shared detailed information with Victim Support relating to Rose’s contact with the Police in respect of Glenn including an incident in which Glenn had harassed a former partner by attempting to claim monies off her via the County Court process (presumed to relate to the 8th May 2021 report from an ex-partner other than Rose (Paragraph 5.19)) The Police safeguarding team also advised that Glenn’s vehicle registration had been added to the ANPR system and no obvious pattern of visiting the victim’s address had been found. Finally the team advised that PNC research had not disclosed any recent convictions which would increase risk levels.

5.35 The IDVA also sought information from a MASH social worker who advised of the history of children’s social care’s involvement with Glenn and his ex-wife’s children and a 2019 MARAC referral from a Bolton IDVA relating to Glenn’s ex-wife and mother of their children as she was documented to have experienced 17 years of domestic abuse, ‘blackmail and false allegations’. The contact details of the Bolton IDVA were provided.

5.36 On 2nd June Rose texted the IDVA to say that she needed her help and advice as she had received a letter from Burnley County Court advising her that Glenn had ‘made a claim’ against her for £4419. The following day the IDVA phoned Rose who was documented to sound emotional throughout the call, saying she feared what Glenn would do next. The IDVA advised her to report the matter to the Police and create a file of all the ‘fraud incidents’. Rose was also advised to inform the Police that she was working with the IDVA service and that her case was due to be heard at MARAC. There is no indication that Rose reported this incident to the Police although in her ‘Defendant’s Response’ to the civil money claim Glenn submitted to Burnley County Court, Rose stated that she had ‘logged’ the matter with the Police.

5.37 Burnley County Court has advised the DHR that Glenn had registered an online civil money claim against Rose on 28th May 2021. In his claim he stated that Rose owed him

£4214 in respect of money he had lent her over an 18 month period and which she had not repaid. When the claim fee of £205 was added the claim amounted to £4419.

5.38 The Court notified Rose that the claim had been issued and she was given 14 days to respond either by paying or disputing the claim. Rose disputed the claim in a 'Defendant's Response' which she submitted to the Court on 3rd June 2021. In this document she stated that she disputed the claim in its entirety on the grounds that all the money Glenn was claiming she owed was not loans but gifts for 'Christmas, birthdays and leisure'. She went on to state that the date of the first loan Glenn claimed to have made to her was dated 30th June 2019 when she stated that she did not know him. She said that the first payment he made to her was not until 8th August 2019 when he gave her money for taking Glenn's child on holiday with her and her children. She added that many of the amounts Glenn transferred to her were accompanied by the reference 'BABE' and she had looked back at her bank statements and found the figure of £4214 to be incorrect.

5.39 Rose then stated that she would like to add that she had an ongoing case of harassment, stalking, fraud and damage to her property 'regarding Glenn' which had resulted in several police logs being created since March 2021 and that she was receiving support from Victim Support. She added that Glenn was served Court papers in relation to a Non Molestation Order on 25th May 2021. She went on to state that Glenn had made two 'fraud claims' to her Bank Account 'along with threatening messages' – which had been logged with the Police. Rose concluded her 'Defendant's Response' by writing that the claim by Glenn was 'another malicious attack towards herself by Glenn' which she said had also been logged with the Police and Victim Support. (It appears that Rose may be mistaken in stating that she had reported the civil money claim to the Police). Rose stated that she was willing to try mediation. The 'Defendant's Response' form advised her that if she had asked for mediation then the claimant would also be asked if they wished to mediate.

5.40 The IDVA experienced difficulty in contacting Rose in the period prior to the MARAC meeting. Rose did not attend scheduled appointments on 8th and 21st June 2021. The IDVA documented that they were considering completing a stalking assessment and making a referral to Paladin – a stalking advocacy service - when the IDVA was able to speak with Rose again. The IDVA noted that there was no evidence of ongoing harassment from Glenn 'at the moment'.

5.41 In advance of MARAC, Rose's GP practice was asked to share information they held. It appears that the GP practice concluded that they held no relevant information but did not send any reply to MARAC.

5.42 On 2nd July 2021 Rose's case was heard at MARAC which was informed that Glenn had been harassing and stalking her and may have damaged her car following the ending of an 18 month relationship. MARAC members apparently felt that the case had not met the criteria for consideration by MARAC as it was not viewed as 'high risk'. The MARAC actions were for the officer in the case to contact Rose 'if needed' in relation to feedback from MARAC and for the possibility of Glenn's vehicle registration to be added to ANPR. (This appeared to have already been actioned) There is no indication that Rose's disclosure to her IDVA that Glenn had initiated a County Court claim against her for £4419 was shared with

the MARAC meeting although the minutes of the MARAC meeting shared with the DHR are very brief.

5.43 Following the MARAC meeting the IDVA texted Rose to arrange a further appointment for 6th July 2021. On that date Rose texted the IDVA to say that she no longer required support as she had had no further contact from Glenn and so she was happy to 'just move forward with my life now'. She went on to say that she felt that she had been pressured into seeking a Non-Molestation Order, adding that she had not felt pressured by the IDVA. She said the Non-Molestation Order would be 'dropped' at a Court hearing in August 2021. She ended by thanking the IDVA for her time and support. The IDVA texted a reply to advise that Rose could return for support at any time in the future and closed the case.

5.44 During July and August 2021 Rose had several contacts with her GP practice in which there was mention of hand eczema – which Rose's family have advised the DHR was a problem over the twelve months prior to her murder which the family felt was linked to her anxiety and depression.

5.45 Burnley County Court has advised the DHR that Glenn's civil money claim was heard at a Dispute Resolution Hearing (DRH) on 21st July 2021. On the day of the hearing Glenn forwarded an email purportedly from Rose to the Court in which she apparently took responsibility for repaying the claim at the rate of £250 per month. However, it has since been established that Rose's email address was shown as 'Gnail.com' as opposed to 'Gmail.com' and that in the email 'debt' was spelled 'dept' which the murder investigation found was how Glenn spells the word 'debt'. It seems likely that Glenn fabricated this email. However, the indications that the email from Rose may have been fabricated were not picked up on at that time and the County Court Judgement (CCJ) was made in Glenn's favour.

5.46 After being informed that the CCJ had been awarded against her, Rose emailed Burnley County Court on 10th August 2021 to inform them that she could not afford the monthly payment of £250 and asked if this could be reduced to £100 per month. Burnley County Court advised her that they could not accommodate her request by email and that she would need to make application to set aside or vary the CCJ. The Court did not receive any such application.

5.47 During January 2022 Rose texted the professional who had been providing her with talking therapy to say that she was 'taking a break' from therapy as she was 'doing great', her anxiety was at 'an all time low' and she had begun talking about her feelings with her partner and that they were 'doing really good'.

5.48 On 14th February 2022 Glenn instructed Debt Collection Agency A – a debt collection agency which is authorised to carry out the execution of CCJs – to obtain a High Court 'Writ of Control' on his behalf. The 'Writ of Control' enables Certificated Enforcement Agents to seek payment and/or remove goods to cover the balance of the debt remaining on the CCJ. Having obtained evidence of the CCJ, Debt Collection Agency A made application to the High Court for the 'Writ of Control' which was obtained on 16th February 2022. (The DHR has been advised by Lancashire Constabulary that the murder investigation established from

analysis of text messages that Rose and Glenn had previously resumed their relationship and that it ended on 14th February 2022).

5.49 On 18th February 2022 Debt Collection Agency A issued a Notice of Enforcement to Rose.

5.50 On 21st February 2022 Rose phoned Debt Collection Agency A to ask them what she could do about the debt and to query how Glenn had 'managed to progress matters so far'. She was advised that unless full payment was received by 3rd March 2022, Debt Collection Agency A would move to enforcement. Rose requested a payment plan which was declined. During the call Rose said that she and Glenn had earlier resumed their relationship after which he had told her that she didn't need to pay the CCJ. However, she said that she had then split up from him a week earlier which she said she assumed was the reason he had obtained the High Court 'Writ of Control'. The Debt Collection Agency A agent advised Rose to seek independent legal advice or obtain a Court Order to prevent enforcement action.

5.51 Burnley County Court has advised the DHR that during February 2022 Rose phoned them and they sent her an application to set aside the CCJ but that this was not completed and returned to them.

5.52 On 3rd March 2022 Rose phoned Debt Collection Agency A to check whether the CCJ had been paid in full as she believed that 'someone' had paid it on her behalf on 1st March 2022. Debt Collection Agency A confirmed that no payment had been received by them but requested her to send them evidence of the payment. Debt Collection Agency A have no record of the identity of the person Rose believed to have paid off the CCJ. However, the analysis of text messages subsequently conducted by Lancashire Constabulary as part of the murder investigation identified that it was Glenn who told Rose that he would pay the CCJ debt. Later the same day Rose sent a screen shot showing a scheduled payment leaving a third party account to Debt Collection Agency A. Debt Collection Agency A responded by advising that they needed proof of the payment leaving the third party account rather than merely being scheduled to leave. Debt Collection Agency A are unable to state the name on the third party account as this information is only held for 14 days. (It was Glenn's bank account) Still later in the day Rose phoned Debt Collection Agency A to advise that the third party had been to his Bank and was told that the Bank was unable to identify the Debt Collection Agency A account and so the funds had been placed on hold but would now be released. Debt Collection Agency A advised Rose that if the funds had not been released by 5pm that day then enforcement action would continue.

5.53 On 4th March 2022 Rose phoned Debt Collection Agency A to check whether the payment had been received. Debt Collection Agency A advised that no payment had been received and the case had been assigned to a High Court Enforcement Agent.

5.54 On 7th March 2022 Glenn phoned Debt Collection Agency A to check on the status of the case and was advised that it had been assigned to a High Court Enforcement Agent. He said that Rose had visited his property at the weekend and offered to pay £250 per month. Debt Collection Agency A advised him that they would normally expect the debt to be paid

in full unless the defendant provided evidence of inability to pay and had no assets to cover the balance.

5.55 On 8th March 2022 Rose emailed Debt Collection Agency A to advise that Glenn would be paying the balance in full on that day and attached a screen shot of a conversation with Glenn. Debt Collection Agency A confirmed that the telephone number on the screen shot was that of Glenn. She later phoned Debt Collection Agency A to check that Glenn had made the payment and stated that Glenn had told her that he would pay the balance, enforcement would stop and then she would have an informal agreement with him to repay the amount. On two occasions during the call Rose stated that she did not want to deal with Glenn. Debt Collection Agency A phoned Glenn to ask why he would tell Rose that he would pay the balance. He denied that he had told Rose that he would pay the balance and confirmed that enforcement action should continue, adding that Rose had purchased a £2000 bike recently.

5.56 On 9th March 2022 Rose phoned the High Court Enforcement Agent – who was due to visit her home – and stated that she could not afford the full amount but would like to set up a payment plan of £200 per month. The Agent attended her property later in the morning but was unable to gain access. The Agent sent an ‘attendance report’ to Glenn to advise that no access had been gained but that Rose had offered £200 per month. Rose later contacted the Agent and advised that Glenn had told her that if she ‘gets back with him’ she would not need to pay the debt. Glenn responded to the attendance report by declining the offer of £200 per month and provided details of Rose’s car registration and the best times to access Rose’s property. Glenn added that if the Agent applied more pressure Rose would pay in full. The DHR Panel asked Debt Collection Agency A whether agents are able to discuss any concerns they may have about the conduct of a claimant with a supervisor/manager. Debt Collection Agency A advised that all agents, both field based and office based, can seek guidance at any time. However, Debt Collection Agency A stated that they wished to stress ‘that the specifics of this case did not identify ‘anything outside the ordinary, nor did they give reason for concern and as such would not have required an escalation’.

5.57 On 14th March 2022 Rose phoned Debt Collection Agency A to ask why her payment plan had been refused when she had already made the first monthly payment of £200. She then said that she was having mental health issues and was ‘back on medication’. Debt Collection Agency A requested her to provide proof of this.

5.58 On 15th March 2022 Rose had a telephone consultation with her GP to report depressed mood and to request commencement on Citalopram again. She said she had previously been prescribed Citalopram but after feeling better her ex-partner had taken the tablets off her and stopped her ‘taking things’. She said that her relationship with her ex-partner had recently ended. She mentioned her car being damaged which she said her ex-partner was responsible for. The GP documented that the police were involved and that Rose was speaking to Victim Support fortnightly. She said that she was also seeing a private counsellor which was ‘really helping’. (The GP practice has no details of any private counsellor. It is assumed that Rose was referring to the talking therapy professional who she was no longer seeing – see Paragraph 5.49). She was documented not to feel anxious

although her mood was up and down. She said that she did not feel suicidal. She also said that she had just started work as a carer and lived with her two children and her mother. A review appointment was arranged in three weeks. (It seems possible that Rose's request for Citalopram may have been linked to the need to provide evidence to Debt Collection Agency A of medication relating to mental health issues).

5.59 On the same date (15th March 2022) Rose emailed Debt Collection Agency A with evidence of medication – which was stated to be 'hormone' medication in Debt Collection Agency A records. Debt Collection Agency A has advised the DHR that the medication was recorded as 'hormone' medication because Rose stated this in the email which accompanied a photograph of the GP prescription of citalopram.

5.60 On 21st March 2022 Glenn phoned Debt Collection Agency A to request an update on the case and was advised that a 'claim of vulnerability' had been made and therefore a hold had been placed on the case whilst 'awaiting proof'. Later the same day Debt Collection Agency A contacted Rose to state that the evidence of mental health she provided was deemed insufficient and that Glenn had instructed that enforcement should continue.

5.61 During emails to Debt Collection Agency A on 25th and 28th March 2022 Rose offered a payment plan of £300 per month which Glenn was informed of by Debt Collection Agency A and accepted.

5.62 The DHR has been advised by the murder investigation that no later than 4th April 2022 Glenn drafted messages on his phone which were purportedly from Rose to Glenn and from Rose to her children. These messages were used by Glenn to create the impression that Rose was still alive and using her phone to send texts after he had murdered her.

5.63 On 5th April 2022 Rose had a telephone consultation with her GP to review her mood and the effect of the Citalopram. She reported feeling much better, less anxious and experiencing no side effects from the medication. The GP planned to review Rose again in one month and the longer term plan was to begin to wean her off the medication after six months if things were stable.

5.64 In early April 2022 Glenn phoned Debt Collection Agency A to check the value of the payment received from Rose.

5.65 A few days later Rose made the first monthly payment of £300.

5.66 In mid-April 2022 Glenn phoned Debt Collection Agency A to ask when he would receive the first payment and was advised that he could expect to receive it in late April 2022.

5.68 On the date in April 2022 on which it is now known that Glenn murdered Rose, he contacted the Police to report that two people were kicking at his front door. The police attended and established that the people at Glenn's door were Rose's youngest sister and her partner who had visited Glenn's address as Rose had not been seen since leaving her home between 8 and 9am that morning and subsequently apparently sending text messages

to her children and their fathers to tell them that she was going away for two weeks to recover from adverse mental health. Rose's family doubted whether Rose had sent the messages as there were spelling mistakes in the messages which they did not think she would have made. An additional reason for Rose's youngest sister and her partner calling at Glenn's home was that they had seen Rose's car parked nearby. When spoken to by the Police Glenn said that he had returned home from work to find that Rose's car keys, house keys and a bank card had been posted through his letter box.

5.69 The Police recorded Rose as a missing person and initiated enquires. The following day Glenn was arrested on suspicion of kidnapping Rose and later arrested on suspicion of her murder. The body of Rose was subsequently discovered buried in remote moorland in a grave which Glenn had dug the day before he transported her to the site and murdered her by inflicting serious head injuries. Glenn was subsequently charged with the murder of Rose. The analysis of text messages shared by Lancashire Constabulary with the DHR indicates that Glenn lured Rose to his home address on the morning of the day on which he murdered her after discussing the possibility of his funding a period of in-patient treatment for her at a private mental health hospital although he also made mention of a property she needed to view which he implied he had made ready for her.

6.0 Perpetrator views

6.1 The perpetrator Glenn was invited to contribute to the DHR through a letter sent to him via his Prison Offender Manager. He promptly replied that he wished to contribute to the DHR. The independent author visited Glenn at the prison where he is serving the sentence imposed for the murder of Rose.

6.2 He began by advising the independent author that he had submitted an appeal against his conviction and sentence. The independent author was a little surprised to hear this as the DHR is usually advised when a perpetrator has submitted an appeal as it is then decided to delay obtaining the account of a perpetrator until any appeal against conviction has been concluded. Glenn was adamant that his legal representatives had submitted the paperwork relating to the appeal in January 2023 although when probed it appeared that Glenn may merely have had the intention of submitting an appeal which had not yet been actioned. This was later confirmed to be the case by Glenn's Prison Offender Manager who advised that although Glenn has repeatedly informed her of his intention to appeal his conviction on the grounds that Rose's death was accidental, he had yet to formally lodge an appeal. Given his stated intention to appeal his conviction, the Independent author asked Glenn if he wished to continue with the interview and he confirmed that he did.

6.3 At his trial the perpetrator changed his plea from 'not guilty' to 'guilty' in the face of overwhelming evidence collected by Lancashire Constabulary during their murder investigation. Despite this 'guilty plea', throughout his conversation with the independent

author he maintained that the death of Rose was 'accidental' and so no insights were gained which could contribute to the learning from this DHR.

6.4 The DHR Panel felt that there could be value in inviting Glenn's former wife and the mother of their three children to contribute to the DHR. A letter inviting Glenn's former wife to contribute to the DHR was delivered to her home address at the same time as a home visit was attempted. No reply was received at that time and no response has been received to the letter.

7.0 Analysis

7.1 In this section each of the terms of reference questions will be answered in turn.

To establish the circumstances surrounding the homicide.

7.2 The circumstances surrounding the homicide are set out in Section 5 of this report.

To establish whether organisations have appropriate policy and procedures to respond to the circumstances identified in this case and to recommend any changes as a result of the review process, with the aim of better safeguarding victims.

7.3 Glenn's economic abuse of Rose appears to have been instrumental in coercing her into resuming her relationship with him on several occasions during the period in which he manipulated the civil money claim process and instructed the High Court Bailiffs to recover the debt.

7.4 The Domestic Abuse Act 2021 statutory guidance states that economic abuse refers to behaviour that has a substantial adverse effect on an individual's ability to acquire, use or maintain money or other property, or to obtain good or services. This can include an individual's ability to acquire food or clothes, or access transportation or utilities. These behaviours can include an attempt to control through restriction, exploitation or sabotage (1).

7.5 In this case Glenn's economic abuse of Rose can be traced back to the point at which their relationship first came to an end around March 2021. Rose contacted the Police to report that Glenn had made a list of all the things that he had purchased for her during the relationship and demanded his money back (Paragraph 5.14). The Police advised Rose that

this was a civil dispute and that no criminal offence was apparent. Rose was advised to seek legal advice. Whilst it is not unusual for people who are ending an intimate relationship to divide up the possessions they accumulated together during the course of their relationship, Glenn appeared to be going a step further than this and demanding that the money he had allegedly spent on Rose be returned to him. However, it was not inappropriate for the Police to perceive the circumstances described by Rose to be a civil matter and advise her to seek legal advice. Indeed Glenn eventually made use of the civil debt recovery process in an effort to recover this money from Rose although at that time he portrayed this money as 'loans' which he had made to Rose over the course of their relationship.

7.6 Rose later contacted the Police to report that he had 'frozen' her bank account (Paragraph 5.15) but subsequently asked the Police to take no further action as she had contacted her bank and they had released whatever hold they had placed on her account. Rose's family have advised the DHR that Glenn twice managed to freeze Rose's bank account by ringing her bank to claim that she had sold him items which he had not received (Paragraph 4.18). Her family say that during these two periods in which her bank account was 'frozen' she suffered financial hardship and her youngest sister advised the DHR that she helped Rose set up a new bank account as an alternative.

7.7 The DHR has been advised by the murder investigation that Glenn twice reported what were documented to be 'purchase scams' to his bank which related to purchases he appears to have claimed he had made from Rose and in respect of which he claimed not to have received the goods. These two 'purchase scam' contacts with his bank took place in April 2020 and April 2021. The second of these dates correspond with Rose's report to the Police on 7th April 2021 (Paragraph 5.15). The murder investigation has advised the DHR that the first April 2020 'purchase scam' reported by Glenn was eventually ruled to be a 'buyer/seller dispute/civil matter' by his bank's fraud team and the second April 2021 'purchase scam' was suspected to be a 'false claim' and deemed to be a 'civil dispute'.

7.8 The DHR has contacted Rose's bank in an effort to better understand whether Glenn was able to effectively freeze Rose's bank account by falsely claiming a 'purchase scam' in which he claimed to have paid her for items she had not provided, but after a protracted process, the information provided by Rose's bank (Barclays) is very limited. Although Rose appears to have been able to fairly quickly resolve the issues arising from Glenn's attempt to 'freeze' her bank account, her family say that it caused her significant financial hardship for a period and may also have put her in fear of the extent to which he was able to exert a degree of control over her financial affairs.

7.9 When Rose made a third report to the Police in just over a month (Paragraph 5.16), the Police appropriately treated her disclosure that Glenn was continuing to demand money from her as a criminal as opposed to a civil matter and crime reports of stalking/harassment and blackmail were recorded. This was good practice by the Police. The DASH risk assessment disclosed a 'standard' risk which raises the question of whether the DASH gives sufficient prominence to economic abuse. There appears to be just one question included in the DASH i.e. 'Are there any financial issues? For example, are you dependent on (...) for money/have they recently lost their job/other financial issues'.

7.10 The College of Policing has developed the Domestic Abuse Risk Assessment (DARA) to support first responders to recognise patterns of coercive and controlling behaviour more easily and as early as possible (2). The equivalent DARA question in respect of economic abuse is 'How often does (...) deny you access to money or control what you can spend it on?'

7.11 Both the DASH and the DARA focus on financial dependence whereas in this case Glenn used the threat of a debt Rose purportedly owed Glenn for money he claimed to have spent on her during the course of their relationship to apply pressure to Rose after their relationship had ended. It is unclear whether Glenn was motivated primarily by vengeance, the desire to pressurise Rose into resuming their relationship or both.

7.12 Having initially responded appropriately to this third report of economic abuse by Rose, there is no indication that Glenn was arrested or interviewed by the Police although it is noted that Rose did not provide a witness statement or support a prosecution. There is no indication that an evidence-led prosecution was considered. However, Rose advised the Police that she had spoken to her solicitor who she said had written to Glenn to advise him to cease contact with her.

7.13 Professional focus on economic abuse shifted to other forms of coercion and control for a time until Rose informed her IDVA that Glenn had 'made a claim' for £4419 against her (Paragraph 5.36). This was the civil money claim which Glenn made to Burnley County Court which eventually resulted in a County Court Judgement (CCJ) in his favour. It seemed clear that this claim had upset Rose who was said to sound emotional throughout the phone call the IDVA made to her the following day. The IDVA advised Rose to report the matter to the Police and create a file of 'fraud incidents'. There is no indication that Rose reported this matter to the Police or that it was included in the information shared with the MARAC meeting at which Rose's case was discussed a month later.

7.14 The DHR is not in position to comment on the merits of Glenn's civil money claim against Rose other than to observe that Rose disputed it, stated that the claim dated from before she knew Glenn and appeared to include the £300 Glenn sent to Rose to contribute to the cost of the holiday in the summer of 2019 on which Rose took Glenn's youngest child.

7.15 However, the DHR is able to observe that the County Court Judgement appears to have been obtained by fabricating an email purportedly from Rose in which she accepted responsibility for repaying the amount (Paragraph 5.45).

7.16 It is concerning that Glenn was able to manipulate the process of making civil money claims to the County Court in order to place Rose in a position where she was formally in debt to him and that the debt was legally enforceable. The DHR notes that this was not the only time he had sought to use the County Court to enforce what he claimed to be a debt owed by a former partner (Paragraph 5.19).

7.17 The independent author has spoken to managers at Burnley County Court and it is clear that they deal with a very large number of civil money claims and there is a strong focus on managing the process with speed and efficiency. The County Court did not notice that the

apparently fabricated email from Rose accepting responsibility for the debt had misspellings (consistent with the way in which Glenn spelt words) and that Rose's email address had been changed from 'Gmail' to 'Gnail'. The National Cyber Security Centre provides advice on how to spot and report scam emails (3). The Centre begins their advice by observing that 'it used to be easier to spot scams' as 'they might contain bad spelling or grammar, come from an unusual email address, or feature imagery or design that feels off'. The Centre then goes on to note that scams are getting smarter and some even fool the experts before setting out advice on how to identify more sophisticated scam emails. Clearly Glenn's apparent email scam was not sophisticated and the fact that it purported to be from someone (Rose) who had recently vehemently stated in her 'Defendant's response' that she wished to contest the CCJ claim could have aroused suspicions that the email was not genuine and led to more careful scrutiny.

7.18 However, one might have expected Rose's disclosures of domestic abuse in her 'Defendant's response' to have been afforded greater weight in the process of deciding the civil money claim. After stating that what Glenn characterised as 'loans' were in fact 'gifts' and then going on to challenge the accuracy of the claim (Paragraph 5.38), Rose stated that there was an ongoing case of harassment, stalking, fraud and damage to her property 'regarding Glenn' which had resulted in several police logs created since March 2021 and that she was receiving support from Victim Support. She added that Glenn was served Court papers in relation to a Non Molestation Order and went on to state that Glenn had made two 'fraud claims' to her Bank Account 'along with threatening messages' – which had been logged with the Police. Rose concluded her 'Defendant's Response' by writing that the claim by Glenn was 'another malicious attack towards herself by Glenn' which she said had also been logged with the Police and Victim Support (Paragraph 5.39).

7.19 Rose's 'Defendant's response' included substantial disclosures of domestic abuse and linked these to the current civil debt recovery claim. She also stated that she had reported incidents to the Police. Had the County Court contacted the Police, they would have been able to verify the accuracy of Rose's disclosures – although Rose appears to have been mistaken in stating that the civil debt claim had been reported to the Police. As it was the disclosures of domestic abuse appear to have been completely over-ridden by the apparent scam email sent by Glenn.

7.20 It appears that in a high volume, largely transactional process, there may be a lack of capacity in the system to afford sufficient attention to disclosures of domestic abuse. However, had Glenn not apparently fabricated the email from Rose, there is the possibility that her disclosures of domestic abuse could have received greater attention if there had been a (Dispute Resolution) Hearing, or the parties had gone to mediation.

7.21 The award of the County Court Judgement gave Glenn considerable power over Rose. He did not take concrete steps to enforce the CCJ for a further seven months. It is not known why Glenn delayed enforcement action but it appears that the prospect of enforcing the CCJ award may have enabled him to coerce Rose into resuming her relationship with him – as Rose indicated in her contact with Debt Collection Agency A on 21st February 2022 (Paragraph 5.52) when she said that after she and Glenn had resumed their relationship, he had told her that she didn't need to pay the CCJ. However, she said that she had then split

up from him a week earlier which she said she assumed was the reason he had obtained the High Court 'Writ of Control'. Lancashire Constabulary's analysis of text messages between Glenn and Rose appear to confirm that this was the case.

7.22 On 16th February 2022 Glenn contacted Debt Collection Agency A to request that they obtain the 'Writ of Control' on his behalf which then enabled Certificated Enforcement Agents to seek payment and/or remove goods to cover the balance of the debt remaining on the CCJ. As the DHR has learned from the chronology helpfully shared with the review by Debt Collection Agency A, the grant of the "Writ of Control' allowed him to use the threat of enforcement action to recover the debt - through payment or seizure of goods - to exercise a high degree of control over Rose during the final two months of her life.

7.23 Rose's family have advised the DHR that she found the involvement of the bailiffs to be very stressful. They said that she was suffering with severe anxiety and her hands became flaky and sore as a result of constant anxiety and she began drinking more alcohol (Paragraph 4.22). Her family also described the steps which Rose took to try and prevent her assets being seized, including putting her car into her mother's name, parking her car at her mother's address and moving her elder child's mountain bike out of the family home (Paragraph 4.23).

7.24 Rose's family have also advised the DHR that Glenn told Rose that he was going to get the bailiffs 'paid off' and that this led to Rose resuming her relationship with him (Paragraph 4.24). It is clear from the Debt Collection Agency A chronology that Glenn was holding out the prospect of paying off the CCJ debt or accepting a payment plan whilst simultaneously encouraging Debt Collection Agency A to apply greater pressure on her and providing information to assist the Agents in enforcing the debt. Debt Collection Agency A became aware of Glenn's conduct to a degree in that Rose told a Debt Collection Agency A Agent that Glenn had told her that if she 'gets back with him' she would not need to pay the debt (Paragraph 5.59) and on one occasion a Debt Collection Agency A agent asked Glenn why he would tell Rose that he would pay the balance at the same time as he was seeking enforcement of the debt through Debt Collection Agency A (Paragraph 5.58). In response Glenn denied that he had told Rose that he would pay the balance.

7.25 The independent author had met with the Debt Collection Agency A's Compliance Manager and Legal Advisor, and they have advised that the CCJ was the foundation for the legal and enforcement steps they subsequently took. It was entirely appropriate for Debt Collection Agency A to assume that the CCJ was a legitimate response to a lawful debt. However, the reliance that Debt Collection Agency A appropriately placed on the propriety of the CCJ only reinforces the importance of the County Court having sufficiently robust systems in place to prevent a CCJ from being granted on dishonest grounds.

7.26 In the meeting with the Debt Collection Agency A staff, they expressed the view that Debt Collection Agency A Agents would not be able to pick up on Glenn's use of the debt recovery process to coerce and control Rose as a great deal of their debt recovery activity takes place in the context of intimate, familial and business relationships which have ended and that it is not unusual for acrimony to be present. However, as stated, Debt Collection Agency A became aware of Glenn's conduct to a degree in that Rose told a Debt Collection

Agency A Agent that Glenn had told her that if she 'gets back with him' she would not need to pay the debt (Paragraph 5.59) and on one occasion a Debt Collection Agency A agent asked Glenn why he would tell Rose that he would pay the balance when he was seeking enforcement of the debt through Debt Collection Agency A (Paragraph 5.58). Debt Collection Agency A was provided with an opportunity to comment on the DHR report and observed that

their business model is such that they do not have dedicated case managers, instead a contact centre which handles queries as they are received. As such it would be unreasonable to suggest that the coercion should have been identified, adding that in isolation the contacts with Rose and Glenn appear to be in line with a lot of cases that they see and that it is only when put together that there is an opportunity to identify something outside the norm.

7.27 The DHR Panel felt that Debt Collection Agency A agents should be equipped to be able to distinguish coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse from the type of disputes between former intimate partners they see on a very regular basis. The question of how best to achieve this should be informed by the methods by which High Court Enforcement Agents are regulated and trained. Debt Collection Agency A has advised the DHR that High Court Enforcement Agents are extensively trained in order to identify areas for concern, but the Agency notes that at no time during this case was physical contact made with Rose and therefore no opportunity to make an assessment of the situation, which may have identified a concern which would have been escalated to a manager for guidance.

7.28 The High Court Enforcement Officers Association – which represents and supports High Court Enforcement Officers (HCEOs) and acts as a voice for their profession - states that all Officers are fully trained, qualified and registered and are authorised by the Lord Chancellor to enforce High Court Writs. All the Association's members agree to adhere to the Association's Code of Best Practice (4). The Code of Best Practice includes a section on 'vulnerable situations' and states that HCEOs have a role in ensuring that the vulnerable and socially excluded are protected. The Code states that HCEOs must withdraw from premises if the only person present is or appears to be a child under the age of 16, or a vulnerable person. Although not exhaustive, HCEOs recognise the following groups as being potentially vulnerable and will act accordingly:

- the elderly;
- people with a disability;
- the seriously ill;
- the recently bereaved;
- single parent families;
- pregnant women;
- unemployed people; and,
- those who have obvious difficulty in understanding, speaking or reading English.

7.29 Victims of domestic abuse are not included in the list of potentially vulnerable groups.

7.30 The recently established Enforcement Conduct Board is the independent oversight body for the debt enforcement sector – including the enforcement agents and the firms in

which they operate - in England and Wales. The Board's mission is to ensure that everyone experiencing enforcement action is treated fairly and protected from poor practice. The Board was set up following The Centre for Social Justice report, 'Taking Control for Good' in 2021 (5) and after a collaboration between the civil enforcement industry and leading debt advice charities. Enforcement action is subject to regulations introduced by the Ministry of Justice in 2014 (6) but there had been no independent body responsible for supervising behaviour against these regulations and no independent oversight of the enforcement industry until the establishment of the Enforcement Conduct Board.

7.31 The rationale for the creation of the Enforcement Conduct Board (ECB) is a predicted increase in the numbers of people experiencing debt enforcement together with concerns that a minority of enforcement officers are not following the National Standards (the 2014 Ministry of Justice regulations) when it comes to collecting money from debtors. The ECB's early priorities are raising standards, improving accountability, complaint handling and protecting the vulnerable and achieving fairness.

7.32 The possibility of the debt recovery process being used by perpetrators of domestic abuse to coerce and control victims – and in this case apparently coerce an ex-partner into resuming her relationship with the perpetrator to facilitate her murder – does not appear to be on the radar of either the Enforcement Control Board or the High Court Enforcement Officers Association. However, the recent establishment of the ECB may provide an opportunity to make the case for training HCEOs in order to raise their awareness of domestic abuse, particularly coercion and control and support the civil debt recovery process to be less susceptible to manipulation by domestic homicide perpetrators such as Glenn.

7.33 Returning to the definition of economic abuse referred to earlier, the repayment plan of £300 per month Rose entered into just prior to her murder – and in respect of which she had made the first payment – had the potential to significantly impact on Rose's ability 'to obtain goods and services'. In one of the texts Rose sent to Glenn around this time she pointed out that she was on benefits and only working part time.

7.34 The Domestic Abuse Act 2021 statutory guidance also points out that economic abuse can also amount to an offence of controlling or coercive behaviour (7), i.e. that the perpetrator's behaviour had a serious effect on the victim by having a substantial adverse effect on the victim's usual day to day activities and the perpetrator knows, or ought to know, that it will have a serious effect on the victim.

7.35 Having received the Debt Collection Agency A chronology, it was possible for the DHR to document the perpetrator's exploitation of the lawful process by which civil debts are enforced to apply pressure on Rose to resume a relationship with him prior to the murder. However, the list of fifteen examples of economic abuse included in the Domestic Abuse Act 2021 statutory guidance only includes one example which is similar to the approach adopted by Glenn, namely 'coercing the victim into signing over property or assets' (8). This suggests that there is a need to widely disseminate the methods used by Glenn to use economic abuse to coerce and control Rose.

7.36 The fact that both the Police initially, and the Bank regarded indications of economic abuse as a 'civil matter' suggests that there is a general need for increased awareness of economic abuse. The DHR has been advised of the work of Surviving Economic Abuse, which is a UK charity dedicated to raising awareness of economic abuse and transforming responses to it. Their strategic priorities are Public understanding and behaviour change; Professional response and system change; Legal, regulatory and public policy change and Survivor partnerships, evidence and equality. Surviving Economic Abuse offers a range of training courses.

7.37 In their contribution to this DHR, Rose's family said that whilst they were aware that Glenn had abused Rose mentally, emotionally and economically, they did not think he was capable of physically hurting Rose, adding that they didn't think 'he had it in him' to be violent (Paragraph 4.25). A key area of learning from this DHR is that perpetrators who use economic abuse to control and coerce their partner or ex-partner are capable of killing their partner. It is vital that the potential seriousness of economic abuse is appreciated by professionals and that the risk that such a perpetrator could kill is recognised.

The Homicide Timeline

7.38 There are challenges in attempting to apply the eight stage homicide timeline (9) developed by Jane Monckton Smith to the relationship between Rose and Glenn as their relationship during the period in which Glenn began planning to murder Rose was visible only to Debt Collection Agency A – a service unfamiliar with indications of coercion and control. However, Stage 1 of the Homicide Timeline ('History of coercion and control') was in evidence at the time their relationship began – in that Glenn's prior intimate relationships had been characterised by physical violence, emotional abuse, controlling behaviour and harassment which did not result in convictions (Paragraph 5.3) and Glenn had also attempted to manipulate the civil debt recovery process to exercise control over a former partner (Paragraph 5.19). Whilst it may be an exaggeration to characterise the beginning of Rose and Glenn's relationship as a 'commitment whirlwind' (Stage 2), Rose's family have advised the DHR that Rose was impressed by Glenn's apparent generosity in contributing £300 to the cost of the holiday on which Rose took one of Glenn's children and this then played into his attempts to portray himself as a person of much greater wealth than was actually the case.

7.39 Turning to stage 4 – 'triggers', Monckton-Smith found the reasons given by men for killing their partners overwhelmingly revolved around withdrawal of commitment or separation (10). Glenn appears to have been able to re-establish control over Rose by dishonestly obtaining the County Court Judgement but when this did not prevent her from ending their relationship once again, Glenn appears to have moved decisively through Stage 5 ('Escalation') and Stage 6 ('a change of thinking') to Stage 7 ('Planning'). The eighth and final stage of the Timeline is the 'Homicide'.

To establish whether there are any lessons to be learned from the case about the way in which professionals and organisations worked together and carried out their duties and responsibilities.

The multi-agency response to Rose's reports of domestic abuse and referral to MARAC

7.40 Between 25th March and 2nd June 2021 Rose reported a number of domestic abuse incidents to agencies which ultimately led to a MARAC referral from Victim Support (IDVA service) on 1st June 2021 which was heard at MARAC on 2nd July 2021. The DHR has been advised that when Rose's case was discussed at MARAC she was not considered to be 'high risk' (Paragraph 5.42). Unfortunately the record of the MARAC meeting is insufficiently detailed to understand the rationale for this view. It seems that MARAC was not made aware of Glenn's application for a County Court Judgement against Rose which she had shared only with her IDVA. The grounds on which Victim Support decided to allocate Rose's case to an IDVA and make the MARAC referral appeared sound i.e. numerous risk factors including victim fear, recent separation, escalation relating to stalking, criminal damage and the sharing of intimate images on social media (Paragraph 5.30), although it is of interest that economic abuse does not appear to have been highlighted at that time.

Sharing or threatening to share indecent images

7.41 In addition to economic abuse, Rose also disclosed the posting of photographs of her wearing underwear online (Paragraph 5.21) and she also disclosed that Glenn had posted photographs on Instagram and on an X rated profile. Under Section 33 of the Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015 it is an offence to disclose private sexual photographs or films without the consent of an individual who appears in them and with intent to cause that individual distress. Under Section 69 of the Domestic Abuse Act 2021 a new offence has been created of threatening to disclose a private sexual photograph or film in which another individual appears intending to cause distress to that individual. Rose did not support a prosecution on either occasion, wanting Glenn to desist and for the images to be removed. She advised Victim Support that she had repeatedly reported the latter incident to Instagram and so Victim Support signposted her to the 'report harmful content' website.

Routine enquiry

7.42 Rose's GP missed an opportunity to make 'routine enquiry' about domestic abuse during Rose's 5th April 2022 telephone consultation with her GP (Paragraph 5.65) given the disclosures Rose had made about domestic abuse in her previous telephone consultation with her GP (Paragraph 5.61). The DHR has been advised that the IRIS (Identification and Referral to Improve Safety) Project is being implemented in GP practices in East Lancashire. Rose also attended a number of appointments with ELHT gynaecology during the period under review when opportunities to make 'routine enquiry' about domestic abuse were missed. The DHR has been advised that changes have since been implemented within the gynaecological services to embed routine enquiry around domestic abuse. Staff have undergone training and learning from previous DHR's which also highlighted lack of routine enquiry as a contributory factor has been shared.

To identify clearly what those lessons are, how they will be acted upon and what is expected to change as a result.

7.43 Lessons to be learnt and recommendations are addressed in Section 9 of this report.

To establish whether the concerns and responses by professionals and their organisations were appropriate both historically and, in the time, leading up to the homicide.

7.44 Rose made no further disclosures to partner agencies of domestic abuse by Glenn following the MARAC meeting in July 2021, with the exception of her GP consultation in March 2022 and during her dealings with Burnley County Court and Debt Collection Agency A.

All enquiries will commence from the point at which Rose's relationship with Glenn began until the date of the domestic homicide. However, any historical information or convictions of domestic abuse, outside of this timeframe should be included.

7.45 This is a question which is addressed through the 'process' by which the DHR was conducted.

To provide details of additional records concerning Domestic Violence and Medical Issues including Mental Health or Physical Injury or Disability that may have a relevant impact on the review.

Protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010

Sex

7.46 Domestic abuse research has found the difference between men and women's experiences of, and involvement in, domestic abuse to be stark, with men significantly more likely to be repeat perpetrators and men significantly more likely than women to use physical violence, threats and harassment (11). Around one in four women aged 16 to 74 had been a victim of domestic abuse in their lifetime, compared with around one in seven men (12). One in seven women in the UK has experienced economic abuse by a current or former partner (13).

Disability

7.47 It is submitted that Rose's mental health issues were not such that she would be considered to have a disability under the Equality Act as any mental impairment did not have a substantial and long-term effect on her ability to do normal daily activities. However, Glenn attempted to present Rose's 'mental health problems' and what he stated was her need 'to take time to put her life back in order' (Paragraph 5.21) as an issue which could have undermined her reports of domestic abuse to the Police. Additionally, Debt Collection Agency A may not have given sufficient weight to her mental health issues when she attempted to provide proof of this to them since Rose described and they documented the medication she had been prescribed as 'hormone' medication when she had, in fact, recently been prescribed Citalopram by her GP (Paragraphs 5.59 – 5.63). Glenn may also have claimed that Rose's mental health issues were substantial enough for him to offer to fund her admission to a specialist private mental health hospital as a means of causing her to doubt her judgment and be more inclined to follow his advice (Paragraph 5.70).

Pregnancy and maternity

7.48 Rose became pregnant on two occasions during her relationship with Glenn and decided to have terminations on both occasions. Little is known about the pregnancies and the factors which may have led Rose to choose termination. The Domestic Abuse Act 2021 guidance states that the association between intimate partner violence and repeat abortion indicates that there is sometimes a repetitive cycle of abuse and pregnancy. The Guidance goes on to observe that experience of intimate partner violence and loss of pregnancy can have further compounding impacts on the victim's emotional state and has been linked with negative mental health outcomes such as depression and suicidal ideation (14). However, pregnancy and termination provide opportunities for interaction with health professionals and may also provide opportunities for women to seek support, as well as for professionals to reach out to women who may be experiencing domestic abuse (15). In Rose's case gynaecological services missed opportunities to make 'routine enquiry' about domestic abuse (Paragraph 7.42).

How, if at all, did the prevailing Covid-19 regulations impact on the effectiveness or otherwise of agency intervention to manage the risks to the victim.

7.49 There is no indication that the Covid-19 pandemic had a significant impact on this case. Rose began to report domestic abuse concerns to the Police and other agencies from 25th March 2021, by which time the restrictions which accompanied the third and final England lockdown were beginning to be eased on a stepped basis (Paragraph 5.14). Rose's GP consultation on 15th March 2022 - during which she made a number of disclosures of domestic abuse – took place by telephone which had become the most common means of interacting with GP's during and following the pandemic. The GP may have been in a slightly stronger position to explore these sensitive issues if the consultation had been in-person.

Agencies will also identify good practice and how that enabled partners to work together in this case.

7.50 When Rose made a third report to the Police in just over a month, the Police appropriately treated her disclosure that Glenn was continuing to demand money from her as a criminal as opposed to a civil matter and crime reports of stalking/harassment and blackmail were recorded (Paragraph 5.16).

7.51 Lancashire Women recognised that series of incidents which Rose shared with them amounted to 'stalking, harassment and malicious behaviour' and referred her to Victim Support.

8.0 Conclusion

8.1 Rose was murdered by her ex-partner Glenn in April 2022 in what appears to have been a carefully planned and implemented homicide. When his relationship with Rose ended in March 2021 Glenn embarked on a period of intense harassment and stalking during which he claimed that Rose owed him money and made threats to Rose if this supposed debt was not repaid, posted intimate images of Rose on social media, stalked her and she also suspected him to be responsible for criminal damage to her car. He was subsequently able to manipulate the civil money claim process to dishonestly obtain a County Court Judgement against Rose which appears to have been a factor in Rose resuming her relationship with him. He only initiated enforcement action to recover the supposed debt through High Court Enforcement Agents when Rose again appears to have ended her relationship with him in February 2022. During the two month period between initiating this enforcement action and murdering Rose, Glenn cruelly deployed the threat of enforcement action whilst from time to time holding out the prospect of personally settling the supposed debt which had the effect of destabilising Rose's life and enabled Glenn to exert control over her including luring her to the remote woodland area where he murdered her.

8.2 There is much learning for a wide range of agencies arising from this DHR, in particular the impact of economic abuse as a tool of coercion and control and the possibility that a perpetrator of economic abuse may present a risk of homicide. Glenn presented himself to Rose as a person of much more substantial financial means than was actually the case and appears to have exploited her desire for greater financial security. It is very concerning that Glenn was able to manipulate both the civil money claim process and the High Court Enforcement of his dishonestly obtained County Court Judgement to exercise coercion and control over Rose and eventually murder her. There is a need to increase the resilience of the systems of civil money claims and debt enforcement to enable these systems to become more resistant to the type of manipulation seen in this case.

9.0 Lesson to be learnt and recommendations.

The recommendations are addressed to Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership but also need to be approved by Burnley Borough Council.

The seriousness of economic abuse

9.1 There are two crucial lessons for professionals to learn from this case. Firstly economic abuse can be a highly impactful means of coercion and control. Secondly, perpetrators who use economic abuse to control and coerce an intimate partner or ex-partner may kill their partner if they attempt to end the relationship.

9.2 When Rose's relationship with Glenn ended in March 2021 she reported that he made a list of all the things he had purchased for her during their relationship and demanded his money back, saying that he would get his money back 'one way or another'. Glenn applied pressure in other ways such as stalking, posting indecent images of her online and possibly damaging her vehicle. However, his primary means of applying pressure upon Rose was the use of economic abuse. He twice disrupted her access to her bank account by making what

appear to have been false claims that he had purchased items from Rose which he had not received and subsequently dishonestly obtained a County Court Judgement against her – a tactic which he had tried and failed to employ against another former partner. Rose obtained support from the Police, Lancashire Women, Victim Support/IDVA, a local solicitor and the NCDV and her case was heard at MARAC. However, there did not appear to be a professional consensus about the level of risk which Rose faced from Glenn. Rose subsequently appeared to disengage from support - or may have been persuaded or coerced into disengaging from support by Glenn, with whom she resumed her relationship. However, after she ended their relationship once more, Glenn employed High Court Enforcement Agents to enforce the County Court Judgement before murdering her.

9.3 Rose was a single parent of two children who lived in a rented property and derived her income from benefits and part time work as a carer. The economic abuse perpetrated by Glenn built in intensity until it had a devastating effect on her life. Rose's family have described how she transferred the ownership of her car to her mother, began parking her car at her mother's address and moved a mountain bike – which her family say she had 'scrimped and saved' to buy for one of her children – from her home. As his economic abuse of her intensified Rose's reported fears increased. Initially she told professionals that she simply wanted Glenn out of her life, but she subsequently disclosed that she was feeling 'scared and vulnerable' and began to 'fear what Glenn would do next'.

9.4 At his trial the perpetrator changed his plea from 'not guilty' to 'guilty' in the face of overwhelming evidence collected by Lancashire Constabulary during their murder investigation. Although he agreed to contribute to the DHR, he maintained that the death of Rose was 'accidental' and said he planned to appeal his conviction and sentence although he has not so far initiated an appeal. Therefore little insight has been gained into his motivation for murdering Rose. However, the application of Monckton-Smith's Homicide Timeline strongly suggests that the murder was overwhelmingly likely to have been a response to Rose's withdrawal of commitment to their relationship, following which he appears to have made deliberate plans to kill her whilst employing the High Court Enforcement Agents to recover the supposed debt which led to the County Court Judgement to maintain control over her.

9.5 It is therefore recommended that the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership disseminates the learning from this DHR and highlights economic abuse as a form of coercion and control, highlights the methods of economic abuse employed by Glenn, the impact of this on the victim Rose and strongly emphasises the point that economic abuse is a very serious form of domestic abuse and that the perpetrator of economic abuse may present a high risk of serious harm or homicide to the victim if the victim attempts to end the relationship.

Recommendation 1

That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership disseminates the learning from this DHR and highlights economic abuse as a form of coercion and control, highlights the methods of economic abuse employed by Glenn, the impact of this on the victim Rose and strongly emphasises the point that economic abuse is a very serious form of domestic abuse

and that the perpetrator of economic abuse may present a high risk of serious harm or homicide to the victim if the victim attempts to end the relationship.

Enhancing risk assessment tools to recognise economic abuse risks

9.6 The learning from this case suggests that neither the DASH risk assessment nor the DARA - which may replace the DASH - are sufficiently sensitive to economic abuse (Paragraphs 7.9 – 7.11). Both risk assessments include only one question on economic abuse which focusses on the denial of access to money or control over what the victim spends money on. It is submitted that this is an insufficiently comprehensive approach to assessing economic abuse. It is appreciated that changing the DASH or DARA to enhance the focus on economic abuse is not a straightforward task, but this does not mean it should not be attempted if there is a need to do it. It is therefore recommended that Pennine Community Safety Partnership gives consideration to how the DASH/DARA and/or the guidance to professionals when using these risk assessment tools could be enhanced to more fully assess the risks arising from economic abuse. There could also be value in highlighting the many forms that economic abuse may take and the links between economic abuse and coercion and control in guidance to professionals on when to consider making a MARAC referral on the grounds of professional judgement.

Recommendation 2

That Pennine Community Safety Partnership gives consideration to how the DASH/DARA and/or the guidance to professionals when using these risk assessment tools could be enhanced to more fully assess the risks arising from economic abuse used to control and coerce. There could also be value in highlighting the many forms that economic abuse may take and the links between economic abuse and coercion and control in guidance to professionals on when to consider making a MARAC referral on the grounds of professional judgement.

Recommendation 3

That Pennine Community Safety Partnership arranges for domestic abuse training to be reviewed to ensure that the training raises professional awareness across all partner agencies about economic abuse, the many forms it may take and the links between economic abuse and coercion and control.

Countering the ease with which the perpetrator manipulated the civil money claim process

9.7 It is of the utmost concern that Glenn was able to manipulate the civil money claim process and dishonestly obtain a County Court Judgement against Rose. It is accepted that the civil money claim process is a high volume process with an emphasis on speed and efficiency. However, for the civil money claim process to command public respect it should also be a fair process which protects vulnerable people from exploitation and intimidation. However, the civil money claim process failed on two counts in this case. Firstly Glenn's

scam email which purported to have been sent by Rose to the County Court to accept responsibility for the debt was not picked up.

9.8 The National Cyber Security Centre provides advice on how to spot and report scam emails (Paragraph 7.17). The Centre begins their advice by observing that ‘it used to be easier to spot scams’ as ‘they might contain bad spelling or grammar, come from an unusual email address, or feature imagery or design that feels off’. The Centre then goes on to note that scams are getting smarter and some even fool the experts before setting out advice on how to identify more sophisticated scam emails. Clearly Glenn’s apparent email scam was not sophisticated and the fact that it purported to be from someone (Rose) who had recently vehemently stated in her ‘Defendant’s response’ that she wished to contest the CCJ claim could have aroused suspicions that the email was not genuine and led to more careful scrutiny.

9.9 It is therefore recommended that Pennine Lancashire Community Safety partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the ease with which Glenn was able to dishonestly obtain a County Court Judgement by using a scam email and ask them to consider what steps they need to take to ensure that their staff are aware of the common signs that an email is not genuine.

Recommendation 4

That Pennine Lancashire Community Safety partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the ease with which Glenn was able to dishonestly obtain a County Court Judgement by using a scam email and ask them to consider what steps they need to take to ensure that their staff are aware of the common signs that an email is not genuine.

The weight given to disclosures of domestic abuse by defendants in civil money claims

9.10 Turning to the second weakness in the civil money claim process, Burnley County Court do not appear to have given sufficient weight to Rose’s ‘Defendant’s response’ which included substantial disclosures of domestic abuse which she linked to Glenn’s civil debt recovery claim. She also stated that she had reported incidents to the Police. Had the County Court contacted the Police, they would have been able to verify the accuracy of Rose’s disclosures – although Rose appears to have been mistaken in stating that the civil debt claim had been reported to the Police. As it was the disclosures of domestic abuse appear to have been completely over-ridden by the apparently scam email sent by Glenn.

9.11 It is therefore recommended that the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the contents of Rose’s ‘Defendant’s response’ and ask them if they are satisfied that disclosures of domestic abuse by Defendants in civil money claims are given sufficient weight and whether judicial and non-judicial staff involved in the civil money claim process have sufficient awareness of domestic abuse including economic abuse and coercion and control.

Recommendation 5

That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the contents of Rose's 'Defendant's response' and ask them if they are satisfied that disclosures of domestic abuse by Defendants in civil money claims are given sufficient weight and whether judicial and non-judicial staff involved in the civil money claim process have sufficient awareness of domestic abuse including economic abuse and coercion and control.

Equipping High Court Enforcement agents to recognise coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse

9.12 The award of the County Court Judgement gave Glenn considerable power over Rose. He did not take concrete steps to enforce the CCJ for a further seven months. It is not known why Glenn delayed enforcement action, but it appears that the prospect of enforcing the CCJ award may have enabled him to coerce Rose into resuming her relationship with him. When she apparently split up with him again in February 2022 Glenn contacted Debt Collection Agency A to request that they obtain a 'Writ of Control' on his behalf which then enabled Certificated Enforcement Agents to seek payment and/or remove goods to cover the balance of the debt remaining on the CCJ. The grant of the "Writ of Control' allowed him to use the threat of enforcement action to exercise a high degree of control over Rose during the final two months of her life.

9.13 Debt Collection Agency A have advised the DHR that they are understandably obliged to accept the authenticity of the CCJ at face value – which provides even greater emphasis on the need to ensure that the process of obtaining a CCJ is not susceptible to manipulation.

9.14 In their contribution to the DHR, Debt Collection Agency A expressed the view that their Agents would not be able to pick up on Glenn's use of the debt recovery process to coerce and control Rose as a great deal of their debt recovery activity takes place in the context of intimate, familial and business relationships which have ended and that it is not unusual for acrimony to be present. However, Debt Collection Agency A became aware of Glenn's conduct to a degree in that Rose told a Debt Collection Agency A Agent that Glenn had told her that if she 'gets back with him' she would not need to pay the debt and on another occasion a Debt Collection Agency A agent asked Glenn why he would tell Rose that he would pay the balance when he was seeking enforcement of the debt through Debt Collection Agency A.

9.15 The DHR Panel felt that Debt Collection Agency A agents should be equipped to be able to distinguish coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse from the disputes between former intimate partners they see on a very regular basis. Debt Collection Agency A has had the opportunity to comment on this DHR report and they take the view that given their business model, which does not include dedicated case managers, and the fact that no Agent spoke to Rose in person, it would have been very challenging for coercion and controlling behaviour to be identified. However, the DHR has established that neither the High Court Enforcement Officers Association – which represents and supports High Court Enforcement Officers (HCEOs) and acts as a voice for their profession nor the recently established Enforcement Conduct Board - which is the independent oversight body for the debt enforcement sector in England and Wales – including the enforcement agents and the

firms in which they operate – appear to be fully sighted on the possibility that a perpetrator of domestic abuse may seek to manipulate the debt enforcement process to coerce and control a partner or ex-partner.

9.16 It is therefore recommended that Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership write to both the Enforcement Conduct Board and the High Court Enforcement Officers Association and share the learning from this DHR about the manner in which Glenn manipulated the debt enforcement process to coerce and control and ultimately facilitate the murder of Rose. The two bodies should be requested to indicate what action they propose to take to enable the debt enforcement process to be better placed to pick up on indications that creditors such as Glenn are manipulating the system and to indicate what action they propose to take to enable High Court Enforcement Agents to distinguish coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse from the disputes between former intimate partners they see on a very regular basis. It is recommended that the Home Office are copied into any correspondence as they (the Home office) may take the view that they are better placed to engage with national bodies such as the Enforcement Conduct Board and the High Court Enforcement Officers Association on these matters.

Recommendation 6

That the Pennine Community Safety Partnership write to both the Enforcement Conduct Board and the High Court Enforcement Officers Association to share the learning from this DHR about the manner in which Glenn manipulated the debt enforcement process to coerce and control and ultimately facilitate the murder of Rose. The two bodies should be requested to indicate what action they propose to take to enable the debt enforcement process to be better placed to pick up on indications that creditors such as Glenn are manipulating the system and to indicate what action they propose to take to enable High Court Enforcement Agents to distinguish coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse from the disputes between former intimate partners they see on a very regular basis.

National dissemination of learning

9.17 The manner in which Glenn manipulated the processes for civil money claims and debt enforcement to coerce and control and ultimately facilitate the murder of Rose is learning which should be disseminated nationally. It is therefore recommended that the Pennine Community Safety Partnership write to the Home Office to request that they disseminate the learning from this DHR nationally.

Recommendation 7

That the Pennine Community Safety Partnership write to the Home Office to request that they disseminate the learning from this DHR in relations to the perpetrator's manipulation of the civil money and debt enforcement processes nationally.

Simplifying advice to vulnerable people who become enmeshed in the civil debt recovery process

9.18 Rose sought support from a range of agencies. However, at key points in the civil money claim process and the debt recovery process she was in urgent need of legal advice which could have helped her to take the steps necessary to legally challenge Glenn's use of the civil debt recovery scheme. There is a need to enhance and simplify the advice available to people who become enmeshed in the civil debt recovery and debt enforcement processes. HM Courts and Tribunal Service, the Enforcement Conduct Board and the High Court Enforcement Officers Association could all play a role in this work. However, Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership may wish to contact Surviving Economic Abuse in the first instance and suggest that enhancing and simplifying the advice available to victims of economic abuse who become enmeshed in the civil debt recovery and debt enforcement processes might be an issue they wish to take up.

Recommendation 8

That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership shares relevant learning from this DHR with Surviving Economic Abuse and suggests that enhancing and simplifying the advice available to victims of economic abuse who become enmeshed in the civil debt recovery and debt enforcement processes might be an issue they wish to take up.

Information held by Rose's solicitors

9.19 As stated in the previous paragraph, Rose would have benefitted greatly from legal advice during the period in which Glenn was successfully manipulating the civil debt recovery process to coerce and control her. In their contribution to the DHR, Rose's family state that Rose's solicitor told her that she could no longer continue to represent her after Glenn emailed the solicitor and threatened her (Paragraph 4.21).

It has not been possible to verify this information with the Burnley Solicitors concerned as the DHR was advised by the Head of Family Law at the Burnley Solicitors that they were unable to assist the DHR as their duty of confidentiality is 'forever enduring'. The DHR Panel was not satisfied with this response and after taking legal advice from Burnley Borough Council's legal advisor, it was established that on the death of a solicitor's client the right to confidentiality passes to the client's personal representative. Further correspondence with the Burnley Solicitors ascertained that they may be able to assist the DHR if the consent of Rose's next of kin is obtained but they would also need a copy of Rose's will or Grant of Probate to progress matters. Rose did not make a will and so the family plan to apply for Probate. When Probate has been granted to the family the independent author will re-contact the Burnley Solicitors.

The 'freezing' of bank accounts whilst reports of 'purchase scams' are investigated

9.20 The DHR has noted that Glenn twice may have managed to briefly 'freeze' Rose's bank account by reporting what were documented to be 'purchase scams' in which he claimed to have paid her for items she had not provided. Although Rose appears to have been able to fairly quickly resolve the issues arising from Glenn's attempt to 'freeze' her bank account, her family say that it caused her significant financial hardship for a period and may also have put her in fear of the extent to which he was able to exert control over her financial affairs. The DHR has not been able to fully establish the extent to which investigations of 'purchase

scams' limit customer's access to bank accounts whilst the matter is investigated by the relevant bank. However, the Financial Ombudsman Service advises that banks may block or freeze accounts to prevent money being removed as a result of fraud or a scam.

9.21 The DHR has been informed by the UK Finance's 2021 Financial Abuse Code (16) which aims to ensure that the financial services sector understands the needs of victim-survivors' of economic abuse and provides a sympathetic, positive response which helps individuals to regain control of their finances. The Code includes specific advice on how to respond to economic abuse involving coercive and controlling behaviour by providing support, sympathetically developing an understanding of the victim-survivor's financial circumstances, establishing the extent of the economic abuse and adopting a flexible approach.

9.22 This DHR identifies the possibility that the report of a 'purchase scam' may be used by a perpetrator of domestic abuse to manipulate and control their victim. It is therefore recommended that the Community Safety Partnership write to the registered office of Barclays Bank to draw their attention to the possibility that perpetrators of domestic abuse may use the process by which 'purchase scams' are investigated by Banks to achieve a temporary freeze or block on a victim of domestic abuse's bank account in order to coerce and control the victim and to ask Barclays Bank what action they take or propose to take to safeguard customers from this type of abuse.

Recommendation 9

That Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership write to the registered office of Barclays Bank to draw their attention to the possibility that perpetrators of domestic abuse may use the process by which 'purchase scams' are investigated by Banks to achieve a temporary freeze or block on the victim of domestic abuse's bank account in order to coerce and control the victim and to ask Barclays Bank what action they take or propose to take, to safeguard customers from this type of abuse.

Public information

9.23 In their contribution to the DHR, Rose's family said that there were two things that they had learned since Rose's murder which they wish they had known earlier. Firstly they were not aware that they could make a Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme (DVDS) application on Rose's behalf. Secondly they didn't report Rose missing to the Police immediately because they believed that it was necessary to wait for 24 – 48 hours before making a missing person report for an adult (Paragraph 4.26). Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership may wish to request Lancashire Constabulary to review the information available to the public on the DVDS scheme and on the reporting of missing persons to check whether this information needs to be revised in the light of the reflections by Rose's family.

9.24 Lancashire Constabulary's response to the above points made by Rose's family is as follows:

DVDS Scheme

Lancashire Constabulary has sought to raise public awareness through various media outlets of how to make a DVDS application following the murder of Rose. The Constabulary believes that this has been a contributory factor to a significant rise in DVDS applications which has necessitated the employment of additional staff. The Constabulary also point out that their website contains a link to the DVDS scheme which explains the purpose of the scheme and provides information on how to make a DVDS request and what happens after the request has been made.

Missing persons

Lancashire Constabulary has advised the DHR that it is a common misperception that a period of time should be allowed to elapse before a person can be reported missing. The Constabulary advise that this is not the case and state that advice on how members of the public can report someone as a missing person is available on their website. They add that members of the public contacting the Police to make a missing person report will always be advised of the course of action to follow.

References

- (1) Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1089015/Domestic_Abuse_Act_2021_Statutory_Guidance.pdf
- (2) Retrieved from <https://library.college.police.uk/docs/college-of-policing/Domestic-Abuse-Risk-Assessment-2022.pdf>
- (3) Retrieved from <https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/collection/phishing-scams/spot-scams>
- (4) Retrieved from https://www.hceoa.org.uk/images/content/pdf-docs/HCEOA_Best_Practice_2021.pdf
- (5) Retrieved from <https://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/CSJJ9052-Taking-Control-For-Good-INT-210720-WEB.pdf>
- (6) Retrieved from <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7d635aed915d269ba8a5a7/taking-control-of-goods-national-standards.pdf>
- (7) Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1089015/Domestic_Abuse_Act_2021_Statutory_Guidance.pdf
- (8) *ibid*

(9) Retrieved from <http://eprints.glos.ac.uk/6896/1/6896%20Monckton-Smith%20%282019%29%20Intimate%20Partner%20Femicide%20using%20Foucauldian.....pdf>

(10) *ibid*

(11) Retrieved from <https://www.welshwomensaid.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Who-Does-What-to-Whom.pdf>

(12) Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/62c6df068fa8f54e855dfe31/Domestic_Abuse_Act_2021_Statutory_Guidance.pdf

(13) Retrieved from <https://survivingeconomicabuse.org/what-is-economic-abuse/>

(14) Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1089015/Domestic_Abuse_Act_2021_Statutory_Guidance.pdf

(15) *ibid*

(16) Retrieved from https://www.ukfinance.org.uk/system/files/2022-12/Financial-Abuse-Code-2021_Updated_2022.pdf

Appendix A Single agency recommendations

East Lancashire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust

No recommendations.

Lancashire Children's Social Care

No recommendations

Lancashire Constabulary

No recommendations

Lancashire Victim Service

No recommendations – to be reviewed at the conclusion of the DHR

NHS Lancashire and South Cumbria Integrated Care Board

The Practice to ensure the recording, the storing and the responses to MARAC information requests should be clearly visible in the records and it should also be recorded what

information has or has not been shared with MARAC including any actions necessary (to support future DA enquiry).

The Practice to promote clinicians being more professionally curious when a patient discloses events to them which are occurring in their home life. Particularly in relation to disclosures of domestic abuse. Including the impact on the wider family and documentation of additional services accessed including those that may be accessed privately.

For the clinicians involved from the practice to consider sharing their "lived experience" regarding involvement with a domestic homicide and subsequent review.

Sharing the lessons learned from the DHR with the individual Practice and across the Lancashire and South Cumbria Primary Care Networks

College 1

No recommendations

Appendix B – Executive Summary

Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership

Domestic Homicide Review Executive Summary

Victim – Rose who was murdered in April 2022

Independent Author – David Mellor BA QPM

Report completed on 7th February 2024

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This is an executive summary of a Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) undertaken by Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership following the murder of Rose (a pseudonym).

1.2 Rose was murdered by her ex-partner Glenn (also a pseudonym) in April 2022. Their relationship began in July 2019 and appears to have continued for around eighteen months. When the relationship ended, Glenn embarked on a period of intense harassment and stalking of Rose between March and June 2021 during which he claimed that Rose owed him money and made threats to Rose if this supposed debt was not repaid, posted intimate images of her on social media, stalked her and she also suspected him to be responsible for criminal damage to her car. He also obtained a civil court order for the recovery of a what appears to be a fictitious debt of £4419 from Rose and used the lawful process for enforcing this debt as a means of coercing and controlling Rose which may have been a factor in her subsequently resuming her relationship with Glenn. The earlier intense period of harassment and stalking had resulted in a MARAC referral and IDVA support for a time following which Rose declined further support and made no further reports of domestic abuse in the ten month period between her case being heard at MARAC and her subsequent murder. Glenn murdered Rose after taking her to remote woodland and then burying her body in a grave he had dug the day before. After Rose's family reported her missing to the Police, Glenn was arrested on suspicion of kidnapping and murder. Following extensive police search activity, Rose's body was recovered. Glenn was charged and convicted of her murder and sentenced to life imprisonment with a minimum term of 32 years.

1.3 The DHR process began with an initial meeting of representatives of Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership on 15th June 2022 when the decision to hold a DHR was unanimously agreed. All agencies that potentially had contact with the victim and/or perpetrator prior to the murder were contacted and asked to confirm whether they had involvement with them. The agencies which confirmed contact with the victims and/or perpetrator and were asked to secure their files.

1.4 The following agencies provided Individual Management Reviews to inform the review:

East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
HCRG Care Group (0-19 service)
Lancashire Children's Social Care
Lancashire Constabulary
Lancashire Victim Services (Victim Support)
College 1
Lancashire and South Cumbria Integrated Care Board

The following agencies provided short reports or other written information to inform the review:

Burnley County Court
Debt collection agency A

1.5 The authors of each IMR were independent in that they had had no prior involvement in the case.

1.6 Rose’s mother and her two sisters contributed to the review. The perpetrator also contributed.

The DHR Panel Members

1.7 The DHR Panel consisted of:

Representative	Organisation
Head of Safenet Support Services.	Safenet (provider of support to victims of domestic abuse)
Designated Safeguarding Lead.	College 1
Community Safety Officer.	Community Safety Partnership - Burnley
Senior Operations Manager	Lancashire Victim Service (Victim Support/IDVA)
Review Officer.	Lancashire Constabulary
Community Safety Partnerships Manager.	Pennine Lancs. Community Safety Partnership
Named Nurse for Safeguarding Children.	Health Care Resourcing Group (HCRG) (0-19 services)
Senior Probation Officer.	Probation Service
Specialist Safeguarding Practitioner for Children and Adults.	Lancashire & South Cumbria Integrated Care Board (ICB)
Senior Manager Safeguarding, Inspection and Audit Service.	Lancashire Children’s Social Care
David Mellor	Independent Chair and Author
Safeguarding Children Nurse.	Health Care Resourcing Group (HCRG) (0-19 services)
Safeguarding Lead.	East Lancashire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust

1.8 DHR Panel members were independent of the line management of any staff involved in the case. The Panel met on five occasions; 13th January, 20th March, 23rd May, 25th September and 13th November 2023.

Author of the overview report

1.9 David Mellor was appointed as the independent author and chair of the DHR Panel established to oversee the review. David is a retired police chief officer who has eleven years' experience as an independent author of DHRs and other statutory reviews.

Statement of independence

1.10 The independent chair and author David Mellor was a police officer in Derbyshire Constabulary, Greater Manchester Police and Fife Constabulary between 1975 and 2005. He retired as a Deputy Chief Constable.

1.11 Since 2006 he has been an independent consultant. He was independent chair of Cheshire East Local Safeguarding Children Board (2009-2011), Stockport Local Safeguarding Children Board (2010-2016) and Stockport Safeguarding Adults Board (2011-2015). Since 2012 he has been an independent chair/author/lead reviewer of a number of Serious Case Reviews, Local Child Safeguarding Practice Reviews, Safeguarding Adults Reviews and Domestic Homicide Reviews.

1.12 He has no connection to services in Pennine Lancashire.

2.0 Terms of Reference

2.1 The terms of reference for the DHR are as follows:

1. To establish the circumstances surrounding the homicide.
2. To establish whether there are any lessons to be learned from the case about the way in which professionals and organisations worked together and carried out their duties and responsibilities.
3. To identify clearly what those lessons are, how they will be acted upon and what is expected to change as a result. Agencies will also identify good practice and how that enabled partners to work together in this case.
4. To establish whether the concerns and responses by professionals and their organisations were appropriate both historically and, in the time, leading up to the homicide.
5. To establish whether organisations have appropriate policy and procedures to respond to the circumstances identified in this case and to recommend any changes as a result of the review process, with the aim of better safeguarding victims.
6. All enquiries are to be restricted to a period of no more than 16 months prior to the date of the domestic homicide and until the review has concluded. However, any historical information or convictions of domestic abuse, outside of this timeframe should be included.

7. To provide details of additional records concerning Domestic Violence and Medical Issues including Mental Health or Physical Injury or Disability that may have a relevant impact on the review.
8. How, if at all, did the prevailing Covid-19 regulations impact on the effectiveness or otherwise of agency intervention to manage the risks to the victim.

3.0 Summary Chronology

Background information (Paragraph 3.1 to 3.3)

3.1 Rose was born in 1988 lived with her two children in a privately rented property in the Burnley Council area. Her family describe her as a spiritual person, who was always ready to help others and loved walking with her children and 'every other kid off the street' in 'the outdoors'. She had been employed for a number of years as a carer for a domiciliary care agency and later at a residential home for adults with high care needs. She was in generally good health.

3.2 The Police attended a number of incidents of domestic abuse between 2011 and 2013 which related primarily to verbal arguments involving Rose and her then partner when he had consumed alcohol. The Police arrested and charged this partner for an offence of battery of Rose although ultimately no further action was taken.

3.3 The perpetrator Glenn was born in 1971 and was therefore 17 years older than Rose. He was known to the Police as result of disclosures of domestic abuse from his former wife who is the mother of their three children. His former wife was referred to MARAC in 2010 and in 2019. The Police investigated two assaults disclosed by Glenn's former wife, but the cases were dismissed by the Court on one occasion and on the second occasion the Police were unable to proceed as a result of evidential difficulties. Glenn's other prior intimate relationships were also characterised by physical violence, emotional abuse, controlling behaviour and harassment which did not result in convictions. Glenn has three convictions and a caution for acquisitive crime, criminal damage and attempting to pervert the course of justice. One aspect of these prior non-violent offences was a tendency towards dishonesty and sometimes quite elaborate deceptions. He was a self-employed builder and handyman.

2019

3.4 In April 2019 the Police received information that Glenn was defrauding people out of large amounts of money. He is understood to have asked customers for cash 'up front' and begun the agreed work but often appears not to have completed it. The information received by the Police in April 2019 was treated as intelligence in the absence of any formal complaints which disclosed conduct which could be investigated as a crime.

3.5 Rose and Glenn's relationship began in July 2019. Rose's elder child and Glenn's youngest child were of a similar age and Rose took Glenn's youngest child away on a holiday with her children during the summer of 2019. Glenn did not accompany them but contributed £300 to the cost of the holiday when her family say that Rose was expecting

only £100. This act of apparent generosity was well received by Rose and her family feel that it was part of Glenn's attempt to present himself to Rose as a person of more substantial means than was actually the case. Their relationship began shortly thereafter. Rose and Glenn appear to have continued to live largely separately throughout their relationship.

3.6 On 23rd March 2020 the first England lockdown in response to the Covid-19 pandemic began. From 4th July 2020 Covid-19 restrictions began to be eased although local lockdowns were introduced from this date. However, partner agencies continued to operate according to the exceptional delivery models they had adopted at the outset of the pandemic. On 5th November 2020 the second England Covid-19 lockdown began and on 6th January 2021 England entered the third Covid-19 lockdown. Restrictions began to be eased on a stepped basis between 8th March 2021 and 19th July 2021.

3.7 On 25th March 2021 Rose contacted the Police to report that after her 18 months long relationship with Glenn had ended he had made a list of all the things that he had purchased for her during the relationship and demanded his money back. The Police attended and advised Rose that this was a civil dispute and that no criminal offence was apparent. Rose was advised to seek legal advice.

3.8 On 7th April 2021 Rose again contacted the Police to report receiving unwanted contact from her ex-partner Glenn over several months. She stated that he had 'frozen' her bank account – which contained £700 - and told her that if she did not make regular payments of £100 by the end of the month, he would send people to her home to collect the money. When the Police attended, Rose asked them to log the incident and take no further action as she had contacted her bank who had released her funds.

3.9 On 28th April 2021 Rose contacted the Police to report further unwanted contact from Glenn who she said was demanding money he alleged she owed him, accompanied by threats in which Glenn stated that he would get his money 'one way or another'. The investigating officer noted that this was the third in a series of unwanted contacts by Glenn and completed crime reports for offences of Stalking /Harassment and Blackmail. A DASH risk assessment was completed which identified a 'standard' risk although Rose did not consent to her information being shared as she did not feel that she needed further support at that time. The officer identified that Glenn was engaging in coercive and controlling behaviour which was also recorded as a crime. The officer documented that they checked for any previous reported incidents between Rose and Glenn and concluded that there were no grounds to support any heightened risk or threat assessment. Rose said that she had spoken with her solicitor who had sent a letter to Glenn advising him to cease contact with her. Rose did not provide a witness statement or support a prosecution. Glenn was not arrested or interviewed by the Police.

3.10 On 6th May 2021 Victim Support received a General Crime Referral from Lancashire Women on behalf of Rose for 'stalking and harassment and malicious behaviour'. The DHR has been advised that Rose had initially been referred into the Lancashire Women counselling service in relation to her 'mental/emotional health' in December 2020 and subsequently attended five counselling sessions between 26th April 2021 and 21st June 2021. Victim Support rang Rose's mobile phone number the following day (7th May 2021)

and received no reply. Expected practice is for three calls to be made to the person within 48 hours but Victim Support did not make a further call until 19th May 2021.

3.11 On 8th May 2021 the Police were contacted by an ex-partner of Glenn reporting that he had been harassing her. She said that they had a brief relationship in 2015 and lived together for two months before separating in August 2015. At that time Glenn left items at her house which he told her she could keep. However, in March 2016 Glenn made application to Burnley County Court for the recovery of a debt in relation to electrical items to the value of £904.84. This case had been dismissed by the court in July 2016 although Glenn continued to contact the ex-partner thereafter and was warned by the Police. an officer from Greater Manchester Police (GMP). The ex-partner went on to say that on checking her credit history she discovered a County Court Judgement claim against her from Glenn relating to the same electrical appliances. This case had been heard by St Helens County Court and dismissed. A Sergeant reviewed the case, and it was considered that the case did not meet threshold for criminal charges and Glenn's ex-partner was advised.

3.12 On 18th May 2021 Rose informed the Police that Glenn had created fake Facebook and Instagram accounts and posted photographs of her wearing her underwear online. Rose stated that the images had since been taken down, but she just wanted Glenn out of her life. When the police attended Rose asked them to tell Glenn to stop his behaviour towards her. She did not support a prosecution. The Police completed a crime report in respect of malicious communication. On the same date the Police phoned Glenn to advise him, and he denied posting the images. He then separately contacted the Police to state that it was Rose who had set up a fake Facebook account which had led to him receiving nuisance calls for which he said Rose had apologised. He added that Rose had mental health problems and that he had suggested to her that she ought to take time to put her life back in order. Glenn declined to support an investigation saying that he had only wished to 'counter the allegations made by Rose'. The Police then re-contacted Rose who denied creating fake accounts relating to Glenn, adding that she was more than happy to stay out of Glenn's life and would not contact him by any method. Glenn subsequently said that he was satisfied with this outcome. No further action was taken.

3.13 On 19th May 2021 Victim Support made a second call to Rose and explained that they were calling in response to the referral from Lancashire Women. Rose said that she was confused as she had so much going on with her ex-partner and said that she was unable to talk at that time. When Victim Support rang her again the following day Rose said that she was OK and feeling supported by the Police. She said that the National Centre for Domestic Violence (NCDV)⁶ were helping her apply for an 'emergency injunction' and she was waiting for them to call her back that day. It appears that the NCDV may have supported Rose to apply for a Non-Molestation Order⁷ which was heard by Burnley Family Court on 9th June

⁶ The NCDV state that they provide a free, fast emergency injunction service to survivors of domestic abuse and violence regardless of their financial circumstances, race, gender or sexual orientation.

⁷ A non-molestation order can protect victims of domestic abuse against behaviour that by itself may not be a criminal offence or in situations where the police have responded to a 999 call but then taken the view that there is insufficient evidence to charge the abuser with a criminal offence such as assault. If a non-molestation order is in place the police can arrest the abuser for the offence of breaching that order. A non-molestation order is usually granted for six to twelve months.

2021 but later withdrawn by Rose. She said that she had suffered harassment from Glenn since splitting up with him in February 2021. She said that not knowing 'what was next' was making her feel nervous and she had seen Glenn driving past her property yesterday. Victim Support advised Rose to keep a log of incidents. Rose said that she felt well supported and safe at the moment and that she would call Victim Support if she needed further support.

3.14 On 25th May 2021 Rose contacted the Police to report that the windscreen of her car had been smashed and her tyres slashed overnight. The Police established that an unknown male wearing a hood and dark clothing had been seen running away from the scene around 1.00am. Rose told the Police that she believed Glenn to be responsible but following an investigation the crime report was closed undetected. On the same day Rose's elder child's school noted the child to be 'distracted' over the damage to Rose's car. The child (then aged 13) was said to be very protective of their mother. Pastoral support was offered.

3.15 On 26th May 2021 Rose re-contacted Victim Support and said that she was feeling 'scared and vulnerable' after her car was damaged. She said that she had been expecting further contact from the Police the previous night but they had not called and so she felt that they didn't care. She added that the incident had distressed her eldest child. She said that Glenn had copies of her passport and driving licence and so she had contacted Action Fraud and paid £25 for insurance protection for two years to protect herself from any fraud in which her personal details were used for loans and parking fines. She had contacted the DVLA to advise them that Glenn had a copy of her driving licence. She went on to say that her solicitor had obtained an emergency Non-Molestation Order which had been served the previous day. The Non-Molestation Order does not appear to have been heard until 9th June 2021. (The DHR has written to the Head of Family Law at Rose's Burnley Solicitors to seek information about their contact with Rose and been advised that they cannot assist the DHR as the duty of confidentiality is 'forever enduring'). Rose added that the Police had placed a vulnerable marker on her address – which Victim Support later confirmed with the Police. Victim Support discussed safety planning with her including installing CCTV at her home and putting a camera in her car and said that they would arrange for an independent domestic violence advisor (IDVA) to contact her. Rose also said that Glenn had posted photographs on Instagram on an 'X rated' profile. She said that she had reported this to Instagram six times. Victim Support signposted her to the 'report harmful content' website.

3.16 Later the same day (26th May 2021) Victim Support emailed a police officer in the Lancashire MASH (multi-agency safeguarding hub) to request information in respect of the victim and Glenn who Victim Support stated was subjecting the victim to 'extreme harassment'. After reviewing the information provided by the Police, Victim Support allocated Rose's case to an IDVA on the grounds of numerous risk factors including victim fear, recent separation, escalation relating to stalking, criminal damage and the sharing of intimate images on social media. The IDVA was requested to complete the triage checklist, a MARAC referral and arrange for an initial assessment. The IDVA contacted Rose the following day and made an appointment to see her on 1st June 2021. Victim Support had created an individualised safety and support plan (ISSP) which was to be reviewed by the IDVA on that date. Victim Support also advised Lancashire Women – who had referred Rose to them - that Rose was receiving support from an IDVA.

3.17 On 28th May 2021 Rose contacted the Police to report that Glenn had telephoned the school which her eldest child and Glenn's youngest child attended to report that her eldest child was going to 'beat up' Glenn's child. After speaking to her eldest child and checking the child's phone, Rose concluded that there was no evidence that her eldest child had threatened Glenn's child and believed that Glenn had contacted the school to 'get at her'. Officers visited Rose and provided her with safeguarding advice. A crime was recorded and closed – 'no further action'.

3.18 On 1st June 2021 the IDVA emailed the Police safeguarding team in the MASH to advise that she had completed a DASH risk assessment (score of 14) and would be referring the case to MARAC as the victim was at potential risk of serious harm from the perpetrator (The MARAC referral was submitted by the IDVA the following day). She asked whether the perpetrator had a history of violence. The IDVA also requested the Police to add the registration of Glenn's car to the automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) system. The Police safeguarding team initially advised the IDVA that they were unable to disclose this information requested as this would be shared at MARAC and asked the IDVA why the information was being requested. The IDVA replied that it was required for extensive safety planning which needed to be completed without waiting for information to be shared at the MARAC meeting which would not take place for several weeks. The Police safeguarding team later (21st June 2021) shared detailed information with Victim Support relating to Rose's contact with the Police in respect of Glenn including an incident in which Glenn had harassed a former partner by attempting to claim monies off her via the County Court process.

3.19 On 2nd June Rose texted the IDVA to say that she needed her help and advice as she had received a letter from Burnley County Court advising her that Glenn had 'made a claim' against her for £4419. The following day the IDVA phoned Rose who was documented to sound emotional throughout the call, saying she feared what Glenn would do next. The IDVA advised her to report the matter to the Police and create a file of all the 'fraud incidents'. Rose was also advised to inform the Police that she was working with the IDVA service and that her case was due to be heard at MARAC. There is no indication that Rose reported this incident to the Police although in her 'Defendant's Response' to the civil money claim Glenn submitted to Burnley County Court, Rose stated that she had 'logged' the matter with the Police.

3.20 Burnley County Court has advised the DHR that Glenn had registered an online civil money claim against Rose on 28th May 2021. In his claim he stated that Rose owed him £4214 in respect of money he had lent her over an 18 month period and which she had not repaid. When the claim fee of £205 was added the claim amounted to £4419. The Court notified Rose that the claim had been issued and she was given 14 days to respond either by paying or disputing the claim. Rose disputed the claim in a 'Defendant's Response' which she submitted to the Court on 3rd June 2021. In this document she stated that she disputed the claim in its entirety on the grounds that all the money Glenn was claiming she owed was not loans but gifts for 'Christmas, birthdays and leisure'. She went on to state that the date of the first loan Glenn claimed to have made to her was dated 30th June 2019 when she stated that she did not know him. She said that the first payment he made to her was not until 8th August 2019 when he gave her money for taking Glenn's child on holiday with her

and her children. She added that all funds Glenn transferred to her were accompanied by the reference 'BABE' and she had looked back at her bank statements and found the figure of £4214 to be incorrect.

3.21 Rose then stated that she would like to add that she had an ongoing case of harassment, stalking, fraud and damage to her property 'regarding Glenn' which had resulted in several police logs being created since March 2021 and that she was receiving support from Victim Support. She added that Glenn was served Court papers in relation to a Non Molestation Order on 25th May 2021. She went on to state that Glenn had made two 'fraud claims' to her Bank Account 'along with threatening messages' – which had been logged with the Police. Rose concluded her 'Defendant's Response' by writing that the claim by Glenn was 'another malicious attack towards herself by Glenn' which she said had also been logged with the Police and Victim Support. (It appears that Rose may be mistaken in stating that she had reported the civil money claim to the Police). Rose stated that she was willing to try mediation. The 'Defendant's Response' form advised her that if she had asked for mediation then the claimant would also be asked if they wished to mediate.

3.22 The IDVA experienced difficulty in contacting Rose in the period prior to the MARAC meeting. Rose did not attend scheduled appointments on 8th and 21st June 2021. The IDVA documented that they were considering completing a stalking assessment and making a referral to Paladin – a stalking advocacy service - when the IDVA was able to speak with Rose again. The IDVA noted that there was no evidence of ongoing harassment from Glenn 'at the moment'.

3.23 On 2nd July 2021 Rose's case was heard at MARAC which was informed that Glenn had been harassing and stalking her and may have damaged her car following the ending of an 18 month relationship. MARAC members apparently felt that the case had not met the criteria for consideration by MARAC as it was not viewed as 'high risk'. The MARAC actions were for the officer in the case to contact Rose 'if needed' in relation to feedback from MARAC and for the possibility of Glenn's vehicle registration to be added to ANPR. (This appeared to have already been actioned) There is no indication that Rose's disclosure to her IDVA that Glenn had initiated a County Court claim against her for £4419 was shared with the MARAC meeting although the minutes of the MARAC meeting shared with the DHR are very brief.

3.24 Following the MARAC meeting the IDVA texted Rose to arrange a further appointment for 6th July 2021. On that date Rose texted the IDVA to say that she no longer required support as she had had no further contact from Glenn and so she was happy to 'just move forward with my life now'. She went on to say that she felt that she had been pressured into seeking a Non-Molestation Order, adding that she had not felt pressured by the IDVA. She said the Non-Molestation Order would be 'dropped' at a Court hearing in August 2021. She ended by thanking the IDVA for her time and support. The IDVA texted a reply to advise that Rose could return for support at any time in the future and closed the case.

3.25 During July and August 2021 Rose had several contacts with her GP practice during which there was mention of hand eczema – which Rose's family have advised the DHR was a

problem over the twelve months prior to her murder which the family felt was linked to her anxiety and depression.

3.26 Burnley County Court has advised the DHR that Glenn's civil money claim was heard at a Dispute Resolution Hearing (DRH) on 21st July 2021. On the day of the hearing Glenn forwarded an email purportedly from Rose to the Court in which she apparently took responsibility for repaying the claim at the rate of £250 per month. However, it has since been established that Rose's email address was shown as 'gnail.com' as opposed to 'gmail.com' and that in the email 'debt' was spelled 'dept' which the murder investigation found was how Glenn spells the word 'debt'. It seems likely that Glenn fabricated this email. However, the indications that the email from Rose may have been fabricated were not picked up on at that time and the County Court Judgement (CCJ) was made in Glenn's favour.

3.27 After being informed that the CCJ had been awarded against her, Rose emailed Burnley County Court on 10th August 2021 to inform them that she could not afford the monthly payment of £250 and asked if this could be reduced to £100 per month. Burnley County Court advised her that they could not accommodate her request by email and that she would need to make application to set aside or vary the CCJ. The Court did not receive any such application.

3.28 During January 2022 Rose texted the professional who had been providing her with talking therapy to say that she was 'taking a break' from therapy as she was 'doing great', her anxiety was at 'an all-time low' and she had begun talking about her feelings with her partner and that they were 'doing really good'.

3.29 On 14th February 2022 Glenn instructed Debt Collection Agency A – a debt collection agency which is authorised to carry out the execution of CCJs – to obtain a High Court 'Writ of Control' on his behalf. The 'Writ of Control' enables Certificated Enforcement Agents to seek payment and/or remove goods to cover the balance of the debt remaining on the CCJ. Having obtained evidence of the CCJ, Debt Collection Agency A made application to the High Court for the 'Writ of Control' which was obtained on 16th February 2022. (The DHR has been advised by Lancashire Constabulary that the murder investigation established from analysis of text messages that Rose and Glenn had previously resumed their relationship and that it ended on 14th February 2022).

3.30 On 18th February 2022 Debt Collection Agency A issued a Notice of Enforcement to Rose. On 21st February 2022 Rose phoned Debt Collection Agency A to ask them what she could do about the debt and to query how Glenn had 'managed to progress matters so far'. She was advised that unless full payment was received by 3rd March 2022, Debt Collection Agency A would move to enforcement. Rose requested a payment plan which was declined. During the call Rose said that she and Glenn had earlier resumed their relationship after which he had told her that she didn't need to pay the CCJ. However, she said that she had then split up from him a week earlier which she said she assumed was the reason he had obtained the High Court 'Writ of Control'. The Debt Collection Agency A agent advised Rose to seek independent legal advice or obtain a Court Order to prevent enforcement action.

3.31 Burnley County Court has advised the DHR that during February 2022 Rose phoned them and they sent her an application to set aside the CCJ but that this was not completed and returned to them.

3.32 On 3rd March 2022 Rose phoned Debt Collection Agency A to check whether the CCJ had been paid in full as she believed that 'someone' had paid it on her behalf on 1st March 2022. Debt Collection Agency A confirmed that no payment had been received by them but requested her to send them evidence of the payment. Debt Collection Agency A have no record of the identity of the person Rose believed to have paid off the CCJ. However, the analysis of text messages subsequently conducted by Lancashire Constabulary as part of the murder investigation identified that it was Glenn who told Rose that he would pay the CCJ debt. Later the same day Rose sent a screen shot showing a scheduled payment leaving a third party account to Debt Collection Agency A. Debt Collection Agency A responded by advising that they needed proof of the payment leaving the third party account rather than merely being scheduled to leave. Debt Collection Agency A are unable to state the name on the third party account as this information is only held for 14 days. (It was Glenn's bank account) Still later in the day Rose phoned Debt Collection Agency A to advise that the third party had been to his Bank and was told that the Bank was unable to identify the Debt Collection Agency A account and so the funds had been placed on hold but would now be released. Debt Collection Agency A advised Rose that if the funds had not been released by 5pm that day then enforcement action would continue.

3.33 On 4th March 2022 Rose phoned Debt Collection Agency A to check whether the payment had been received. Debt Collection Agency A advised that no payment had been received and the case had been assigned to a High Court Enforcement Agent.

3.34 On 7th March 2022 Glenn phoned Debt Collection Agency A to check on the status of the case and was advised that it had been assigned to a High Court Enforcement Agent. He said that Rose had visited his property at the weekend and offered to pay £250 per month. Debt Collection Agency A advised him that they would normally expect the debt to be paid in full unless the defendant provided evidence of inability to pay and had no assets to cover the balance.

3.35 On 8th March 2022 Rose emailed Debt Collection Agency A to advise that Glenn would be paying the balance in full on that day and attached a screen shot of a conversation with Glenn. Debt Collection Agency A confirmed that the telephone number on the screen shot was that of Glenn. She later phoned Debt Collection Agency A to check that Glenn had made the payment and stated that Glenn had told her that he would pay the balance, enforcement would stop and then she would have an informal agreement with him to repay the amount. On two occasions during the call Rose stated that she did not want to deal with Glenn. Debt Collection Agency A phoned Glenn to ask why he would tell Rose that he would pay the balance. He denied that he had told Rose that he would pay the balance and confirmed that enforcement action should continue, adding that Rose had purchased a £2000 bike recently.

3.36 On 9th March 2022 Rose phoned the High Court Enforcement Agent – who was due to visit her home – and stated that she could not afford the full amount but would like to set

up a payment plan of £200 per month. The Agent attended her property later in the morning but was unable to gain access. The Agent sent an 'attendance report' to Glenn to advise that no access had been gained but that Rose had offered £200 per month. Rose later contacted the Agent and advised that Glenn had told her that if she 'gets back with him' she would not need to pay the debt. Glenn responded to the attendance report by declining the offer of £200 per month and provided details of Rose's car registration and the best times to access Rose's property. Glenn added that if the Agent applied more pressure Rose would pay in full. The DHR Panel asked Debt Collection Agency A whether agents are able to discuss any concerns they may have about the conduct of a claimant with a supervisor/manager. Debt Collection Agency A advised that all agents, both field based, and office based, can seek guidance at any time. However, Debt Collection Agency A stated that they wished to stress 'that the specifics of this case did not identify 'anything outside the ordinary, nor did they give reason for concern and as such would not have required an escalation'.

3.37 On 14th March 2022 Rose phoned Debt Collection Agency A to ask why her payment plan had been refused when she had already made the first monthly payment of £200. She then said that she was having mental health issues and was 'back on medication'. Debt Collection Agency A requested her to provide proof of this.

3.38 On 15th March 2022 Rose had a telephone consultation with her GP to report depressed mood and to request commencement on Citalopram again. She said she had previously been prescribed Citalopram but after feeling better her ex-partner had taken the tablets off her and stopped her 'taking things'. She said that her relationship with her ex-partner had recently ended. She mentioned her car being damaged which she said her ex-partner was responsible for. The GP documented that the police were involved, and that Rose was speaking to Victim Support fortnightly. She said that she was also seeing a private counsellor which was 'really helping'. (The GP practice has no details of any private counsellor. It is assumed that Rose was referring to the talking therapy professional who she was no longer seeing – see Paragraph 5.49). She was documented not to feel anxious although her mood was up and down. She said that she did not feel suicidal. She also said that she had just started work as a carer and lived with her two children and her mother. A review appointment was arranged in three weeks. (It seems possible that Rose's request for Citalopram may have been linked to the need to provide evidence to Debt Collection Agency A of medication relating to mental health issues).

3.39 On the same date (15th March 2022) Rose emailed Debt Collection Agency A with evidence of medication – which was stated to be 'hormone' medication in Debt Collection Agency A records. Debt Collection Agency A has advised the DHR that the medication was recorded as 'hormone' medication because Rose stated this in the email which accompanied a photograph of the GP prescription of citalopram.

3.40 On 21st March 2022 Glenn phoned Debt Collection Agency A to request an update on the case and was advised that a 'claim of vulnerability' had been made and therefore a hold had been placed on the case whilst 'awaiting proof'. Later the same day Debt Collection Agency A contacted Rose to state that the evidence of mental health she provided was deemed insufficient and that Glenn had instructed that enforcement should continue.

3.41 During emails to Debt Collection Agency A on 25th and 28th March 2022 Rose offered a payment plan of £300 per month which Glenn was informed of by Debt Collection Agency A and accepted.

3.42 The DHR has been advised by the murder investigation that no later than 4th April 2022 Glenn drafted messages on his phone which were purportedly from Rose to Glenn and from Rose to her children. These messages were used by Glenn to create the impression that Rose was still alive and using her phone to send texts after he had murdered her.

3.43 On 5th April 2022 Rose had a telephone consultation with her GP to review her mood and the effect of the Citalopram. She reported feeling much better, less anxious and experiencing no side effects from the medication. The GP planned to review Rose again in one month and the longer term plan was to begin to wean her off the medication after six months if things were stable.

3.44 In early April 2022 Glenn phoned Debt Collection Agency A to check the value of the payment received from Rose. A few days later Rose made the first monthly payment of £300. In mid-April 2022 Glenn phoned Debt Collection Agency A to ask when he would receive the first payment and was advised that he could expect to receive it in late April 2022.

3.45 On the date in April 2022 on which it is now known that Glenn murdered Rose, he contacted the Police to report that two people were kicking at his front door. The police attended and established that the people at Glenn's door were Rose's youngest sister and her partner who had visited Glenn's address as Rose had not been seen since leaving her home between 8 and 9am that morning and subsequently apparently sending text messages to her children and their fathers to tell them that she was going away for two weeks to recover from adverse mental health. Rose's family doubted whether Rose had sent the messages as there were spelling mistakes in the messages which they did not think she would have made. An additional reason for Rose's youngest sister and her partner calling at Glenn's home was that they had seen Rose's car parked nearby. When spoken to by the Police Glenn said that he had returned home from work to find that Rose's car keys, house keys and a bank card had been posted through his letter box.

3.46 The Police recorded Rose as a missing person and initiated enquires. The following day Glenn was arrested on suspicion of kidnapping Rose and later arrested on suspicion of her murder. The body of Rose was subsequently discovered buried in remote moorland in a grave which Glenn had dug the day before he transported her to the site on 22nd April 2022 and murdered her by inflicting serious head injuries. Glenn was subsequently charged with the murder of Rose. The analysis of text messages shared by Lancashire Constabulary with the DHR indicates that Glenn lured Rose to his home address on the morning of 22nd April 2022 after discussing the possibility of his funding a period of in-patient treatment for her at a private mental health hospital although he also made mention of a property she needed to view which he implied he had made ready for her.

4.0 Key issues arising from the review.

The seriousness of economic abuse

4.1 There are two crucial lessons for professionals to learn from this case. Firstly economic abuse can be a highly impactful means of coercion and control. Secondly, perpetrators who use economic abuse to control and coerce an intimate partner or ex-partner may kill their partner if they attempt to end the relationship.

4.2 When Rose's relationship with Glenn ended in March 2021 she reported that he made a list of all the things he had purchased for her during their relationship and demanded his money back, saying that he would get his money back 'one way or another'. Glenn applied pressure in other ways such as stalking, posting indecent images of her online and possibly damaging her vehicle. However, his primary means of applying pressure upon Rose was the use of economic abuse. He twice disrupted her access to her bank account by making what appear to have been false claims that he had purchased items from Rose which he had not received and subsequently dishonestly obtained a County Court Judgement against her – a tactic which he had tried and failed to employ against another former partner. Rose obtained support from the Police, Lancashire Women, Victim Support/IDVA, a local solicitor and the NCDV and her case was heard at MARAC. However, there did not appear to be a professional consensus about the level of risk which Rose faced from Glenn. Rose subsequently appeared to disengage from support - or may have been persuaded or coerced into disengaging from support by Glenn, with whom she resumed her relationship. However, after she ended their relationship once more, Glenn employed High Court Enforcement Agents to enforce the County Court Judgement before murdering her.

4.3 Rose was a single parent of two children who lived in a rented property and derived her income from benefits and part time work as a carer. The economic abuse perpetrated by Glenn built in intensity until it had a devastating effect on her life. Rose's family have described how she transferred the ownership of her car to her mother, began parking her car at her mother's address and moved a mountain bike – which her family say she had 'scrimped and saved' to buy for one of her children – from her home. As his economic abuse of her intensified Rose's reported fears increased. Initially she told professionals that she simply wanted Glenn out of her life, but she subsequently disclosed that she was feeling 'scared and vulnerable' and began to 'fear what Glenn would do next'.

4.4 At his trial the perpetrator changed his plea from 'not guilty' to 'guilty' in the face of overwhelming evidence collected by Lancashire Constabulary during their murder investigation. Although he agreed to contribute to the DHR, he maintained that the death of Rose was 'accidental' and said he planned to appeal his conviction and sentence although he has not so far initiated an appeal. Therefore little insight has been gained into his motivation for murdering Rose. However, the application of Monckton-Smith's Homicide Timeline strongly suggests that the murder was overwhelmingly likely to have been a response to Rose's withdrawal of commitment to their relationship, following which he appears to have made deliberate plans to kill her whilst employing the High Court Enforcement Agents to recover the supposed debt which led to the County Court Judgement to maintain control over her.

4.5 It is therefore recommended that the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership disseminates the learning from this DHR and highlights economic abuse as a form of coercion and control, highlights the methods of economic abuse employed by Glenn, the impact of this on the victim Rose and strongly emphasises the point that economic abuse is a very serious form of domestic abuse and that the perpetrator of economic abuse may present a high risk of serious harm or homicide to the victim if the victim attempts to end the relationship.

Recommendation 1

That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership disseminates the learning from this DHR and highlights economic abuse as a form of coercion and control, highlights the methods of economic abuse employed by Glenn, the impact of this on the victim Rose and strongly emphasises the point that economic abuse is a very serious form of domestic abuse and that the perpetrator of economic abuse may present a high risk of serious harm or homicide to the victim if the victim attempts to end the relationship.

Enhancing risk assessment tools to recognise economic abuse risks.

4.6 The learning from this case suggests that neither the DASH risk assessment nor the DARA - which may replace the DASH - are sufficiently sensitive to economic abuse. Both risk assessments include only one question on economic abuse which focusses on the denial of access to money or control over what the victim spends money on. It is submitted that this is an insufficiently comprehensive approach to assessing economic abuse. It is appreciated that changing the DASH or DARA to enhance the focus on economic abuse is not a straightforward task, but this does not mean it should not be attempted if there is a need to do it. It is therefore recommended that Pennine Community Safety Partnership gives consideration to how the DASH/DARA and/or the guidance to professionals when using these risk assessment tools could be enhanced to more fully assess the risks arising from economic abuse. There could also be value in highlighting the many forms that economic abuse may take and the links between economic abuse and coercion and control in guidance to professionals on when to consider making a MARAC referral on the grounds of professional judgement.

Recommendation 2

That Pennine Community Safety Partnership gives consideration to how the DASH/DARA and/or the guidance to professionals when using these risk assessment tools could be enhanced to more fully assess the risks arising from economic abuse used to control and coerce. There could also be value in highlighting the many forms that economic abuse may take and the links between economic abuse and coercion and control in guidance to professionals on when to consider making a MARAC referral on the grounds of professional judgement.

Recommendation 3

That Pennine Community Safety Partnership arranges for domestic abuse training to be reviewed to ensure that the training raises professional awareness across all partner agencies about economic abuse, the many forms it may take and the links between economic abuse and coercion and control.

Countering the ease with which the perpetrator manipulated the civil money claim process.

4.7 It is of the utmost concern that Glenn was able to manipulate the civil money claim process and dishonestly obtain a County Court Judgement against Rose. It is accepted that the civil money claim process is a high volume process with an emphasis on speed and efficiency. However, for the civil money claim process to command public respect it should also be a fair process which protects vulnerable people from exploitation and intimidation. However, the civil money claim process failed on two counts in this case. Firstly Glenn's scam email which purported to have been sent by Rose to the County Court to accept responsibility for the debt was not picked up.

4.8 The National Cyber Security Centre provides advice on how to spot and report scam emails. The Centre begins their advice by observing that 'it used to be easier to spot scams' as 'they might contain bad spelling or grammar, come from an unusual email address, or feature imagery or design that feels off'. The Centre then goes on to note that scams are getting smarter and some even fool the experts before setting out advice on how to identify more sophisticated scam emails. Clearly Glenn's apparent email scam was not sophisticated and the fact that it purported to be from someone (Rose) who had recently vehemently stated in her 'Defendant's response' that she wished to contest the CCJ claim could have aroused suspicions that the email was not genuine and led to more careful scrutiny.

4.9 It is therefore recommended that Pennine Lancashire Community Safety partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the ease with which Glenn was able to dishonestly obtain a County Court Judgement by using a scam email and ask them to consider what steps they need to take to ensure that their staff are aware of the common signs that an email is not genuine.

Recommendation 4

That Pennine Lancashire Community Safety partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the ease with which Glenn was able to dishonestly obtain a County Court Judgement by using a scam email and ask them to consider what steps they need to take to ensure that their staff are aware of the common signs that an email is not genuine.

The weight given to disclosures of domestic abuse by defendants in civil money claims.

4.10 Turning to the second weakness in the civil money claim process, Burnley County Court do not appear to have given sufficient weight to Rose's 'Defendant's response' which included substantial disclosures of domestic abuse which she linked to Glenn's civil debt recovery claim. She also stated that she had reported incidents to the Police. Had the County Court contacted the Police, they would have been able to verify the accuracy of

Rose's disclosures – although Rose appears to have been mistaken in stating that the civil debt claim had been reported to the Police. As it was the disclosures of domestic abuse appear to have been completely over-ridden by the apparently scam email sent by Glenn.

4.11 It is therefore recommended that the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the contents of Rose's 'Defendant's response' and ask them if they are satisfied that disclosures of domestic abuse by Defendants in civil money claims are given sufficient weight and whether judicial and non-judicial staff involved in the civil money claim process have sufficient awareness of domestic abuse including economic abuse and coercion and control.

Recommendation 5

That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the contents of Rose's 'Defendant's response' and ask them if they are satisfied that disclosures of domestic abuse by Defendants in civil money claims are given sufficient weight and whether judicial and non-judicial staff involved in the civil money claim process have sufficient awareness of domestic abuse including economic abuse and coercion and control.

Equipping High Court Enforcement agents to recognise coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse.

4.12 The award of the County Court Judgement gave Glenn considerable power over Rose. He did not take concrete steps to enforce the CCJ for a further seven months. It is not known why Glenn delayed enforcement action, but it appears that the prospect of enforcing the CCJ award may have enabled him to coerce Rose into resuming her relationship with him. When she apparently split up with him again in February 2022 Glenn contacted Debt Collection Agency A to request that they obtain a 'Writ of Control' on his behalf which then enabled Certificated Enforcement Agents to seek payment and/or remove goods to cover the balance of the debt remaining on the CCJ. The grant of the "Writ of Control" allowed him to use the threat of enforcement action to exercise a high degree of control over Rose during the final two months of her life.

4.13 Debt Collection Agency A have advised the DHR that they are understandably obliged to accept the authenticity of the CCJ at face value – which provides even greater emphasis on the need to ensure that the process of obtaining a CCJ is not susceptible to manipulation.

4.14 In their contribution to the DHR, Debt Collection Agency A expressed the view that their Agents would not be able to pick up on Glenn's use of the debt recovery process to coerce and control Rose as a great deal of their debt recovery activity takes place in the context of intimate, familial and business relationships which have ended and that it is not unusual for acrimony to be present. However, Debt Collection Agency A became aware of Glenn's conduct to a degree in that Rose told a Debt Collection Agency A Agent that Glenn had told her that if she 'gets back with him' she would not need to pay the debt and on another occasion a Debt Collection Agency A agent asked Glenn why he would tell Rose that

he would pay the balance when he was seeking enforcement of the debt through Debt Collection Agency A.

4.15 The DHR Panel felt that Debt Collection Agency A agents should be equipped to be able to distinguish coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse from the disputes between former intimate partners they see on a very regular basis. Debt Collection Agency A has had the opportunity to comment on this DHR report and they take the view that given their business model, which does not include dedicated case managers, and the fact that no Agent spoke to Rose in person, it would have been very challenging for coercion and controlling behaviour to be identified. However, the DHR has established that neither the High Court Enforcement Officers Association – which represents and supports High Court Enforcement Officers (HCEOs) and acts as a voice for their profession nor the recently established Enforcement Conduct Board - which is the independent oversight body for the debt enforcement sector in England and Wales – including the enforcement agents and the firms in which they operate – appear to be fully sighted on the possibility that a perpetrator of domestic abuse may seek to manipulate the debt enforcement process to coerce and control a partner or ex-partner.

4.16 It is therefore recommended that Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership write to both the Enforcement Conduct Board and the High Court Enforcement Officers Association and share the learning from this DHR about the manner in which Glenn manipulated the debt enforcement process to coerce and control and ultimately facilitate the murder of Rose. The two bodies should be requested to indicate what action they propose to take to enable the debt enforcement process to be better placed to pick up on indications that creditors such as Glenn are manipulating the system and to indicate what action they propose to take to enable High Court Enforcement Agents to distinguish coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse from the disputes between former intimate partners they see on a very regular basis. It is recommended that the Home Office are copied into any correspondence as they (the Home office) may take the view that they are better placed to engage with national bodies such as the Enforcement Conduct Board and the High Court Enforcement Officers Association on these matters.

Recommendation 6

That the Pennine Community Safety Partnership write to both the Enforcement Conduct Board and the High Court Enforcement Officers Association to share the learning from this DHR about the manner in which Glenn manipulated the debt enforcement process to coerce and control and ultimately facilitate the murder of Rose. The two bodies should be requested to indicate what action they propose to take to enable the debt enforcement process to be better placed to pick up on indications that creditors such as Glenn are manipulating the system and to indicate what action they propose to take to enable High Court Enforcement Agents to distinguish coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse from the disputes between former intimate partners they see on a very regular basis.

National dissemination of learning

4.17 The manner in which Glenn manipulated the processes for civil money claims and debt enforcement to coerce and control and ultimately facilitate the murder of Rose is learning which should be disseminated nationally. It is therefore recommended that the Pennine Community Safety Partnership write to the Home Office to request that they disseminate the learning from this DHR nationally.

Recommendation 7

That the Pennine Community Safety Partnership write to the Home Office to request that they disseminate the learning from this DHR in relations to the perpetrator's manipulation of the civil money and debt enforcement processes nationally.

Simplifying advice to vulnerable people who become enmeshed in the civil debt recovery process.

4.18 Rose sought support from a range of agencies. However, at key points in the civil money claim process and the debt recovery process she was in urgent need of legal advice which could have helped her to take the steps necessary to legally challenge Glenn's use of the civil debt recovery scheme. There is a need to enhance and simplify the advice available to people who become enmeshed in the civil debt recovery and debt enforcement processes. HM Courts and Tribunal Service, the Enforcement Conduct Board and the High Court Enforcement Officers Association could all play a role in this work. However, Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership may wish to contact Surviving Economic Abuse in the first instance and suggest that enhancing and simplifying the advice available to victims of economic abuse who become enmeshed in the civil debt recovery and debt enforcement processes might be an issue they wish to take up.

Recommendation 8

That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership shares relevant learning from this DHR with Surviving Economic Abuse and suggests that enhancing and simplifying the advice available to victims of economic abuse who become enmeshed in the civil debt recovery and debt enforcement processes might be an issue they wish to take up.

Information held by Rose's solicitors.

4.19 As stated in the previous paragraph, Rose would have benefitted greatly from legal advice during the period in which Glenn was successfully manipulating the civil debt recovery process to coerce and control her. In their contribution to the DHR, Rose's family state that Rose's solicitor told her that she could no longer continue to represent her after Glenn emailed the solicitor and threatened her. It has not been possible verify this information with the Burnley Solicitors concerned as the DHR was advised by the Head of Family Law at the Burnley Solicitors that they were unable to assist the DHR as their duty of confidentiality is 'forever enduring'. The DHR Panel was not satisfied with this response and after taking legal advice from Burnley Borough Council's legal advisor, it was established that on the death of a solicitor's client the right to confidentiality passes to the client's personal representative. Further correspondence with the Burnley Solicitors ascertained

that they may be able to assist the DHR if the consent of Rose's next of kin is obtained but they would also need a copy of Rose's will or Grant of Probate to progress matters. Rose did not make a will and her family plan to apply for Probate. Once Probate has been granted, the independent author will re-contact the solicitors.

The 'freezing' of bank accounts whilst reports of 'purchase scams' are investigated.

4.20 The DHR has noted that Glenn twice may have managed to briefly 'freeze' Rose's bank account by reporting what were documented to be 'purchase scams' in which he claimed to have paid her for items she had not provided. Although Rose appears to have been able to fairly quickly resolve the issues arising from Glenn's attempt to 'freeze' her bank account, her family say that it caused her significant financial hardship for a period and may also have put her in fear of the extent to which he was able to exert control over her financial affairs. The DHR has not been able to fully establish the extent to which investigations of 'purchase scams' limit customer's access to bank accounts whilst the matter is investigated by the relevant bank. However, the Financial Ombudsman Service advises that banks may block or freeze accounts to prevent money being removed as a result of fraud or a scam.

4.21 The DHR has been informed by the UK Finance's 2021 Financial Abuse Code which aims to ensure that the financial services sector understands the needs of victim-survivors' of economic abuse and provides a sympathetic, positive response which helps individuals to regain control of their finances. The Code includes specific advice on how to respond to economic abuse involving coercive and controlling behaviour by providing support, sympathetically developing an understanding of the victim-survivor's financial circumstances, establishing the extent of the economic abuse and adopting a flexible approach.

4.22 This DHR identifies the possibility that the report of a 'purchase scam' may be used by a perpetrator of domestic abuse to manipulate and control their victim. It is therefore recommended that the Community Safety Partnership write to the registered office of Barclays Bank to draw their attention to the possibility that perpetrators of domestic abuse may use the process by which 'purchase scams' are investigated by Banks to achieve a temporary freeze or block on a victim of domestic abuse's bank account in order to coerce and control the victim and to ask Barclays Bank what action they take or propose to take to safeguard customers from this type of abuse.

Recommendation 9

That Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership write to the registered office of Barclays Bank to draw their attention to the possibility that perpetrators of domestic abuse may use the process by which 'purchase scams' are investigated by Banks to achieve a temporary freeze or block on the victim of domestic abuse's bank account in order to coerce and control the victim and to ask Barclays Bank what action they take or propose to take, to safeguard customers from this type of abuse.

Public information

4.23 In their contribution to the DHR, Rose's family said that there were two things that they had learned since Rose's murder which they wish they had known earlier. Firstly they were not aware that they could make a Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme (DVDS) application on Rose's behalf. Secondly they didn't report Rose missing to the Police immediately because they believed that it was necessary to wait for 24 – 48 hours before making a missing person report for an adult. Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership may wish to request Lancashire Constabulary to review the information available to the public on the DVDS scheme and on the reporting of missing persons to check whether this information needs to be revised in the light of the reflections by Rose's family.

Good practice

4.24 When Rose made a third report to the Police in just over a month, the Police appropriately treated her disclosure that Glenn was continuing to demand money from her as a criminal as opposed to a civil matter and crime reports of stalking/harassment and blackmail were recorded.

4.25 Lancashire Women recognised that series of incidents which Rose shared with them amounted to 'stalking, harassment and malicious behaviour' and referred her to Victim Support.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 Rose was murdered by her ex-partner Glenn in April 2022 in what appears to have been a carefully planned and implemented homicide. When his relationship with Rose ended in March 2021 Glenn embarked on a period of intense harassment and stalking during which he claimed that Rose owed him money and made threats to Rose if this supposed debt was not repaid, posted intimate images of Rose on social media, stalked her and she also suspected him to be responsible for criminal damage to her car. He was subsequently able to manipulate the civil money claim process to dishonestly obtain a County Court Judgement against Rose which appears to have been a factor in Rose resuming her relationship with him. He only initiated enforcement action to recover the supposed debt through High Court Enforcement Agents when Rose again appears to have ended her relationship with him in February 2022. During the two month period between initiating this enforcement action and murdering Rose, Glenn cruelly deployed the threat of enforcement action whilst from time to time holding out the prospect of personally settling the supposed debt which had the effect of destabilising Rose's life and enabled Glenn to exert control over her including luring her to the remote woodland area where he murdered her.

5.2 There is much learning for a wide range of agencies arising from this DHR, in particular the impact of economic abuse as a tool of coercion and control and the possibility that a perpetrator of economic abuse may present a risk of homicide. Glenn presented himself to Rose as a person of much more substantial financial means than was actually the case and appears to have exploited her desire for greater financial security. It is very concerning that Glenn was able to manipulate both the civil money claim process and the High Court Enforcement of his dishonestly obtained County Court Judgement to exercise coercion and control over Rose and eventually murder her. There is a need to increase the resilience of

the systems of civil money claims and debt enforcement to enable these systems to become more resistant to the type of manipulation seen in this case.

6.0 Lesson to be learnt and recommendations.

The seriousness of economic abuse

Recommendation 1

That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership disseminates the learning from this DHR and highlights economic abuse as a form of coercion and control, highlights the methods of economic abuse employed by Glenn, the impact of this on the victim Rose and strongly emphasises the point that economic abuse is a very serious form of domestic abuse and that the perpetrator of economic abuse may present a high risk of serious harm or homicide to the victim if the victim attempts to end the relationship.

Enhancing risk assessment tools to recognise economic abuse risks.

Recommendation 2

That Pennine Community Safety Partnership gives consideration to how the DASH/DARA and/or the guidance to professionals when using these risk assessment tools could be enhanced to more fully assess the risks arising from economic abuse used to control and coerce. There could also be value in highlighting the many forms that economic abuse may take and the links between economic abuse and coercion and control in guidance to professionals on when to consider making a MARAC referral on the grounds of professional judgement.

Recommendation 3

That Pennine Community Safety Partnership arranges for domestic abuse training to be reviewed to ensure that the training raises professional awareness across all partner agencies about economic abuse, the many forms it may take and the links between economic abuse and coercion and control.

Countering the ease with which the perpetrator manipulated the civil money claim process.

Recommendation 4

That Pennine Lancashire Community Safety partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the ease with which Glenn was able to dishonestly obtain a County Court Judgement by using a scam email and ask them to consider what steps they need to take to ensure that their staff are aware of the common signs that an email is not genuine.

The weight given to disclosures of domestic abuse by defendants in civil money claims.

Recommendation 5

That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the contents of Rose's 'Defendant's response' and ask them if they are satisfied that disclosures of domestic abuse by Defendants in civil money claims are given sufficient weight and whether judicial and non-judicial staff involved in the civil money claim process have sufficient awareness of domestic abuse including economic abuse and coercion and control.

Equipping High Court Enforcement agents to recognise coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse.

Recommendation 6

That the Pennine Community Safety Partnership write to both the Enforcement Conduct Board and the High Court Enforcement Officers Association to share the learning from this DHR about the manner in which Glenn manipulated the debt enforcement process to coerce and control and ultimately facilitate the murder of Rose. The two bodies should be requested to indicate what action they propose to take to enable the debt enforcement process to be better placed to pick up on indications that creditors such as Glenn are manipulating the system and to indicate what action they propose to take to enable High Court Enforcement Agents to distinguish coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse from the disputes between former intimate partners they see on a very regular basis.

National dissemination of learning

Recommendation 7

That the Pennine Community Safety Partnership write to the Home Office to request that they disseminate the learning from this DHR in relations to the perpetrator's manipulation of the civil money and debt enforcement processes nationally.

Simplifying advice to vulnerable people who become enmeshed in the civil debt recovery process.

Recommendation 8

That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership shares relevant learning from this DHR with Surviving Economic Abuse and suggests that enhancing and simplifying the advice available to victims of economic abuse who become enmeshed in the civil debt recovery and debt enforcement processes might be an issue they wish to take up.

Information held by Rose's solicitors.

The 'freezing' of bank accounts whilst reports of 'purchase scams' are investigated.

Recommendation 9

That Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership write to the registered office of Barclays Bank to draw their attention to the possibility that perpetrators of domestic abuse may use the process by which 'purchase scams' are investigated by Banks to achieve a temporary freeze or block on the victim of domestic abuse's bank account in order to coerce and control the victim and to ask Barclays Bank what action they take or propose to take, to safeguard customers from this type of abuse.

Public information

Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership may wish to request Lancashire Constabulary to review the information available to the public on the DVDS scheme and on the reporting of missing persons to check whether this information needs to be revised in the light of the reflections by Rose's family.

Lancashire Constabulary's response to the above points made by Rose's family is as follows:
DVDS Scheme

Lancashire Constabulary has sought to raise public awareness through various media outlets of how to make a DVDS application following the murder of Rose. The Constabulary believes that this has been a contributory factor to a significant rise in DVDS applications which has necessitated the employment of additional staff. The Constabulary also point out that their website contains a link to the DVDS scheme which explains the purpose of the scheme and provides information on how to make a DVDS request and what happens after the request has been made.

Missing persons

Lancashire Constabulary has advised the DHR that it is a common misperception that a period of time should be allowed to elapse before a person can be reported missing. The Constabulary advise that this is not the case and state that advice on how members of the public can report someone as a missing person is available on their website. They add that members of the public contacting the Police to make a missing person report will always be advised of the course of action to follow.

Appendix C – Multi Agency Recommendations

Title of DHR	Burnley DHR2							To be actioned	
Plan	Multi-agency Recommendations							Ongoing	
Independent author	David Mellor							Complete	
Governance arrangements	The Pennine Community Safety Partnership provides the governance arrangements for Domestic Homicide Reviews across the Pennine area. The board will oversee and ensure effective implementation of the recommendations within an appropriate timeframe.								
Recommendations	Lead Agency	Responsible Lead	Key Action/s	Evidence	Key outcomes	Over all RAG	Progress/O utcome achieved	Target date/ completion date	
1) <i>That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership disseminates the learning from this DHR and highlights economic abuse as a form of coercion and control, highlights the methods of economic abuse employed by Glenn, the impact of this on the victim Rose and strongly emphasises the point that economic abuse is a very serious form of domestic abuse and that the perpetrator of economic abuse may present a high risk of serious harm or homicide to the victim if the victim attempts to end the relationship.</i>	Burnley Borough Council/ Pennine CSP	Partnership Officer	Embedding this learning of economic abuse into training and sharing with partners to build an understanding of this form of coercion and control. Share learning with local domestic abuse commissioned services.	Pennine DHR learning and recommendations report to capture the learning from our local DHRs and key themes.	Raising awareness of economic control to control victims		Complete	29.01.2025	

<p>2) <i>That Pennine Community Safety Partnership gives consideration to how the DASH/DARA and/or the guidance to professionals when using these risk assessment tools could be enhanced to more fully assess the risks arising from economic abuse used to control and coerce. There could also be value in highlighting the many forms that economic abuse may take and the links between economic abuse and coercion and control in guidance to professionals on when to consider making a MARAC referral on the grounds of professional judgement.</i></p>	<p>Burnley Borough Council/ Pennine CSP</p>	<p>Partnership Officers</p>	<p>Promoting professional curiosity and understanding of economic abuse to front line practitioners completing the DASH/DARA model</p>	<p>Disseminate the Pennine DHR learning and recommendations report to frontline practitioners</p>	<p>To promote curiosity when completing the assessment and when to complete a MARRAC referral</p>		<p>Complete</p>	<p>29.01.2025</p>
<p>3) <i>That Pennine Lancashire Community Safety partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the ease with which Glenn was able to dishonestly obtain a County Court Judgement by using a scam email and ask them to consider what steps they need to take to ensure that their staff are aware of the common signs that an email is not genuine.</i></p>	<p>Burnley Borough Council/ Pennine CSP</p>	<p>Partnership Officer</p>	<p>Share this learning with the service to highlight the learning from the review</p>	<p>CSP written to service and shared specific learning.</p>	<p>Use learning to inform development of policy in recognising DA, and improve processes to reduce vulnerability of system to abuse from DA perpetrators.</p>		<p>Complete</p>	<p>29.01.2025</p>

<p>4) <i>That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership writes to HM Courts and Tribunal Service to advise them of the contents of Rose’s ‘Defendant’s response’ and ask them if they are satisfied that disclosures of domestic abuse by Defendants in civil money claims are given sufficient weight and whether judicial and non-judicial staff involved in the civil money claim process have sufficient awareness of domestic abuse including economic abuse and coercion and control.</i></p>	<p>Burnley Borough Council/ Pennine CSP</p>	<p>Partnership Officer</p>	<p>Share this learning with the service to highlight the learning from the review</p>	<p>CSP written to service and shared specific learning.</p>	<p>Use learning to inform development of policy in recognising DA, and improve processes to reduce vulnerability of system to abuse from DA perpetrators.</p>		<p>Complete</p>	<p>29.01.2025</p>
<p>5) <i>That the Pennine Community Safety Partnership write to both the Enforcement Conduct Board and the High Court Enforcement Officers Association to share the learning from this DHR about the manner in which Glenn manipulated the debt enforcement process to coerce and control and ultimately facilitate the murder of Rose. The two bodies should be requested to indicate what action they propose to take to enable the debt enforcement process to be better placed to pick up on indications that creditors such as Glenn are manipulating the system and to indicate what action they propose to take to enable High Court Enforcement Agents to distinguish coercive and controlling behaviour and economic abuse from the disputes between former intimate partners they see on a very regular basis.</i></p>	<p>Burnley Borough Council/ Pennine CSP</p>	<p>Partnership Officer</p>	<p>Share this learning with the service to highlight the learning from the review</p>	<p>CSP written to service and shared specific learning.</p>	<p>Use learning to inform development of policy in recognising DA, and improve processes to reduce vulnerability of system to abuse from DA perpetrators.</p>		<p>Complete</p>	<p>29.01.2025</p>

6) <i>That the Pennine Community Safety Partnership write to the Home Office to request that they disseminate the learning from this DHR in relations to the perpetrator's manipulation of the civil money and debt enforcement processes nationally.</i>	Burnley Borough Council/ Pennine CSP	Partnership Officer	Share this learning with the service to highlight the learning from the review	CSP written to service and shared specific learning.	Use learning to inform development of policy in recognising DA, and improve processes to reduce vulnerability of system to abuse from DA perpetrators.		Complete	29.01.2025
7) <i>That the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership shares relevant learning from this DHR with Surviving Economic Abuse and suggests that enhancing and simplifying the advice available to victims of economic abuse who become enmeshed in the civil debt recovery and debt enforcement processes might be an issue they wish to take up.</i>	Burnley Borough Council/ Pennine CSP	Partnership Officer	Share the final report with Surviving Economic Abuse and this recommendation	Final report	Sharing the learning from this DHR and the methods of economic control using the civil debt recovery		Report shared on publication	30.05.2025
8) <i>That Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership write to the registered office of Barclays Bank to draw their attention to the possibility that perpetrators of domestic abuse may use the process by which 'purchase scams' are investigated by Banks to achieve a temporary freeze or block on the victim of domestic abuse's bank account in order to coerce and control the victim and to ask Barclays Bank what action they take or propose to take, to safeguard customers from this type of abuse.</i>	Burnley Borough Council/ Pennine CSP	Partnership Officer	Share this learning with the service to highlight the learning from the review	CSP written to service and shared specific learning.	Use learning to inform development of policy in recognising DA, and improve processes to reduce vulnerability of system to abuse from DA perpetrators.		Complete	29.01.2025

Appendix D – Response from the Home Office



Interpersonal Abuse Unit
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Tel: 020 7035 4848
www.homeoffice.gov.uk

Richard Brown
Community Safety Officer
Bumley Council, Town Hall
Manchester Road
Bumley
Lancashire
BB11 9SA

1st May 2025

Dear Richard,

Thank you for resubmitting the report (Rose) for Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was reassessed in March 2025.

The QA Panel noted that Rose's family's contribution was powerful and helps the reader to understand what Rose was like as a person, as well as her experiences of abuse. There are also sincere condolences expressed to Rose's family and friends.

There was good specialist domestic abuse representation on the panel, as well as a good analysis of economic abuse and the use of debt collection as a means for this and for coercing Rose back into the relationship. This analysis is sensitive, and effort is made to understand the impact this had on Rose, with important lessons drawn out. Appropriate and relevant recommendations are made that will help to hold key organisations accountable in relation to their awareness of economic abuse and coercive and controlling behaviour.

The QA Panel noted that most of the issues raised in the previous feedback letter following the first submission have now been addressed. The view of the Home Office is that the DHR may now 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 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 Panel feedback letter 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 Panel, I would like to thank you, the report chair and author, and other colleagues for the considerable work that you have put into this review.

Yours sincerely,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel