Home Office

Interpersonal Abuse Unit
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

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

Mahdiyyah Khalifa
Population Health Policy Project Assistant
Public Health
Coventry City Council
One Friargate
Coventry
CV1 2GN

21st July 2026

Dear Mahdiyyah,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Aaliyah) for Coventry Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Board. The report was considered at the QA Board meeting on 24th June 2026. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Board

DHR QA Board Feedback for the Community Safety Partnership

TITLE OF DHR	Aaliyah
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP	Coventry
DATE REVIEWED BY QA BOARD	24th June 2026
DECISION	Publish with amendments
GOOD PRACTICE COMMENDED	• Positive consideration has been given to 'honour'-based abuse, cultural competence, professional curiosity, bias, assumptions and the use of language throughout the review. • The involvement of Aaliyah's brother, supported by AAFDA, is a particular strength and demonstrates good practice in ensuring the family's voice is heard and reflected throughout the review process. • The review remains robust despite the challenges associated with securing engagement from some statutory agencies. • The analysis is thoughtful, well developed and clearly linked to the key issues arising from the case. • The inclusion of Panaghar as specialist support to the panel is particularly welcome and demonstrates recognition of the importance of cultural expertise within this review.
FEEDBACK FOR FUTURE DHRs	• For future reviews, consideration should be given to strengthening the distinction between evidence, professional analysis and panel interpretation. • Where a family pen portrait has been provided, it should be included within the report. • Please avoid using terms such as "abusive relationship", as this language does not identify who is perpetrating the abuse and against whom. Wherever possible, the report should use language that clearly attributes responsibility, thereby maintaining perpetrator accountability and a victim-centred narrative.

	DHR SECTION	**DHR QA BOARD FEEDBACK (improvements required before publication)**
1	Title Page	Please add the month and year of submission to the executive summary. Completed
2	Contents Page	No amendments required.
3	Pen Portrait	There is a reference at section 4.1 to Aaliyah's youngest sister having written a contribution that is stated to appear at the beginning of the report; however, this could not be located in the Overview Report. Please ensure that this contribution is included, as it would provide an important family perspective and help strengthen the victim-centred focus of the review.

4	Condolences	No amendments required.
5	Confidentiality and Anonymity	Please consider amending the wording “victim of the homicide subject to this review”. The introduction states that it has not been possible to establish a cause of death. Referring to Aaliyah as a “victim of the homicide” appears inconsistent with this position and may unintentionally predetermine the circumstances of her death.
6	Terms of Reference	• Given the overseas context and Aaliyah travelling to Pakistan prior to her death, the panel may wish to reflect on whether transnational safeguarding considerations and overseas risk were sufficiently captured within the agreed lines of enquiry and, if so, how these have been explored within the review. • Please indicate if Aaliyah’s brother/wider family contributed to the development of the terms of reference.
7	Equality and Diversity	• This section identifies the relevant characteristics and themes; however, it would benefit from a clearer explanation of the evidence base underpinning the analysis. • Given the later findings and conclusions, please review some of the language used to ensure neutrality and avoid unintended cultural generalisations, for example “outgoing British girl”, and “patriarchal, uneducated first cousin”. Where such terms are used, the report should clearly explain their relevance and evidential basis. • The report should also set out more explicitly how conclusions relating to family pressure, the arranged marriage, and ‘honour’-based abuse dynamics were reached, particularly given the acknowledgement elsewhere that there is uncertainty about why Aaliyah agreed to the marriage.
8	Background Information	• Please consider clarifying the terminology used throughout the report, as both DARDR and DHR are referenced. • As above, references to “patriarchal values” and “patriarchal upbringing” should be clearly linked to the available evidence and to the review’s findings. • The report may also wish to reflect on the statement that incidents of domestic abuse were assessed as “both Aaliyah and Sauron being equally to blame for the abuse”. Given current understanding of domestic abuse dynamics, this finding warrants careful scrutiny and analysis. • Paragraph 10.4 appears to contain a chronology inconsistency. The report states that Aaliyah planned to return on 1 November 2021, but later records that she died on 10 October 2021. This should be clarified.
9	Combined Chronology	The review records concerns from the maternal aunt that the family were considering Aaliyah being “sectioned under the Mental Health Act as mum’s behaviour is irrational”, alongside references to heavy alcohol use and concerns regarding the child. Later, the review also notes that the maternal family “appear to be controlling and undermining of Aaliyah’s attempts to

		parent her child" (11.20). Given these observations, the panel may wish to reflect on whether Aaliyah's presentation was considered primarily through the lens of substance use and mental health, or whether sufficient consideration was also given to the potential influence of 'honour'-based abuse, family control, and wider family dynamics.
10	Overview	• Paragraph 12.3 suggests that Aaliyah was assessed to be a perpetrator or equally to blame. It would be helpful to understand how the panel explored this assessment and whether cultural context, coercive control or 'honour'-based abuse dynamics influenced agency perceptions. • The review states that Aaliyah *"agreed"* to the arranged marriage and references a first-cousin marriage within a wider 'honour'-based abuse context. It would be helpful to understand how agencies or the panel established that the marriage was entered into with free and informed consent.
11	Analysis	• The analysis considers Aaliyah's cultural context, trauma, 'honour'-based abuse dynamics and lived experience. However, parts of the section appear based on inferred experience and panel interpretation. Please outline how the review established and evidenced these aspects of Aaliyah's lived experience. • As above, please outline how the panel established that the marriage was entered into with free and informed consent.
12	Conclusions	Please also outline the evidential basis for conclusions that Children's Social Care showed "active bias", "openly disrespected Aaliyah" and "took steps to influence other agencies in a negative way", given the significance of these findings.
13	Lessons learnt and recommendations	• The panel may wish to consider whether all national recommendations are proportionate to the evidence available, particularly where the report states the cause and circumstances of Aaliyah's death cannot be established. It would be helpful to ensure strong findings regarding Children's Social Care are clearly evidenced and aligned to the recommendations. • The layout would benefit from review as Lessons Learned and Recommendations are embedded throughout Section 13 and then repeated later within standalone Lessons and Recommendations sections. Consider whether consolidating learning and recommendations into dedicated sections would improve readability and avoid repetition. • Consider whether language such as *"it feels as though"*, *"must have felt"*, *"there is no doubt"* and *"would have been immense"* would benefit from review to distinguish panel interpretation from evidenced findings.

14	Timescales	Please consider including the date the DHR commenced / first panel meeting, date of completion, and overall duration of the review to assist assessment against statutory guidance timescales. Given the delay between death (October 2021) and recommencement (June 2024), it may also be helpful to briefly outline any impact this had on the review process and learning.
15	Involvement of family / friends / community	• Please confirm whether any attempts were made to engage Sauron as part of the review process, given the report states that the panel was unable to obtain his involvement. • Please confirm whether Aaliyah's family was provided with a copy of the Home Office information leaflet and any details of available advocacy or support services.
16	DHR contributors	No amendments required.
17	DHR Panel	For clarity, please confirm the role and contribution of agencies listed as panel members where no IMR or summary report appears to have been provided, such as the Probation Service and Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership Trust.
18	DHR Author	Within the Author section, please check consistency of the pseudonym used as "Aaliya" is referenced whereas the report elsewhere refers to "Aaliyah."
19	Parallel Reviews	No amendments required.
20	Dissemination	• Please consider updating the reference to the Data Protection Act 1998, as this has been superseded by the Data Protection Act 2018 and UK GDPR arrangements. • Please state in the main body of the report whether Aaliyah's brother/wider family has been consulted about key dates to avoid for publication.
21	Action Plan	Given the review was commissioned in 2023 and relates to events in 2021, consideration should be given to evidencing learning already implemented and any outcomes achieved during the review period.
22	Has there been a request to withhold publication? *If Yes, include the reason for the request.*	No request to withhold publication.

	Is it proportionate and appropriate?	
23	Any other comments	The executive summary reflects many of the issues identified in the review, it should be revised following consideration of the wider QA feedback.