



**Independent Learning
Lessons Review - Late
Trevor Devamanikkam**

11th May 2023

*Jane Humphreys
JHSC Consultancy Limited*

Contents Page

1. Executive Summary	3
2. Confidentiality and Anonymity	4
3. Methodology	4
4. Structure of Review Report	6
5. Societal and Organisational Context.....	6
6. Background to the Learning Lessons Review	6
7. Delays to the Learning Lessons Review	11
8. The Independent Reviewer’s Attempts to Engage with the Survivor	12
9. Terms of Reference	13
What did the Church of England Know about the Alleged Abuse Perpetrated by Trevor Devamanikkam.....	14
10. The Survivor’s Time at St Aidan’s Vicarage	14
11. Alleged Verbal Disclosure to the Bishop of Doncaster – 28 July 2012	22
12. Verbal Disclosure to the Bishop of Sheffield – December 2012	25
13. Alleged Verbal Disclosure to the Archdeacon of Rotherham – 7 February 2013	27
14. Alleged Verbal Disclosure to the Bishop of Sheffield – February 2013.....	28
15. Written Disclosures to the Bishop of Sheffield – 26 March and 1 June 2013	30
16. Letter dated 1 June 2013 to the Archbishop of York, President of Tribunals and Bishop of Beverley	32
17. Further Disclosures of Abuse	37
18. Written Disclosure of Abuse – 19 February 2015	38
19. The role of the National Safeguarding Team – Core Group meeting	42
The second part of the Terms of Reference relates to the support to the survivor and Trevor Devamanikkam	46
20. Support to survivor	46
21. Support to Trevor Devamanikkam.....	48
22. Support from the Church of England	48
23. Health involvement	49
24. West Yorkshire Police involvement	53
25. Thames Valley Police involvement	53
26. Oxford Local Authority	54
27. Recent Development within Church of England Safeguarding	55
28. Conclusions	56
29. Recommendations	57
30. The Review Author	58

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This Learning Lessons Review has been independently commissioned by the National Safeguarding Team of the Church of England.
- 1.2 Its purpose is to consider how best the Church of England identify and learn lessons, and improve practice – it is not an independent inquiry nor is it a statutory review.
- 1.3 This Review took far too long to commence and to complete.
- 1.4 The reasons for the delays are referred to in this report.
- 1.5 The delay will have had a significant impact on the survivor and for others involved in this Review. It is over ten years since the survivor first disclosed his abuse.
- 1.6 The survivor has not engaged in this Review and asked via his solicitor that the following be noted.
- 1.7 “The victim who complained to the police about being raped by Trevor Devamanikkam wishes to disassociate himself on the grounds the Church refused to abide by his terms of participation which was that the investigator and writer of the report would be appointed completely independently. The Church refused to his request.”
- 1.8 Attempts to engage the survivor in this Review are referred to later in this report.
- 1.9 The Review relates to non-recent sexual abuse committed by the late Reverend Trevor Devamanikkam against the survivor who at the time was 16 years old and was residing at St Aidan’s Vicarage, Buttershaw, Bradford.
- 1.10 In 2012 and 2013, the survivor alleged he made a number of disclosures of non-recent abuse to senior Clergy, and they failed to act on them.
- 1.11 He was himself a member of Clergy at the time of the disclosures.
- 1.12 This report does substantiate some of the survivor’s disclosures of abuse to senior members of Clergy.
- 1.13 The survivor also reported his allegations of sexual abuse to Rotherham Police sometime in September 2013; they did not act on those disclosures either. It is understood the survivor received an apology for those failures.
- 1.14 Further disclosures were made by the survivor in 2014, 2015 and 2016.
- 1.15 On 1 May 2015, the survivor reported his allegations to West Yorkshire Police. The police investigation took over two years. The Independent Reviewer observed during her review that there was some delay on the part of the Church of England in locating material relating to Trevor Devamanikkam that the police had requested as part of their investigation. This may have contributed to the overall duration of the police investigation.
- 1.16 In May 2016, the survivor submitted a number of Clergy Discipline Measure (CDM) complaints against senior members of Clergy. These related to their failure to act on his disclosures and their failure to provide him with pastoral support.
- 1.17 The CDM provides a legal process for handling allegations of serious misconduct by Clergy.
- 1.18 The complaints and appeals process went on for a considerable period of time in relation to some of the Clergy.
- 1.19 Some of the Clergy were also spoken to by the police in relation to their involvement with the survivor. Furthermore, the Independent Reviewer was told that South Yorkshire Police

- investigated the actions of some Clergy and considered the potential offence of misconduct in a public office, but took no further action.
- 1.20 Whilst some Clergy were subject to criminal investigations and complaints under the CDM, there was no further action taken in respect of any of them either by the police or by the Church.
 - 1.21 On 10 May 2017, Trevor Devamanikkam was charged with six serious sexual offences all relating to the survivor.
 - 1.22 He was due in court on 6 June 2017 in relation to those charges, but did not attend. He was subsequently found in his flat having taken his own life.
 - 1.23 Whilst Trevor Devamanikkam was not convicted of the offences against him, the Independent Reviewer, for the benefit of doubt, can confirm the survivor was sexually abused by Trevor Devamanikkam.
 - 1.24 This is an important message for the survivor to hear and for the Church of England to reflect on.
 - 1.25 The Review considered the support offered to the survivor and Trevor Devamanikkam by the Church of England. Whilst there is evidence of some support being offered to them both, neither of them were provided with support or pastoral care in a timely manner.
 - 1.26 By the time the survivor was offered support from the Church of England, he had understandably lost faith and trust in the Church.
 - 1.27 The Review found that Trevor Devamanikkam had a significant history of mental health episodes over several years and was receiving professional mental health support up until the day before he took his own life.
 - 1.28 Mental Health professionals were also aware of the details of the allegations against him and had attempted to discuss these with him prior to his death.
 - 1.29 Other statutory agencies had knowledge and involvement with Trevor Devamanikkam as well.

2. Confidentiality and Anonymity

- 2.1 The Review will reference individuals in the following:
 - 2.1.1. The survivor is referred to throughout the Review as “the survivor”.
 - 2.1.2. Any statutory partners are referred to by their professional titles.
 - 2.1.3. Clergy and Church officers are referred to by their title at the time the survivor said he made his disclosure to them.**
 - 2.1.4. The late Reverend Trevor Devamanikkam is referred to by name.

3. Methodology

- 3.1 The Learning Lessons Review involved the collation of documents from Dioceses, the National Safeguarding Team and the statutory partners who had knowledge of, or involvement with, Trevor Devamanikkam.
- 3.2 Individual interviews also took place, most were undertaken remotely via Teams.

- 3.3 Some of those individuals contacted did not respond to the Independent Reviewer or declined to be involved, and some were no longer alive.
- 3.4 The Review ordinarily would have been an opportunity for the survivor to share his experiences with the Independent Reviewer. However, he chose not to engage which is his right.
- 3.5 The Independent Reviewer has not received any supporting material directly from the survivor, nor had the chance to discuss his lived experience. Furthermore, the Independent Reviewer has been unable to discuss with the survivor information received from numerous sources, thereby missing the opportunity for the survivor to clarify certain accounts given during this Review.
- 3.6 The Independent Reviewer has attempted to present the survivor's written experiences and accounts of events from his submission to the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA) July 2019, from the information he submitted when he made his CDM complaints, and from letters sent by the survivor's solicitor to Leeds Diocese in 2015 and 2016.
- 3.7 As the survivor submitted objections to his personal data being shared by Dioceses involved and the National Safeguarding Team for the purpose of this Review, there have been different approaches to the sharing of information and involvement in the Review.
- 3.8 One Diocese initially shared information for the Review but, following objections from the survivor, requested this information was returned and not used in this Review.
- 3.9 The lack of organisational memory in some Dioceses and the National Safeguarding Team, and changes of personnel, has meant there has been a lack of clarity and understanding as to the events surrounding the survivor and the disclosures he made.
- 3.10 Some current Diocesan staff had no knowledge of the events of this case and struggled to find any records relating to Diocese involvement.
- 3.11 The lack of adequate case management systems and record management has meant some Dioceses were unable to provide the information in a timely manner, and in some cases very limited information at all.
- 3.12 Quite frequently, individuals would recount events for which there was no written evidence to substantiate what they had said. Some historical accounts and more up-to-date recall varied at times as well.
- 3.13 Given all of the different approaches taken by the Dioceses to sharing information, the Independent Reviewer is confident she has not received all of the information that could have assisted her. This includes information which the survivor may hold which could well provide conflicting evidence to that which the Independent Reviewer has received.
- 3.14 The Independent Reviewer has not considered media articles relating to this case as her professional experience is that these articles are not always an accurate reflection of what has been said, and are often reported and taken out of context.
- 3.15 The Independent Reviewer's report, analysis and observations are therefore based on what she received and heard during the time she undertook the Learning Lessons Review.

4. Structure of Review Report

- 4.1 The Review is set out in chronological order of the events and disclosures the survivor said he made from his time living at St Aidan's Vicarage in 1984 until the appointment of the Independent Reviewer in 2019.

- 4.2 The Review presents evidence obtained in relation to each of the allegations the survivor said he made during this period, including the written information taken by sources at paragraph 3.6 which provides some of his account of events.
- 4.3 Written and verbal evidence provided by the Dioceses involved, the National Safeguarding Team, statutory bodies and individuals who had knowledge of events, is also considered.
- 4.4 At the conclusion of each section, the Independent Reviewer has considered the information received and has given her opinion of the accounts given by the survivor and those he stated he disclosed his abuse to, and whether they can be substantiated.
- 4.5 The Independent Reviewer has commented on the Dioceses' approaches and actions to the disclosures made by the survivor. Where the Independent Reviewer finds the account by the survivor is substantiated, the Independent Reviewer has taken into consideration the Church of England Safeguarding-related policies and procedures that existed at that time.

5. Societal and Organisational Context

- 5.1 Whilst the scope of this Review begins in 1984, the actual disclosures of abuse by the survivor were ten years ago. At this time, there was a significant amount of statutory legislation and guidance relating to the [Safeguarding of Children and Vulnerable Adults](#), including the [Children Act 1989](#), [Working Together to Safeguard Children](#), 2010, and [No Secrets Guidance](#), 2000.
- 5.2 When the survivor made his disclosures, the following policies and guidance were in place within the Church of England:
 - 5.2.1 [Promoting a safe church](#), 2006
 - 5.2.2 [Protecting All God's Children](#), 2010
 - 5.2.3 [Responding Well to those who have been sexually abused](#), 2011
- 5.3 It is clear that senior Clergy should have known what to do and who to consult when responding to allegations of non-recent abuse at that time.

6. Background to the Learning Lessons Review

- 6.1 The background to this Review has been protracted; the Independent Reviewer attempts to understand why that was.
- 6.2 In July 2016, a decision was made by the National Safeguarding Adviser that a National Core Group should be convened in relation to allegations made by the survivor relating to Trevor Devamanikkam and the complaints he had submitted against senior Clergy in May 2016. This was to be chaired by the National Safeguarding Team.
- 6.3 The Core Group was convened in accordance with the Church of England [Practice Guidance: Responding to Serious Safeguarding Situations Relating to Church Officers](#), 2015. Its purpose was to co-ordinate and manage Church of England responses to allegations of abuse in collaboration with statutory agencies where the respondents were senior members of Clergy.
- 6.4 The guidance stated the National Safeguarding Team should manage the Core Group meetings in conjunction with those Dioceses involved. A series of Core Group meetings took place between 3 August 2016 and 11 January 2018. There were six Core Group meetings in total. The Review will comment separately on the Core Group process.

- 6.5 Following the police charges relating to Trevor Devamanikkam and his subsequent death, the National Core Group agreed on 13 September 2017 that an Independent Learning Lessons Review should be commissioned by the National Safeguarding Team, in accordance with the [Church of England Practice Guidance: Responding to, assessing and managing safeguarding concerns or allegations against church officers](#).
- 6.6 On 25 October 2017, the National Safeguarding Advisor and the Lead Safeguarding Bishop at the time agreed that it was appropriate for such a Review to be conducted. On 11 January 2018, a further Core Group meeting was held to update members of events and to discuss the commissioning of the Independent Learning Lessons Review. The legal advice at the time given to the Core Group suggested the Independent Review could not be commissioned until the complaint and appeal process against a number of senior Clergy had been concluded.
- 6.7 From August 2018 until December 2018, the National Safeguarding Team progressed the drafting of the first set of Terms of Reference and attempted to commission a suitably experienced Independent Reviewer. It is unclear what happened between the final Core Group meeting in January 2018 and the commencing of the drafting of the Terms of Reference. There was reference in the Core Group minutes of 10 January 2018 that comments on the Terms of Reference should be sent to the National Safeguarding Team's Senior Casework Manager by 7 February 2018.
- 6.8 It would appear that a further Core Group meeting had been agreed for 11 March 2018, but did not take place. In October 2018, the Provincial Safeguarding Adviser at Lambeth Palace became the point of contact for the survivor, and he undertook to progress the commissioning of the Learning Lessons Review. Between December 2018 and March 2019, further draft terms of reference were produced and shared with the survivor. He was invited to participate in the Review, but indicated to the Provincial Safeguarding Adviser that he did not wish to contribute to the Review.
- 6.9 On 5 March 2019, the survivor was sent further draft Terms of Reference and the Curriculum Vitae (CV) of the first Independent Reviewer the National Safeguarding Team had identified. He was asked to comment on both proposals. On 24 June 2019, amended Terms of Reference were sent to the survivor and he was asked to comment on their content.
- 6.10 During July 2019, the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA) in the Church of England took place.
- 6.11 On 18 July 2019, the survivor was asked again if he wanted to comment on the Terms of Reference and to indicate if he wanted to be involved in the Review. On 31 July 2019, the survivor sent an email to the Provincial Safeguarding Adviser stating: "I just want you to be assured I want this sorted like I am sure you do. If the Church/NST are willing to spend some time with us to appoint a jointly agreeable reviewer and have terms of reference that are acceptable to us and the agreed reviewer, we could move forward ... In the meantime, we will begin the process of our own review."
- 6.12 On 31 July 2019, the National Director at the National Safeguarding Team emailed the survivor and apologised for not being able to meet with him to discuss his proposals for the Review. He was aware the survivor had met with the Provincial Safeguarding Adviser and another colleague and referenced the fact that the survivor had received an initial draft Terms of Reference in March 2019, a further set in June 2019, and stated he would postpone the date for comments back from the survivor to 12 August 2019. The National Director went on to say, "Once they are

- received, I suggest we meet to discuss them”, and he stated that the survivor was welcome to bring his solicitor with him to any meeting. He identified three dates he was available to meet with the survivor during the month of August 2019.
- 6.13 On 1 August 2019, the Provincial Safeguarding Adviser notified colleagues in the National Safeguarding Team that the survivor was considering contacting the first Independent Reviewer. An email suggests the survivor did ring and leave the first Independent Reviewer a message which was returned.
- 6.14 On 30 August 2019, the survivor replied to the National Director’s email of 31 July 2019, referring to a telephone call they had and the offer from the National Director to visit the survivor at his home. The survivor stated: “Unless you able to agree to my proposals, I have no interest in meeting or contact with you further.”
- 6.15 The survivor’s proposals for the review were the following:
- *Phase 1 - an independent senior safeguarding expert (the manager) will be appointed by agreement between the parties this manager will nominate the safeguarding expert (the reviewer) who is to carry out the review. This manager will have access to sufficient funds deemed by him or her to meet the needs of the review, such funds are to be controlled by him or her and be provided on demand. The manager will have access to independent legal advice of his or her own choosing for advice on legal issues.*
 - *Phase 2 - the TOR are to be decided by the reviewer I will put suggested TOR to the review and the church organisations will also be entitled to put their suggested TOR. The reviewer will have the final decision on the TOR to be employed.*
 - *Phase 3 - the reviewer is to be provided with unfettered access to church office holders and employees present and retired for interview. The reviewer is to have unfettered access to all documentation. The church will appoint a document handler who will sign sworn statements to explain his or her efforts to obtain documentation from the various parties I will provide unfettered access to my documentation.*
 - *Phase 4 - publication of the report (suitably anonymised) will be at the same time as it is released to me and the church organisation. In addition to and the church organisations most closely involved will be provided with an unredacted version of the report.*
- 6.16 At this time, the survivor also objected to the first Independent Reviewer who had been appointed to carry out the Learning Lessons Review as he was not deemed to be independent; he was a Chair of a Diocesan Safeguarding Panel at the time. Following discussions between the survivor and the then newly appointed Director at the National Safeguarding Team, the first Independent Reviewer was asked to step down.
- 6.17 On 11 September 2019, the newly appointed National Director at the National Safeguarding Team had a telephone conversation with the survivor which was followed up by email. It was confirmed they had talked about identifying a long list of independent reviewers between them, with a view that they could hopefully then agree jointly one Independent Reviewer. The email references the need to have an agreed criteria that would have to be met for any proposed candidates to be on a shortlist, and the National Director also pointed the survivor to the Department for Education (DfE) list of approved child death/abuse case independent reviewers as a possible avenue for him to explore for potential candidates to undertake the Review.

- 6.18 The National Director at the National Safeguarding Team also sought the survivor's views/thoughts as to how the long list might be established. Following discussion between the National Director and the survivor, it was also agreed that the draft Terms of Reference of the Review would be amended, and the scope of the Review would go beyond Trevor Devamanikkam's death. The National Director also agreed with the survivor's proposal that any Independent Reviewer should have access to full material and project support.
- 6.19 The National Director at the National Safeguarding Team sought interest in undertaking this Independent Review via the Association of Directors of Children's Services (ADCS) in September 2019. This is how the current Independent Reviewer came to be appointed.
- 6.20 On 1 October 2019, the Provincial Safeguarding Adviser at Lambeth Palace sent an email to the survivor regarding the appointment of the Independent Reviewer. He was informed that four possible Independent Reviewers had been identified and he was asked if he would like to be involved in the interviews to determine who should be appointed. The Provincial Safeguarding Adviser suggested to the survivor that they were thinking of doing the interviews by phone, but if he wanted face-to-face that would be considered. The Provincial Safeguarding Adviser also stated that if the survivor did not want to be involved in the interviews, did he have any particular questions he would like asked? The survivor was also asked if he would like to meet the person recommended once they had been appointed. The survivor replied back to the Provincial Safeguarding Adviser referencing his four-phase proposal for the review and stated continuing with the Review "was a waste of money."
- 6.21 On 1 October 2019, the National Director at the National Safeguarding Team also wrote to the survivor following a conversation they had had. She expressed her commitment to work with him collaboratively wherever possible and she acknowledged his "experience" of working with the NST "has been difficult in the past." The National Director hoped that they could continue to share constructive dialogue even where they may not reach agreement about details or decisions. The Director told the survivor: "I can assure you I believe there is considerable learning for us in this team and the wider Church from the history of this case and many others, I would like to reassure you of our sincere desire to learn and improve."
- 6.22 The National Director acknowledged the survivor's concerns that he had regarding the independence of the Review and his concerns that it would not achieve independent and objective scrutiny. The National Director then gave her response to the survivor's Review proposals which he had submitted to the previous National Director, stating: "It would [not] be possible to nominate an objectively Independent Reviewer without the involvement of a third party which could lead to further delay". She wrote that she had identified several expressions of interest from potential Independent Reviewers, none of whom were known to her or had any involvement in the Church. The National Director now had those CVs, and she invited the survivor to take part in the shortlisting and interview process.
- 6.23 The National Director proposed they appoint an Independent Reviewer by the end of October 2019, and said in her letter that she understood from a conversation the survivor had with the Provincial Safeguarding Adviser that he did not feel in a position to take part in the process because it did not meet his proposal for Phase 1. Whilst acknowledging his position, the National Director stated, subject to the dates she had outlined, she would keep the invitation open for the survivor to be part of an interview panel to choose the Independent Reviewer. She went on to say: "Do let me know if you would like to do this by Monday 7 October as we will

- need to go ahead and arrange an interview schedule. If I have not heard from you by then I will assume that you are not in a position to take part for all the reasons you have previously outlined.”
- 6.24 The National Director’s letter also stated: “We have not yet finalised the Terms of Reference for the Review, however as you know from our previous conversation, we have accepted your representation that the review should not end at the death of Trevor Devamanikkam, but should continue beyond that date, you have suggested putting your own Terms of Reference to the reviewer alongside those suggested by us on the basis that the reviewer should have final decision on the wording of the terms. I would like to put your Terms of Reference to the reviewer, although I accept you may not want to do this given that the process of choosing the reviewer is not in line with your proposal about that.” She goes on to say that the final Terms of Reference “Do need to be agreed by us as we are commissioning the review. ... I have already given a commitment to you by email that the reviewer should have access to all relevant documentation and the NST will support this wherever possible, the NST will also provide project support to include collation of documents.” The letter concludes: “I am sorry for the distress that you have experienced both through original events and the subsequent history of this matter”.
- 6.25 The current Independent Reviewer was interviewed on 21 October 2019, and after references were obtained, offered the contract to undertake the Learning Lessons Review. The Independent Reviewer was also given the opportunity to comment on the draft Terms of Reference during December 2019 and provide feedback. The final agreed Terms of Reference were put in the public domain on 18 February 2020. The survivor had been given a further period of time to respond by 7 February 2020, having been sent the Terms of Reference several weeks earlier. He did not respond.
- 6.26 The Independent Reviewer considered the survivor’s proposals for this Review and the National Safeguarding Team’s response. She supports the survivor’s view that the first proposed Independent Reviewer was not independent. This individual had connections with the Church of England. It appeared the survivor was not given the opportunity to be involved in any discussion around appointing the Independent Reviewer. It is worth noting some members of the Core Group also shared a similar observation about the independence of the first Independent Reviewer.
- 6.27 There is considerable evidence of numerous attempts to engage the survivor in the revised proposals to commission an Independent Reviewer, and the approach and proposals made by the National Director of a joint approach with the survivor in identifying an Independent Reviewer were in the Independent Reviewer’s opinion sound. The Independent Reviewer does not believe there was a need to identify a nominated safeguarding expert who then identifies an Independent Reviewer, nor is that the approach taken when statutory authorities commission learning reviews.

7. Delays to the Learning Lessons Review

- 7.1 There were significant delays in the Review commencing and then progressing. The Independent Reviewer has tried to capture those delays. Limited information was provided to

- the Independent Reviewer at the beginning of the Review in early 2020. The Independent Reviewer received a chronology document dated 3 May 2019, produced for the forthcoming IICSA inquiry. This gave brief details around the allegations made by the survivor and the subsequent events and actions up until March 2019, and a copy of the draft Terms of Reference. The accompanying documents to the IICSA chronology were not provided despite the Independent Reviewer asking for them on more than one occasion.
- 7.2 In March 2020, the country went into “Lockdown”. This caused considerable delay in the gathering of information, particularly from the Dioceses involved. Records were often hard copy and as no-one was working in the Diocesan offices, information was not accessed for many months, and in the case of one Diocese well over a year.
- 7.3 There was significant delay in writing to statutory organisations and Dioceses as some of the basic details relating to this Review were not made available by the National Safeguarding Team. This included details relating to Trevor Devamanikkam, including his date of birth and last known address. The Independent Reviewer could not write to agencies to request their assistance with the Review without basic information. In May 2020, the Independent Reviewer finally wrote to the relevant Dioceses and statutory partners. Other sources that the Independent Reviewer identified during the Review were contacted later.
- 7.4 A number of Dioceses and external partners were written to on more than one occasion, having not responded to the Independent Reviewer’s previous requests. There were significant delays in both the National Safeguarding Team and some Dioceses trying to locate relevant information for this Review. Some Church organisations were extremely slow in providing any information, including the National Safeguarding Team who did not provide some key information until October 2022 having been asked on many occasions. Correspondence from the previous Provincial Safeguarding Adviser at Lambeth Palace who had involvement with the survivor were also deleted; it is unclear why this happened.
- 7.5 The Independent Reviewer had to arrange to visit a number of Church settings to view hard copy records and there were delays in being able to undertake these visits due to “Lockdown.” Information held by some Church staff in handwritten notebooks also had to be viewed in person as it was difficult to copy and send to the Independent Reviewer. Interviews with individual people took several months to arrange, and due to the delays in receiving key documents, some follow-up interviews needed to take place when new or contradictory information came to light.
- 7.6 The response from external organisations was more timely, and most organisations shared information promptly with the exception of the police forces involved. The Independent Reviewer had to contact Operation Hydrant to assist in order to get most of the information via the police forces involved in this Review.
- 7.7 The Review was paused between February 2020 and April 2020 when the survivor objected to the Review. The Review was paused again between July and November 2021 whilst the newly formed Independent Safeguarding Board (ISB) reviewed the progress made in the Review and considered whether the Review should continue or not.

8. The Independent Reviewer's Attempts to Engage with the Survivor

- 8.1 In December 2019, the National Director at the National Safeguarding Team contacted the survivor and provided him with the Independent Reviewer's details. She asked his permission for his email address to be shared with the Independent Reviewer. This was agreed. Consequently the Independent Reviewer contacted the survivor on 8 January 2020 to introduce herself and asked if they could have an initial telephone discussion. On 17 January 2020, the survivor indicated via email that he was willing to meet with the Independent Reviewer stating: "By all means I will speak/meet with you, I will be able to tell you our opposition to how the review is being done and all the problems with it as currently proposed...". He goes on to say: "I believe from [National Director] you are in Yorkshire, so if you want to pop over I have no problem with that." The Independent Reviewer replied back to the survivor and offered some dates to contact him the following week with a view to visiting him.
- 8.2 On 21 January 2020, the survivor rang the Independent Reviewer and shared concerns with her about his experiences to date with the Church and National Safeguarding Team. He mentioned he and his solicitor had sent proposals to the previous National Safeguarding Lead at the National Safeguarding Team as to how the Review should be undertaken (the Independent Reviewer had not seen these proposals at that time). The survivor stated the first Independent Reviewer identified was not independent, that he had made a number of complaints against Clergy, and he believed the Church knew about Trevor Devamanikkam's mental health. He also stated his solicitor had told him not to get involved with the Review. The Independent Reviewer assured the survivor she would request a copy of his proposal relating to the Learning Lessons Review.
- 8.3 On 30 January 2020, the Independent Reviewer spoke again with the survivor and attempted to reassure the survivor of her independence. The Independent Reviewer outlined how she was appointed and how she received the contract for the Review. The survivor told the Independent Reviewer that he had spoken to his solicitor regarding her request to meet them both, he stated his solicitor believed the work "will be biased", and he had told him not to cooperate with the Review. The survivor told the Independent Reviewer that his solicitor had told him not to open/comment on the Terms of Reference. The survivor also said that he was now paying for his own counselling. He added that a payment of £500 had previously been made by Leeds Diocese to the organisation he had received counselling from, after he said he had been told his sessions would be paid in full by Leeds Diocese. He was assured that the support he received from the Church would be considered as part of the Review. The survivor was clear in the conversation that he would not share any information he had, as he did not agree with how the Review had been set up.
- 8.4 From those initial conversations between the Independent Reviewer and the survivor in early 2020, it became clear he was not going to comment on the Terms of Reference on the advice of his solicitor or be involved in the Review. As a result, the Independent Reviewer spoke with the National Director of the National Safeguarding Team and her legal advisor on 5 February 2020, and suggested an alternative approach for the survivor to consider as a way forward. The Independent Reviewer suggested asking the survivor to identify someone suitably qualified to

- work with her to undertake the Review in the hope that he would engage with the Review and share relevant material. This approach was not agreed by the National Director.
- 8.5 The Independent Reviewer spoke a further time with the survivor on 27 July 2021, when he rang her to enquire as to the progress of the Review and whether it had stopped. During that conversation, the survivor was asked to consider meeting with the Independent Reviewer and Deputy Director of the National Safeguarding Team at his home in order that they could discuss the Review and hopefully engage him in the process.
- 8.6 On 2 August 2021, The Deputy Director of the National Safeguarding Team received an email reply from the survivor to the proposal to meet with herself and the Independent Reviewer. In this email, the survivor informed the Deputy Director that he could not agree to the visit as: “the Review was not set up from its very beginning or is currently being conducted, in any recognisable way which could be considered good practice.” He went on to say: “The NST went on to appoint another reviewer Jane Humphreys without properly working with the survivor or any other interested parties. The only involvement I was offered was a quick phone call whether I had a couple of questions to be considered that they may ask at interviews. That was the total extent of involvement I was offered. ... the TOR were written by the NST/Church without any consultation or sense of working together. Only later was I given a very short time to make comments.”
- 8.7 On 4 August 2021, the Interim Director at the National Safeguarding Team was contacted by the survivor’s solicitor requesting no further contact with the survivor and for all contact to go via himself. The Independent Reviewer has had no further contact with the survivor since July 2021.

9. Terms of Reference

- 9.1 The final Terms of Reference for this Learning Lessons Review were published on 18 February 2020. The Terms of Reference focused on two distinct questions:
- 9.2 **What did the Church of England know about alleged abuse perpetrated by the late Trevor Devamanikkam?**
- 9.2.1 The Review was to consider:
- 9.2.2 What information was available to the Church of England relating to alleged abuse perpetrated by the late Trevor Devamanikkam.
- 9.2.3 Who had this information and what did they do with it.
- 9.3 **What was the Church of England’s response to those allegations?**
- 9.3.1 The Review was to consider:
- 9.3.2 Whether, when the abuse was reported, Church officers and Church bodies responded in a timely manner in line with policies, practice and procedure in place in the Church of England at that time, and made appropriate statutory referrals to the police and Children Services where appropriate.
- 9.3.3 Whether such abuse and any further abuse could have been prevented.
- 9.3.4 How were the survivor/s and alleged perpetrator supported by the Church of England.
- 9.3.5 Whether, taking into account the Gibb Review and other relevant past case reviews, what additional lessons can be learnt which are relevant and might improve safeguarding practice in the Church of England.

What did the Church of England Know about the Alleged Abuse Perpetrated by Trevor Devamanikkam

This Learning Lessons Review presents the survivor's evidence first in relation to the allegation/disclosures he said he made, then evidence of others involved who had knowledge or were involved at that time.

10. The Survivor's Time at St Aidan's Vicarage

- 10.1 **The events at St Aidan's vicarage commenced in 1984, and any reference to the Bishop of Bradford hereafter is to the incumbent at the time.**
- 10.2 On 16 May 2016, the survivor submitted a CDM complaint against the Bishop of Bradford. He claimed the Bishop of Bradford knew of the abuse against him by Trevor Devamanikkam; he believed this to have come through his maternal grandmother reporting this to the Bishop. The survivor stated the day after the abuse was revealed, the Bishop of Bradford turned up at St Aidan's vicarage. The survivor stated he was asked to leave, he stated he did not go back to his nan's because he was "frightened", he did not know if she knew about the sexual abuse that had been going on, he could not bear to face her. He stated he left the vicarage and walked as far as Cleckheaton where he sat on a bench "and slept rough for two nights." He understood Trevor Devamanikkam left the vicarage soon after.
- 10.3 The survivor submitted a CDM complaint against Trevor Devamanikkam on 16 May 2016. He stated he had been sexually abused as a youngster. He described how he arrived at the vicarage of Trevor Devamanikkam after his maternal grandmother went to see the vicar at a neighbouring parish in Carlinghow who she knew well. He stated the Vicar at Carlinghow gave his nan some advice and he organised a period of respite at St Aidan's Church under the care of Trevor Devamanikkam, who was a priest. He stated he and his nan did not know Trevor Devamanikkam, but they trusted the vicar they had sought advice from. He stated Trevor Devamanikkam picked him up from Carlinghow Vicarage. He said he was only "just" 16 at the time and he stayed at St Aidan's vicarage for "several weeks." He stated the abuse that occurred "stopped very abruptly"; this followed a visit from his nan to the vicarage. This bothered him as he did not want her to know what was happening. He stated his nan spoke with Trevor Devamanikkam, then left. He was not privy to the conversation between his nan and Trevor Devamanikkam.
- 10.4 The next day, the Bishop of Bradford arrived and spoke to Trevor Devamanikkam. The survivor was not privy to that conversation either. He stated he was told by the Bishop of Bradford "to get my things and that I had to leave." He stated he had nowhere to go but the Bishop of Bradford said, "you have to go and go now, it's not my problem where you go but you cannot stay here."
- 10.5 On 20 February 2015, a letter was received by West Yorkshire and the Dales Diocese office (now Leeds Diocese) from personal injury lawyers, acting on behalf of the survivor. This letter stated they were acting on behalf of the survivor in connection with a claim for personal injury and loss

- sustained as a consequence of the abuse that he suffered as a child at St Aidan's vicarage at the hands of a priest named Trevor Devamanikkam.
- 10.6 Prior to the survivor reporting his abuse to West Yorkshire Police in May 2015, the letter of claim is the only written disclosure the Independent Reviewer has seen where Trevor Devamanikkam was named. The response by Leeds Diocese to this letter is detailed later in this Review.
- 10.7 A second letter dated 7 January 2016, from the same personal injury lawyers, was also sent to the Diocese of West Yorkshire and the Dales. In this letter, there was more detail of the allegations made by the survivor against Trevor Devamanikkam. It is unclear why a second letter was sent. The letter states that the survivor's mother left the family and was predominantly cared for by his paternal grandmother. Finding that she was having difficulties, she turned to the Church for help and support. The letter states the vicar of a neighbouring parish arranged for the survivor to have a period of respite with the Church and arranged for him to be placed with Trevor Devamanikkam. The letter also states that the Vicar at the neighbouring church took the survivor to St Aidan's himself and that he stayed at the vicarage for "several weeks" during which time he attended St Aidan's Church as a parishioner.
- 10.8 Details of the survivor's departure from the vicarage state the "Abuse came to an end suddenly when the claimant's grandmother visited, he saw her briefly, then she went into the study with the Rev Trevor Devamanikkam and then left without seeing or speaking to him." The following day, the Bishop of Bradford came to the vicarage and also spoke to Trevor Devamanikkam in his study. When the Bishop came out, he said to the survivor: "you have to go now. It's not my problem where you go but you have to leave here." The survivor was given no explanation and he had to gather his belongings and leave the vicarage immediately. The letter also references the fact there was a housekeeper residing at the vicarage with the survivor.
- 10.9 In his evidence to IICSA in July 2019, the survivor stated he had been in the care of his grandparents since his mother had left the family. He stated his nan was finding things difficult to cope with and she turned to the Church for help. The survivor and his nan went to see the vicar at the next door parish whom she had known for a long time. The survivor stated there was a "chap" there with the vicar who recommended that they all needed a break from each other, and he had a friend, namely Trevor Devamanikkam. He recommended the survivor went to stay with Trevor Devamanikkam whilst he and his nan sorted things out.
- 10.10 The survivor stated Trevor Devamanikkam came and picked him up from the vicarage at Carlinghow. He stated he was just 16 years of age at the time and described the abuse that occurred whilst at the vicarage and the circumstances leading to him leaving the vicarage. He stated that one day his nan came to the vicarage, she spoke briefly to him, then went in another room to speak with Trevor Devamanikkam. After about 5-10 minutes, Trevor Devamanikkam came into the kitchen where he was waiting and told him his nan had gone. He stated that the next day the Bishop of Bradford arrived at the vicarage, he asked the survivor his name and then went to speak with Trevor Devamanikkam. After a few minutes, the Bishop of Bradford came out and said to him: "you do know you can't stay here anymore? I need you to go and get your bag and I need you to go." The survivor stated he replied, "Where am I to go?", and the Bishop said "that's not my problem. He stated he walked out of the vicarage with Trevor Devamanikkam and the Bishop on either side, and that is how he left the vicarage.

10.11 **Other Evidence**

- 10.12 The Independent Reviewer was only able to consider the Bishop of Bradford's written responses to the complaint made against him by the survivor; this was dated 24 November 2017.
- 10.13 The Bishop of Bradford became Bishop in March 1984. Not long after his arrival, he attended a senior staff meeting. There were no minutes of this meeting, but he recalls Trevor Devamanikkam had a number of individuals at the vicarage and that he was given no information as to who the individuals were. He recalled that neither the Archdeacon or the Diocesan Secretary had been consulted about the arrangements at the vicarage, it was felt to be inappropriate, and that Trevor Devamanikkam should be consulted about the arrangements. He recalled it was agreed the matter would be investigated. The Bishop commented: "I cannot recall, however, if anything happened about the issue." He went on to say: "I believe TD may have been spoken to about the arrangements, but I have no recollection of whether I did this or (more likely) the Archdeacon or the Diocese Secretary." He stated: "At no time was any mention made to me as to the identity of who was living at the vicarage or that anything inappropriate or improper was taking place between them." He said the concerns centred around the fact that the vicarage "was occupied by third parties unconnected to the Church, and also the basis upon which such third parties were living in the vicarage."
- 10.14 The Bishop had no recollection of anything further in relation to St Aidan's until the summer of 1985. He stated he was made aware "I believe the Archdeacon (but it could equally have been the Rural Dean) knew that TD had a mental breakdown of some sorts and that arrangements would have to be made for his care, he said he believed the Archdeacon made those arrangements." He stated thereafter Trevor Devamanikkam was away from the parish and his office as incumbent due to ill health, and he invited the churchwardens and the Parish Curate to Bishopscroft to discuss events, and also the fact that Trevor Devamanikkam had applied for and obtained office in St Davids, Wales.
- 10.15 The Bishop recalled only ever visiting St Aidan's vicarage once to open a summer fete. He could not recall if Trevor Devamanikkam was there or had left, and the next time was when the new incumbent came sometime in 1986. He had no recollection of ever meeting the survivor nor visiting him whilst he was at the vicarage, nor speaking with him. He also said he had never met or spoken to anyone representing to be his grandmother. Whilst the Bishop stated he never took any personal steps to require the survivor to leave the vicarage, he accepted that an instruction may have been given to Trevor Devamanikkam to resolve the situation concerning him which may have led to Trevor Devamanikkam seeking alternative accommodation for the survivor "since this would appear to be confirmed by statement of TD." The Independent Reviewer is aware that these were actually the wrong initials and should have been the initials of the churchwarden.
- 10.16 The Bishop of Bradford stated he was never aware of any suggestion of sexual abuse between the survivor and Trevor Devamanikkam, and had the grandmother, the survivor or anyone else said so, he would have reported "the matter immediately to the appropriate authorities." He wondered whether the survivor's grandmother visited Trevor Devamanikkam because he was trying to sort out alternative accommodation for him. He also commented on the survivor's submission in the complaint against him where the survivor stated that he "stayed at St Aidan's for several weeks and attended mass on Sundays as well as occasions during the week, I never got involved in the parish life although simply sat at the back of the church during service. I

- became known by the parishioners as the boy who was staying at the vicarage, who they actually thought I was I don't know."
- 10.17 The Bishop of Bradford stated: "This picture is completely at odds with the picture presented by [deaconess and churchwarden]. They both indicated [the survivor] was fully involved in the parish, participated in services and was well known by everyone." The churchwarden stated: "whilst [the survivor] was in the parish he appeared happy, he was friendly with youngsters ... he attended church services."
- 10.18 **Licensed Deaconess who had been in St Aidan's Parish in 1984 when the survivor was living at the vicarage**
- 10.19 The Licensed Deaconess at St Aidan's parish wrote to the Registrar Leeds Diocese on 10 October 2015, following a conversation they both had after it became apparent she had knowledge of St Aidan's and Trevor Devamanikkam. In her letter, she states she became the Licensed Deaconess to the parish of St Aidan's, Buttershaw, on 24 June 1984; Trevor Devamanikkam was her training incumbent. She had temporary lodgings before moving into permanent accommodation at the beginning of August 1984. She stated sometime between 24 June 1984 and August 1984, the survivor arrived at the vicarage. She recalled he helped her move into her accommodation.
- 10.20 The Deaconess remembered Trevor Devamanikkam's housekeeper also moved in around a similar time. She recalled the survivor and housekeeper lived at the vicarage for "some months." She stated the survivor had been living with the vicar at Carlinghow prior to moving to live with Trevor Devamanikkam, he had asked Trevor Devamanikkam for help as the survivor could not continue to stay with him. She recalled that, within her first month in the parish, Trevor Devamanikkam took her to meet with the vicar at Carlinghow and that is when he told her that the survivor had been staying with the vicar at Carlinghow.
- 10.21 She went on to say that just after Easter 1985, but before the Bradford fire on 11 May 1985, the survivor arrived at her house after she had gone to bed, he was in a state of panic saying Trevor Devamanikkam was having a "heart attack", and could she come to the vicarage. On arriving at the vicarage, she encountered a state of bedlam. Trevor Devamanikkam was not having a heart attack, but some sort of mental breakdown and he had "wrecked much of the interior of the house." He asked her to contact a friend who lived in Leeds, which she did, and she sat with him until he arrived. She stated the survivor made himself scarce. Trevor Devamanikkam's GP was called, and he was sedated. The day after, Trevor Devamanikkam told the Deaconess he had contacted the Rural Dean and Archdeacon about what had occurred.
- 10.22 Trevor Devamanikkam was subsequently sent to a retreat in North Yorkshire; he was not allowed to take his car. The Deaconess recalled he returned within a couple of days to the vicarage and was then officially "off sick" and not allowed to work in the parish again. She stated the Archdeacon and senior staff of the Diocese asked the housekeeper and the survivor to vacate the vicarage. The Deaconess assumed they helped the survivor to find alternative accommodation as he left soon after, the housekeeper took longer to leave, but was eventually found a flat. Trevor Devamanikkam did not vacate the vicarage until sometime after the Bradford fire. She recalled he then went to Wales as a Minor Canon and then joined the Royal Navy as a Chaplain.

- 10.23 Following Trevor Devamanikkam's breakdown, she was summoned, along with one of the churchwardens and the churchwarden's mother, to see the Bishop of Bradford to speak about events surrounding Trevor Devamanikkam's breakdown.
- 10.24 On 27 September 2017, the Licensed Deaconess provided a statement for the Bishop of Bradford (who was the incumbent in 1984) in response to the CDM complaint the survivor had made against him. She recalled Trevor Devamanikkam was officiating on the Easter Monday, 7 April 1985, but by the time of the Bradford Fire, 11 May 1985, he was not in ministry. Her recollection of the Trevor Devamanikkam "breakdown" was that the survivor arrived at her home "in a state of panic," he stated Trevor Devamanikkam was having a "heart attack" and could she come quickly. She believed the survivor would have recalled she had been a qualified nurse.
- 10.25 She stated she never found out what "triggered this explosion or TD conduct," but she subsequently became aware that he was diagnosed with bipolar disorder which was consistent with his behaviour in April/May 1985. She stated there had been no signs of mental instability from Trevor Devamanikkam prior to this episode. She recalled the following day she returned to the vicarage, and Trevor Devamanikkam told her he had contacted the then Archdeacon of Bradford and Rural Dean, and that they had both visited the vicarage that day. She stated he gave no indication that the Bishop of Bradford had visited, or he had been told about the incident.
- 10.26 The Deaconess recalled Trevor Devamanikkam told her that it had been arranged for him to go to a retreat at Thirsk, North Yorkshire. He was not allowed to take his car or dog with him; she believed he went on the Friday and was back by the Saturday as he did not wish to be parted from his car or dog. Thereafter, he was off work due to ill health although she recalled he stayed at the vicarage for some time before he left. She recollected it was the Archdeacon and Rural Dean who instructed the survivor and the housekeeper to leave the vicarage, and she believes he had some help in finding alternative accommodation. She could not recall the survivor being in the vicarage much longer after the incident, and it took longer to find accommodation for the housekeeper.
- 10.27 A meeting was later held with the Bishop of Bradford at Bishopscoft with other members of the Parish. They were told that Trevor Devamanikkam would not be returning to the parish. She and others were surprised by this as they were expecting him back after he recovered. She recalled he then went to St Davids, Wales, in summer 1985.
- 10.28 The Deaconess recalled the Bishop of Bradford visiting St Aidan's on two occasions, a summer fete in 1985 and the licensing of the new incumbent on 15 September 1986. She did recall concerns about "sub-letting of the vicarage to lodgers but this was more in terms of the concerns of having lodgers."
- 10.29 The Deaconess agreed to be interviewed for this Review, her recollection was as recounted above, although she did comment that she thought the Bishop of Bradford had some involvement in finding accommodation for the survivor after he left the vicarage.

10.30 **Churchwarden who had been in St Aidan's Parish in 1984 when the survivor was living at the Vicarage**

- 10.31 A churchwarden at St Aidan's also provided a statement as part of the CDM investigation for the Bishop of Bradford, dated 27 November 2017, in response to the CDM complaint the survivor had made against him. He recalled the survivor appearing at the vicarage in 1984, he understood that he had come to stay with Trevor Devamanikkam having previously been staying with a friend of Trevor Devamanikkam. Also at the vicarage was the housekeeper. He recalled sometime during 1984/5, Trevor Devamanikkam contacted him to say that the Bishop of Bradford had asked him to find alternative accommodation for the survivor. He could not recall when this was, but believed it could have been either September/October 1984 or February/March 1985.
- 10.32 The churchwarden stated he drove the survivor and Trevor Devamanikkam to a Bed and Breakfast in Killinghall in Bradford, and that Trevor Devamanikkam told him he had been instructed to find some alternative accommodation for the survivor, but did not say why. He dropped them both at the Bed and Breakfast and waited about ten minutes when Trevor Devamanikkam emerged, and he drove him home. He recalled "within the week [the survivor] had reappeared at the vicarage and he remained there afterwards." He went on to say that in May 1985 (he could not be certain about the date) an incident took place at the vicarage, the Deaconess rang him and asked him to go to the vicarage. He went, he did not recall seeing the survivor or Trevor Devamanikkam, but the house had been "trashed" by Trevor Devamanikkam with a great deal of furniture broken. He stated he was very clear that the following day the Archdeacon and Rural Dean came to the vicarage, and following that, Trevor Devamanikkam was no longer practising due to ill health.
- 10.33 The churchwarden remembered he, his mother who was a fellow churchwarden, and the Deaconess, were summoned to visit the Bishop of Bradford at Bishopscroft. They were informed Trevor Devamanikkam would not be returning and he was taking up another job. The churchwarden said they were all shocked that he would not be returning to the parish once he recovered.
- 10.34 The churchwarden agreed to be interviewed for this Review, his recollection was recounted as above although he thought the survivor had been brought to the vicarage by a male friend of Trevor Devamanikkam.
- 10.35 In the survivor's response to the President of Tribunals dated 7 January 2018, appealing decisions that have been made in relation to his complaints, the survivor refuted the account of Trevor Devamanikkam's breakdown or the circumstances of him leaving the vicarage. The survivor stated he could not have been at the vicarage in 1985, by that time he was on a Youth Training scheme (YTS), and he would have been too old to do that if he had left in 1985. He stated Trevor Devamanikkam never had any breakdown whilst he was there, and that he was still the vicar at Buttershaw when he left the vicarage. He also commented on the churchwarden's statement which suggested that the Bishop of Bradford had asked Trevor Devamanikkam to find him alternative accommodation. He agreed with the suggestion he may have left the vicarage September/October 1984. He did not comment on the churchwarden's account that he drove him and Trevor Devamanikkam to a Bed and Breakfast, nor the suggestion made by the churchwarden that within a week the survivor had returned to the vicarage.

10.36 **National Safeguarding Team and Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers Accounts**

10.37 The Senior Caseworker National Safeguarding Team and Leeds Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers separately had conversations with the survivor in relation to his time at the vicarage. In an email dated 21 September 2016 from the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser Leeds to the Senior Caseworker National Safeguarding Team, she references a forty-minute call she had with the survivor that day and stated the survivor “reiterated that the Bishop of Bradford came to the vicarage the day after the breakdown of Trevor Devamanikkam.”

10.38 The Senior Caseworker National Safeguarding Team also had a three-hour meeting with the survivor on 2 May 2018. She took notes of the meeting which included the survivor stating it had been agreed that he would stay with Trevor Devamanikkam at the vicarage for two weeks’ respite care, but he actually stayed for twelve weeks. The notes also set out that the survivor found a job working part-time at the market whilst living at the vicarage and he had met a boy at the market who said he had been with “Trevor Devamanikkam and lots of other boys too.” In the notes, the survivor describes the abuse that occurred and said Trevor Devamanikkam suggested his “nan would be ashamed if she knew.” According to the notes, the survivor was asked to leave the vicarage by the Bishop of Bradford, he did not return to his grandmother’s as he did not know what she knew. The notes add that the survivor slept rough for two nights, then found a bedsit and applied for benefits. The notes also reference the survivor saying that two days after he moved into the bedsit, Trevor Devamanikkam bought him a Baby Belling cooker and he never saw him again. The Independent Reviewer has also seen a note of a communication meeting on 13 June 2018, where the senior case worker references her meeting with the survivor. The minutes of the meeting state the survivor did leave the vicarage, but then returned. The note goes on to say “An indication of the level of intimidation that abusers have over their victims”.

10.39 Another email seen by the Independent Reviewer sent to the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser Leeds in June 2018, referenced a conversation between the survivor and another member of Clergy, where the survivor is said to have disclosed the details of his abuse, and by whom, to the member of Clergy. He said he was seventeen at the time.

10.40 **Information Related to Trevor Devamanikkam**

10.41 When Trevor Devamanikkam was interviewed by West Yorkshire Police, he had said that the survivor had stayed with him “overnight or for a few nights.”

10.42 When Thames Valley Police attended Trevor Devamanikkam’s flat on 6 June 2017, they found the legal document notifying him of the charges against him on which he had written: “In my interview I was never told how long the survivor stayed with me I found out from Church Court he said 5 weeks, he in fact stayed over a year...”

10.43 The charges against Trevor Devamanikkam were dated between 27 March 1984 and 30 April 1985.

10.44 **Analysis**

- 10.45 The Independent Reviewer was unable to speak with a number of individuals in relation to the survivor's time at the vicarage, either because they were no longer alive, or they did not respond to her invitation to participate in the Review.
- 10.46 It is clear the survivor spent a period of time at the vicarage where Trevor Devamanikkam lived with his housekeeper. The survivor's account of how he left the vicarage has been consistent. He was asked to leave the vicarage by the Bishop of Bradford following conversations between his grandmother and Trevor Devamanikkam and the subsequent conversation the next day between the Bishop of Bradford and Trevor Devamanikkam. The survivor believed his grandmother had reported the abuse to the Bishop.
- 10.47 The survivor by his own admission was not party to either of these conversations.
- 10.48 The survivor stated in his complaint against the Bishop of Bradford that, when he left the vicarage, he did not go to his grandmother's house "as I did not know if she knew of the sexual abuse that had been going on."
- 10.49 The Bishop of Bradford's response to the complaint against him confirms he was aware there were people living at the vicarage and he asked for this to be looked into, but he states he had no direct involvement in the survivor leaving the vicarage nor had he met him. He did concede his instruction to find out who was at the vicarage may have led to the survivor leaving, but he claims he had no involvement in this.
- 10.50 Written evidence and interviews with others at the Parish during this period provide additional, but conflicting, information regarding the survivor's time at the vicarage, and in particular how long he was at the vicarage and the events that led to him leaving there.
- 10.51 The accounts provided by the churchwarden and the Deaconess of Trevor Devamanikkam's "breakdown", and the subsequent departure of both the survivor, the housekeeper and then Trevor Devamanikkam himself, are quite time-specific and would suggest the survivor was at the vicarage until 1985. If these accounts are not factual, this becomes an incredulous version of how the survivor, the housekeeper and Trevor Devamanikkam left the vicarage.
- 10.52 The fact that the Deaconess and churchwarden both suggested other Clergy were involved in the survivor and others leaving the vicarage does not mean the Bishop of Bradford did not visit the vicarage. However, other than the survivor's account of events, it is not possible to confirm he did.
- 10.53 The Independent Reviewer is not able to substantiate the survivor's claim that the Bishop of Bradford knew of the alleged abuse that was taking place. Furthermore, based on the material reviewed, the Independent Reviewer is unclear as to how the survivor could substantiate that claim as he states he was not party to any of the discussions that took place between Trevor Devamanikkam and the Bishop of Bradford, or Trevor Devamanikkam and his grandmother.
- 10.54 Based on the information available to her, the Independent Reviewer is left wondering if the survivor resided at the vicarage between 1984-1985, and during this period was asked to leave the vicarage but returned after a short period of time, and finally left following Trevor Devamanikkam's "breakdown" in 1985.

11. Alleged Verbal Disclosure to the Bishop of Doncaster - 28 July 2012

- 11.1 **This section relates to events in the Diocese of Sheffield in 2012, and any reference to the Bishop of Doncaster hereafter is to the incumbent at the time.**
- 11.2 The survivor brought a number of related complaints against the Bishop of Doncaster between 2016 and 2018. These complaints were in respect of a disclosure regarding his own abuse to the Bishop of Doncaster in July 2012 and a safeguarding concern at a local school.
- 11.3 With reference to the disclosure of his own abuse, the survivor alleged that in July 2012, at the end of a Parochial Church Council (PCC) meeting, he verbally disclosed to the Bishop of Doncaster that he had been sexually abused. This is alleged to have taken place in the vestry. His complaint was that the Bishop of Doncaster failed to act on this disclosure. This is the first time the survivor stated he made a disclosure of non-recent abuse, he stated he did not name Trevor Devamanikkam.
- 11.4 The survivor secondly alleged that the Bishop of Doncaster lied at a PCC meeting in July 2012, where the survivor alleged the Bishop of Doncaster had stated that, in relation to allegations of abuse at the local school by a member of staff, the police had been called and the matter sorted. The survivor alleged that the police had not been called, and therefore the Bishop of Doncaster had failed to act upon allegations of abuse and had lied at the PCC meeting. As a result of the survivor's concerns that the matter had not been investigated, he made two anonymous referrals, one in 2012 to the NSPCC after the PCC meeting, and a further call to the NSPCC in 2015, when there was a further allegation made against the same member of staff at the school. The survivor stated he had contacted South Yorkshire Police in October 2017, and they had said they had not been contacted by the Bishop of Doncaster or the school regarding allegations of sexual abuse. He said South Yorkshire Police confirmed to him they had received information in 2012 and 2015 via calls made to the NSPCC regarding the allegations, and the matters had been investigated.
- 11.5 In one of the survivor's complaints against the Bishop of Doncaster in May 2016, he stated that at the PCC meeting on 28 July 2012, the Bishop was informed about the alleged abuse allegations at the school, and he promised the PCC that he would look into the matter and get back to the PCC at a later date, but they never heard back from him.
- 11.6 In another complaint the survivor made against the Bishop of Doncaster in December 2017, he stated the Bishop had already been informed about the abuse allegations and that the purpose of the meeting in July 2012 was to update the PCC about the action taken.
- 11.7 In a further complaint, dated 25 September 2018, against the Bishop of Doncaster, the survivor refers to the PCC meeting in July 2012. He stated the Bishop did not act on a safeguarding concern at a local school, and, because of his dissatisfaction with the Bishop's response at the PCC meeting and scepticism regarding Rotherham Council Children Services, he reported the disclosures to the NSPCC who contacted the police. He stated: "I did this after the PCC meeting with the Bishop of Doncaster."
- 11.8 In a separate complaint against the Bishop of Sheffield, the survivor alludes to the school safeguarding issue, saying in early 2012 he received a letter through the vicarage door from a mother alleging her children had been sexually abused by someone working at the school. The

- survivor stated he advised the mother to speak to the Headteacher and report the matter to the police. The survivor stated he reported the matter to the Diocese of Sheffield Director of Education [he gave a name, but this person was not in post at that time], he also visited the school and told the Headteacher he knew of the allegations. He said he was told that “the matter had been dealt with and it was nothing to do with him.” He stated he was told the police had looked into it, but he did not believe the Headteacher.
- 11.9 The survivor stated the matter was referred to a committee of the School Governing Body and there was then a separate meeting with the PCC and the Bishop of Doncaster. He stated the PCC demanded to know what was going on and expressed their disgust at the lack of action. The survivor stated the Bishop of Doncaster promised to look into the matter and get back to them, he stated to this date (almost four years) they have heard nothing.
- 11.10 In his submission to IICSA, the survivor stated that a meeting took place in July 2012, this meeting was between the PCC and the Bishop of Doncaster. He alleged that one of the issues discussed at this meeting related to a safeguarding matter at the local school. He alleged that the Bishop stated at the meeting that the police had been called regarding the safeguarding matter and it had been “sorted.” He stated that he and others did not believe the Bishop and he was “cross.” He said that he asked the Bishop if he could have two minutes in the vestry with him at the end of the meeting and he stated that he said: “Do you know why I am so cross because this happened to me and I have never told anybody in what was then 28 years, and I am not going to stand by. I am the Vicar, I am older. I am not standing by and potentially letting this happen to children on my patch.” He stated that the Bishop replied by saying “Well, thank you for telling me,” and he then left the meeting.
- 11.11 The Independent Reviewer is aware that the survivor also submitted two letters from people at the PCC meeting, addressed to the President of Tribunals, as supporting evidence to his claim that the Bishop of Doncaster had said the police had been called.
- 11.12 The Bishop of Doncaster was interviewed as part of the Review, he provided the Independent Reviewer with a significant amount of information relevant to the Review. He spoke of the meeting held on 28 July 2012 which was arranged over what had been described as pastoral breakdown between the survivor, the PCC, and the local school. The Bishop of Doncaster had only been in post since February 2012, and this was his first meeting with the survivor and the PCC. The Bishop of Doncaster stated that the meeting was not called to discuss any matters relating to safeguarding nor were any discussed at the meeting, and it would not have been appropriate to do so. He recalled the meeting being a “difficult meeting.” He denied making any comments regarding the police investigating a safeguarding matter and it having been “sorted”, nor was he aware of the safeguarding matters that had been raised at the school at that time. He could not recall everyone who was at the meeting, but there were PCC representatives and the survivor.
- 11.13 The Bishop of Doncaster had requested copies of the minutes of the PCC meeting held on 28 July 2012 as part of his response to the complaint made against him. He was told by the incumbent at that time that no minutes could be found of the PCC meeting of 28 July 2012, and that “virtually no records or paperwork were left in the possession of the parish or had seemingly been destroyed or are unaccounted for at the departure of the previous incumbent.”
- 11.14 The Bishop was asked by the Independent Reviewer about his conversation with the survivor in the vestry after the PCC meeting. He could not recall the detail of the discussion, but he stated

- no disclosure of abuse was made to him by the survivor. He stated he only met the survivor on one further occasion at a meeting on 7 November 2012 that was held at the local school, which included the school Head/Chair of Governors and the Diocesan Director of Education. This meeting was again to discuss the deteriorating relationship between the school and the Church. He stated there was no reference to any safeguarding matters at this meeting either.
- 11.15 The Bishop stated he was asked about the allegations made by the survivor against him, by both the police and the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser, and on each occasion he told them the survivor had not disclosed any abuse to him. It was the police that disclosed the name of the alleged perpetrator, and this was the first time the Bishop of Doncaster had heard Trevor Devamanikkam's name mentioned.
- 11.16 The Independent Reviewer contacted the relevant Local Authority regarding the allegations made by the survivor around the safeguarding concerns at the local school in 2012 and 2015.
- 11.17 They provided information that on 6 July 2012, a Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) strategy meeting was held following an anonymous referral (the referrer did not give their name), dated 4 July 2012. The referral set out alleged allegations of sexual abuse by someone working at the school. The allegations included inappropriate touching, the fact that the person was going into toilets and looking under toilet doors and "patting" children on their bottoms. It was also alleged one child had gone home crying and did not want to go back to the school, and the older boy kept asking to speak to the police.
- 11.18 The person making the anonymous referral had said that members of the family were concerned about what would happen to the boys, and this included them being taken into care. This allegation was investigated by the Local Authority and police, and a follow-up strategy meeting took place on 11 July 2012.
- 11.19 A further anonymous referral was made (the referrer's name was given in this instance) on 13 May 2015 of sexual abuse against the same individual as July 2012. The details of this referral were that the referrer stated that a parent had alleged that the same person from 2012 had been sexually assaulting both her children since 2012.
- 11.20 On 4 June 2015, a LADO allegations meeting was held. This matter was investigated by the Local Authority and police, and the notes state "there is clear evidence to indicate that the parent making the allegations is currently unwell and she has made other allegations which appear to be similarly unfounded... the parent made very similar allegations in 2012."
- 11.21 The information provided by the Local Authority confirms that the first referral had been jointly investigated by the police and the Local Authority before the PCC meeting on 28 July.
- 11.22 **Analysis**
- 11.23 There is contradictory information from the survivor as to the purpose of the PCC meeting. He suggests it was both to raise concerns around the safeguarding matter at the school and the Bishop of Doncaster saying he would look into this, and also the Bishop of Doncaster saying at the meeting that the safeguarding matter had been investigated and the police had been called.
- 11.24 The Bishop of Doncaster provided background evidence to the PCC meeting which did relate to disquiet between the PCC, the parish, and the local school. He was clear that there was no discussion around safeguarding matters at the school and he was not aware of any concerns relating to the school until May 2016, when the survivor made the complaint against him. It

- should be noted that, having learned from the complaint made against him by the survivor about the school incident, the Bishop of Doncaster then asked the Diocesan Director of Education to confirm that action had been taken by the school.
- 11.25 The survivor states he made both anonymous referrals to the NSPCC regarding the safeguarding concerns, the first one was “straight after the PCC meeting in July 2012.” That cannot be accurate as the first referral was made on 4 July 2012 and the PCC meeting was 28 July 2012. There is clear evidence that the safeguarding concerns relating to a local school had been jointly investigated and concluded before the PCC meeting was held on 28 July 2012. This was also confirmed in a letter to the Bishop of Doncaster from the then headteacher.
- 11.26 As an aside, had the Bishop of Doncaster fed back to the PCC meeting on 28 July 2012 that the police had been called and the matter investigated regarding the safeguarding concern at the school, it would have been an accurate comment to make.
- 11.27 In relation to the survivor’s allegation that he disclosed his own abuse to the Bishop of Doncaster in the vestry after the PCC meeting on 28 July 2012, the Bishop of Doncaster refutes that suggestion.
- 11.28 The Independent Reviewer is not able to substantiate the survivor’s claim that he did make a verbal disclosure of abuse to the Bishop of Doncaster.

12. Verbal Disclosure to the Bishop of Sheffield - December 2012

- 12.1 **This section relates to events in the Diocese of Sheffield in 2012, and any reference to the Bishop of Sheffield hereafter is to the incumbent at the time.**
- 12.2 In the survivor’s complaint against the Bishop of Sheffield dated May 2016, the survivor refers to a telephone call the week before Christmas 2012. He stated there had been a burglary at the vicarage, the Bishop of Sheffield had rung him and during this call, he asked the Bishop if he was aware of the meeting between the PCC and the Bishop of Doncaster, the allegations at the school and “the disclosure of abuse which I then told him about.” He said he went on to tell the Bishop of Sheffield of his abuse and what had occurred at the meeting with the Bishop of Doncaster.
- 12.3 The survivor told IICSA that he made his first disclosure to the Bishop of Sheffield on the telephone in December 2012. He had been burgled several times at the vicarage, including December 2012. As a result of this, he received a visit by the Archdeacon of Doncaster, and then the next day the Bishop of Sheffield rang to ask how he was.
- 12.4 He stated that during this telephone conversation with the Bishop of Sheffield, he said “You and I need to chat... Did the [Bishop of Doncaster] tell you about the school and about my own disclosure to him of my own abuse?”. He stated the Bishop of Sheffield replied, “I can’t remember”. He stated he then told the Bishop “everything”, he stated he told the Bishop about the school, everything that had happened there and told him that “I said to Bishop of Doncaster I was abused by a priest”. He stated he named Trevor Devamanikkam to the Bishop of Sheffield in this conversation with him. He stated the Bishop of Sheffield then said he had to leave the call as he had another meeting to go to.

- 12.5 The Bishop of Sheffield was interviewed for this Review. He gave some background to his appointment and his recollection of the conversation he had in December 2012. He was appointed to his role in 2009. During 2009/2010 he visited all the licensed Clergy in their own homes including the survivor. The survivor had a routine ministerial review with the then Bishop of Beverley on 24 April 2012, the report of this review included mention of burglaries at the vicarage, as a result of which the Bishop wrote to the survivor on 18 July 2012, offering to meet with him in the autumn. He received no reply back.
- 12.6 The Bishop of Sheffield stated the conversation with the survivor the week before Christmas 2012 was as a result of a further burglary at the vicarage. He said the survivor was understandably upset on the phone because of the burglaries. The Bishop recalled that, during the conversation, the survivor did allude to something in his past, that he had been abused but he did not mention by who. He did not believe the survivor wanted him to act on what he had said. He recalled the survivor did make some reference to telling the Bishop of Doncaster about his abuse and also mentioned the safeguarding concerns at the school. The Bishop did not recall ending the call “suddenly”, but said he may have only had a limited time to speak with the survivor because of other engagements.
- 12.7 The Bishop of Sheffield also said he discussed with the Bishop of Doncaster about the survivor’s allegations, and the Bishop of Doncaster had said he had not made any disclosure to him and the meeting with the PCC was in relation to a breakdown in relationships with the school and the Church.
- 12.8 The Bishop of Sheffield said he believed that he had had a brief discussion with his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser about the survivor’s disclosure, and was advised there was “nothing to act on.” He is aware the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser has no recollection of any discussions with him around this case.
- 12.9 The Bishop of Sheffield did not take notes or make any record of this first telephone conversation even though the survivor had made reference to some past abuse and also to a possible safeguarding concern at a school.
- 12.10 The Bishop of Sheffield did arrange an in-person follow-up visit to the survivor in his vicarage out of concern for his wellbeing. This is referenced in Section 14.
- 12.11 **Analysis**
- 12.12 The Bishop of Sheffield has confirmed the survivor did mention he had been abused in the telephone conversation of December 2012; he refutes the suggestion that Trevor Devamanikkam was named. The Bishop did not believe the survivor wanted him to act on his disclosure and he took no notes of the conversation. The Bishop thought he had a brief discussion with his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser; this is not corroborated.
- 12.13 In discussion with the Independent Reviewer, the Bishop recognised the role his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser had in supporting him in relation to disclosures of abuse. The Bishop did not follow the policies and procedures in place at the time. He recognised he should have done so and that he should have attempted to see if the survivor wanted to discuss the disclosures further or needed further support in doing so.
- 12.14 The survivor’s allegation that he disclosed his abuse to the Bishop of Sheffield, and he did not act on the disclosure, is substantiated. However, the Independent Reviewer cannot substantiate that Trevor Devamanikkam was named during this conversation.

13. Alleged Verbal Disclosure to the Archdeacon of Rotherham - 7 February 2013

- 13.1 **This section relates to events in the Diocese of Sheffield in 2012, and any reference to the Archdeacon of Rotherham hereafter is to the incumbent at the time.**
- 13.2 The survivor told IICSA that he verbally disclosed he had been abused to the Archdeacon of Rotherham at a meeting held at Church House to discuss his management of a safeguarding issue in his parish.
- 13.3 The survivor stated the meeting ended up in a “bit of a row”, and he said: “I have told [Bishop of Doncaster] I was abused, I have told [Bishop of Sheffield] and now I am telling you.” The survivor said he did not name Trevor Devamanikkam.
- 13.4 There is also reference to the survivor stating he disclosed his abuse to the Archdeacon of Rotherham and the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser in one of his complaints against the Bishop of Sheffield. He states that during a telephone call of 13 February 2013, he asked the Bishop of Sheffield if “the Archdeacon and Child Safeguarding officer had told him he had disclosed his abuse to them.”
- 13.5 The Archdeacon of Rotherham provided information for this Learning Lessons Review, but following the survivor’s objection to sharing of information, he requested the information he had initially provided be returned and not used. This was complied with by the Independent Reviewer. Whilst the Archdeacon did not want to provide any written information to the Independent Reviewer at the request of the survivor, he did agree to speak to the Independent Reviewer in relation to the meeting held with the survivor on 7 February 2013.
- 13.6 The Archdeacon stated the meeting was arranged to discuss a safeguarding issue in the survivor’s parish; also at the meeting was the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser. He said the meeting with the survivor came after a series of other meetings with him which had been “difficult meetings.” The meeting was around half an hour long, but he couldn’t recall accurately as it was seven years ago. The Archdeacon recalled the meeting as being “fairly heated” and the survivor made a number of accusations relating to a number of senior people in the Diocese. He did not deny it was possible that the survivor did say something as he left the meeting on 7 February, but if he did, he had no recollection of hearing anything that was in his view a disclosure of abuse.
- 13.7 The Archdeacon commented that the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser’s handwritten notes of the meeting referred to the survivor making “various other comments not related to the matter”, and the President of Tribunals, when dealing with the complaint against him, commented on the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser’s note, saying it was “possible that the survivor did make disclosures at that point.”
- 13.8 The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser agreed to speak to the Independent Reviewer via phone. She recalled the meeting on 7 February 2013, which took place in a small room at Church House with herself, the Archdeacon of Rotherham and the survivor. The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser did not recall the survivor making any disclosures of abuse whilst she was there, and, had he done so, she would have acted on this disclosure and asked him more questions regarding what he was alleging. She stated that the room was small, and she would have heard

- any comments made. The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser confirmed she prepared a report after this meeting for the Archdeacon and the Bishop of Sheffield.
- 13.9 Sheffield Diocese provided very limited information for this Review which was somewhat surprising given the involvement of a number of Clergy from this Diocese at the time. Whilst the note of the meeting of 7 February 2013 was not shared with the Independent Reviewer, the current Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser at Sheffield confirmed that there was no mention of any disclosure of abuse in the written record of the meeting.
- 13.10 The Independent Reviewer also made enquiries to see whether there had been a complaint made by the survivor against the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser, given she was at the meeting with him and the Archdeacon. The survivor might have considered making a complaint against the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser if, given her role, she had not acted on the allegation he stated he had made at the meeting. Sheffield Diocese confirmed they have no record of any complaint made against the previous Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser in either 2013, 2014 or 2015.
- 13.11 **Analysis**
- 13.12 The survivor states he verbally disclosed his abuse at the end of the meeting on 7 February 2013; he did not name Trevor Devamanikkam.
- 13.13 The Archdeacon of Rotherham stated he had no recollection of any disclosure being made; the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser was clear she heard no disclosure of abuse at that meeting. The written record taken by the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser at the time makes no reference to any disclosure of abuse by the survivor. Whilst the Independent Reviewer has not seen a note of the meeting with the survivor on 7 February 2013, she is aware the last sentence states: "After some lengthy complaint about previous circumstances from the survivor, he left."
- 13.14 The survivor took a complaint out against the Archdeacon of Rotherham, but appears not to have made a complaint against the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser whose role was to ensure allegations of abuse are responded to and dealt with appropriately.
- 13.15 In his letters to the Bishop of Sheffield dated 26 March 2013 and 1 June 2013, the survivor refers to the abuse he says he disclosed to the Bishop of Sheffield and Doncaster, but makes no reference to disclosing to the Archdeacon and his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser. It is unclear why the survivor does not mention his disclosures to them in these letters.
- 13.16 Other than the survivor's evidence, the Independent Reviewer has not been presented with any other information that would support the survivor's allegation that he verbally disclosed he was abused at the end of a meeting on 7 February 2013.
- 13.17 The Independent Reviewer is not able to substantiate the survivor's claim that he did make a verbal disclosure of abuse to the Archdeacon of Rotherham.

14. Alleged Verbal Disclosure to the Bishop of Sheffield

- 14.1 **This section relates to events in the Diocese of Sheffield in 2013, and any reference to the Bishop of Sheffield hereafter is to the incumbent at the time.**
- 14.2 The survivor told the IICSA inquiry that he made a further verbal disclosure during a telephone call to the Bishop of Sheffield in February 2013. He stated during this call he said to the Bishop

- of Sheffield “Do you remember our telephone call before Christmas,” he stated the Bishop replied, “I can’t quite remember”. He stated he told the Bishop “everything again and he did nothing.”
- 14.3 The survivor also made a complaint against the Bishop of Sheffield in May 2016, he alleged he disclosed his abuse again on Ash Wednesday (13 February 2013). He stated that during this call he asked the Bishop of Sheffield if “The Archdeacon and Child Safeguarding officer had told him that he had disclosed his abuse to them, and also did he remember he had disclosed to the Bishop of Doncaster and himself previously.” The survivor stated the Bishop did not answer him, he then stated he was going to resign, it was now making him ill, he was being made a scapegoat and “now two Bishops, an Archdeacon and a Child Safeguarding officer had all had an adult disclose sexual abuse and rape to them and had done absolutely nothing.” He stated the conversation then ended.
- 14.4 When interviewed, the Bishop of Sheffield stated he had arranged to visit the survivor on 14 February 2013 in response to the letter he had sent in July 2012 and the telephone call they had in December 2012; this visit was arranged by his secretary. This visit was part of a programme of pastoral visits to Clergy routinely in their own homes. On 11 February 2013, the Bishop had to call the survivor to inform him he would not be able to meet with him as he had just received notification of a complaint against the survivor under the CDM process. This complaint had arisen following on from a meeting the survivor had with the Archdeacon of Rotherham and his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser on 7 February 2013. The Bishop of Sheffield stated he was the person who made the survivor aware of the impending complaint against him (which was followed up in writing on 14 February). This letter also made the survivor aware of the pastoral support he could receive from a recently retired Bishop during this complaints process against him.
- 14.5 The Bishop of Sheffield took notes of the conversation he had with the survivor as the survivor indicated he was going to resign his position, and the Bishop advised him to think carefully and take advice before taking such a step. It was agreed at the survivor’s request that he would remain in his post and serve three months’ notice before he left his parish. The Bishop of Sheffield stated he was reasonably confident that the survivor did not disclose or mention anything about the abuse in this telephone conversation, and the notes he took make no reference to any disclosure nor any mention of Trevor Devamanikkam. The Bishop of Sheffield stated the survivor subsequently resigned two days later, his resignation letter gave a number of reasons why he was resigning but made no reference to his abuse or any reference to having disclosed to anyone. The letter ended: “Dear Bishop, I wish to apologise for any way in which you feel I have let you down. I know we do not agree on certain fundamental issues of the practice of the faith, but I hope you will also believe me when I say that I have always tried to do my best to be a true servant of God in this place.”
- 14.6 **Analysis**
- 14.7 The Bishop of Sheffield cannot recall any disclosure of abuse by the survivor during the telephone call of 11 February 2013, nor any reference to Trevor Devamanikkam.
- 14.8 The Bishop of Sheffield stated he was not aware of Trevor Devamanikkam’s name until the police investigations into the allegations of abuse began in April 2016.

- 14.9 He took notes of the discussion he had with the survivor; there is no reference to any disclosure of abuse.
- 14.10 The survivor in his resignation letter to the Bishop of Sheffield gave a number of reasons why he was resigning his post as Clergy. There was no reference of any disclosures to the Bishop of Sheffield in this letter.
- 14.11 The Independent Reviewer is not able to substantiate the survivor's claim that he verbally disclosed to the Bishop of Sheffield for a second time nor that he mentioned Trevor Devamanikkam's name.

15. Written Disclosures to the Bishop of Sheffield - 26 March 2013 and 1 June 2013

- 15.1 **This section relates to events in the Diocese of Sheffield in 2013, and any reference to the Bishop of Sheffield hereafter is to the incumbent at the time.**
- 15.2 The survivor wrote to the Bishop of Sheffield on 26 March 2013. This was his response to the complaint that had been brought out against him by the Archdeacon of Rotherham and the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser. In this letter, he details the events of the meeting with the Archdeacon and the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser. He makes no reference to disclosing any abuse to either of them but does say, "I also find it incredible that myself having disclosed both to the Bishop of Doncaster and the Bishop of Sheffield of the abuse I suffered as a youngster at the hands of a priest and having received no pastoral support whatsoever in spite of this being the Church's own guidelines...."
- 15.3 The survivor told the IICSA inquiry that he had written two letters to the Bishop of Sheffield, one on 26 March 2013 and another on 1 June 2013 (by which time he had left the parish). He does not give any detail around the 26 March letter but does refer to the letter dated 1 June 2013, "You will never know what it took to tell you, but you will also never know the hurt you and your suffragan have caused me by doing absolutely nothing about it." The survivor stated the letter of 1 June 2013 was copied to the President of Tribunals, the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Beverley. He told the inquiry he received no replies to his letter of 1 June 2013 except for a response from the Archbishop of York who he said wrote back and said, "Thank you for copying me into the letter which I have read, please be assured of my prayers and best wishes during this testing time."
- 15.4 The Bishop of Sheffield, when interviewed, said the survivor's letter of 26 March 2013 would have been seen by his Registrar and his chaplain, whom he thought might deal with any concerns in the letter. He saw his role at that time as one in responding/dealing with the complaint process under the CDM against the survivor. The Bishop stated that any response to the complaint would have been copied into the Archdeacon of Rotherham, and he assumed at the time also to the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser as she supported the Archdeacon to make the complaint against the survivor. His assumption was also based on a substantial quotation from the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser in the Archdeacon's reply back to the response from the survivor dated 1 May 2013. He believed the survivor had not made any verbal disclosures of

- abuse in detail in the two phone calls, and had been offered pastoral support in relation to the complaint against himself.
- 15.5 The survivor sent a further letter to the Bishop of Sheffield dated 1 June 2013; this was in response to the outcome of a complaint against him. In this letter, the survivor states: “Finally, I am especially appalled by both you and the Bishop of Doncaster lack of pastoral care and duty towards myself and especially in relation to my revealing to you both (twice to yourself) that I have suffered sexual abuse as a youth by a priest.” The Bishop stated this letter would have been seen by his Registrar and his Chaplain whose role it is to support him, including in relation to complaints. He stated he would have looked to them for advice on how to respond. He stated that part of his thinking at that time around not responding to the letter was it contained many inaccuracies. There had also been a number of complex matters he had been dealing with in relation to the survivor and his former parish. The Bishop believed he would have needed to respond to the whole letter and its contents. The Bishop did reflect he could have addressed the matter regarding the survivor’s disclosure and simply said something else regarding the other matters.
- 15.6 The Bishop confirmed he did not share the letter with his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser as she had been part of the meeting with the survivor on 7 February 2013 with the Archdeacon of Rotherham, and, as she had been involved in the complaint against the survivor, this could/may have compromised the complaint process.
- 15.7 The Independent Reviewer asked the Bishop of Sheffield if he had considered contacting statutory organisations such as the police or the Local Authority. He stated he would not have thought to do this at that time, and there was no National Safeguarding Team to seek advice from in 2013. He stated his actions would be very different now and that safeguarding is much better resourced at both a local and national level. The Bishop stated that if a similar case were referred now, a Core Group meeting would be set up to discuss and agree actions.
- 15.8 The Bishop of Sheffield recognised several years ago that he did not follow the policies and procedures at that time, and he should have sought advice from his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser regarding the disclosure the survivor made in his letters to ensure they were acted on and the survivor was offered support.
- 15.9 The Bishop of Sheffield has made a number of offers to meet with the survivor to discuss his actions which were thwarted by the ongoing complaints and police investigations into his actions. No further action was taken by the Church or by the police following these investigations.
- 15.10 The Bishop of Sheffield first made an offer to meet with the survivor when he was responding to the survivor’s letter to make his complaint out of time in July 2016. He made contact with the survivor in September 2016, this offer was made prior to his enthronement as the Bishop of Oxford which took place on 30 September 2016. At that time, the survivor was advised by the police not to meet with him. The Bishop contacted the survivor again on 27 June 2017, with an offer to meet and the survivor replied saying he had consulted with his solicitor and was willing to meet with him and asked the Bishop, “Do you now regret or are sorry for not having taken my disclosure seriously and responding to them properly.” It appears the Bishop did not receive this email and only became aware it had been sent when officers at the National Safeguarding Team informed him the survivor had not heard back from him. The Bishop immediately contacted the National Safeguarding Team and asked that they let the survivor know he had not

received the email but was willing to meet with him. The Bishop wrote again to the survivor on 12 April 2019, with an offer to meet with him in that letter. The Bishop in the letter makes reference to various offers to meet with the survivor since he made his complaints against him in 2016. He goes on to say “My offer remains open and is sincerely made. I regret the breakdown in our relationship, and I am prepared to make an apology for the ways in which I fell short of your expectations.”

15.11 The Bishop of Sheffield confirmed that his offer to meet with the survivor remains.

15.12 **Analysis**

15.13 The Bishop of Sheffield received two letters from the survivor dated 26 March 2013 and 1 June 2013, where he stated he had been abused by a priest. The letters also refer to the fact the survivor stated he had previously made disclosures of abuse to the Bishop of Sheffield and the Bishop of Doncaster.

15.14 The Bishop of Sheffield did not seek advice from his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser regarding the letters, believing that doing so would potentially compromise a complaint he was dealing with relating to the survivor. This was the wrong course of action to have taken.

15.15 The Bishop of Sheffield should have sought advice from his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser and the survivor should have been contacted and supported to discuss in detail what support he might want, and also, as importantly, be encouraged to report his disclosures of abuse to the police.

15.16 The Bishop of Sheffield did not follow the policies and procedures in place at that time.

15.17 The survivor’s allegations he disclosed his abuse on two occasions in written form and the Bishop of Sheffield did not act on the disclosures, are substantiated.

16. Letter dated 1 June 2013 Sent to the Archbishop of York/President of Tribunals and Bishop of Beverley

16.1 **This section relates to events in 2013, and any reference to the Archbishop of York, President of Tribunals and Bishop of Beverley hereafter is to the respective incumbents at the time.**

16.2 The survivor’s letter dated 1 June 2013 to the Bishop of Sheffield was copied to the Archbishop of York, the President of Tribunals, and the Bishop of Beverley. This letter contains a disclosure of abuse by a priest against the survivor which reads: “Finally, I am especially appalled by both you and the Bishop of Doncaster lack of pastoral care and duty towards myself and especially in relation to my revealing to both of you (twice to yourself) that I have suffered sexual abuse as a youth by a priest.”

16.3 Archbishop of York

16.3.1 The survivor made a CDM complaint against the Archbishop of York in May 2016, alleging that he failed to act on his written disclosure of abuse when he had been sent a copy of a letter sent to the Bishop of Sheffield on 1 June 2013. In this letter he had stated he had been abused as child by a priest. The letter of 1 June 2013 was sent by

the survivor as an accompanying letter to one sent to the Archbishop of York on 7 June 2013 in response to matters of a safeguarding complaint.

- 16.3.2 In his submission to IICSA, the survivor said that he wrote a letter, dated 1 June 2013, to the Bishop of Sheffield stating: “You will never know what it took to tell you, but you will also never know the hurt you and your suffragan have caused me by doing absolutely nothing about it.” The survivor stated that the letter was copied to the President of Tribunals, the Bishop of Beverley, and to the Archbishop of York. He told IICSA that the only person who responded to the letter was the Archbishop of York who wrote back saying, “Thank you for copying me into the letter, which I have read. Please be assured of my prayers and best wishes during this testing time.” The survivor went on to say to IICSA the Archbishop of York “did nothing.”
- 16.3.3 The Archbishop of York also gave evidence to IICSA, he was asked his views about the response he gave to the survivor’s allegations of abuse. He told IICSA that the responsibility for dealing with the disclosures “Actually did lie with the Bishop of Sheffield.” He went on to say “I got a copy on the back of another letter he had written to me, and I assumed that the Bishop was going to deal with this in a timely fashion because he had already dealt with another safeguarding matter in relationship to the survivor very propitiously, so my assumption was he was going to take this disclosure pretty seriously and deal with it, because that is where both the pastoral care really lay, and I happened to have been copied in, but I assumed the Bishop was going to be doing it.” When asked by a member of IICSA whether there was any impediment in the collective Church mind that prevents an apology to the survivor for the original abuse, the Archbishop of York replied, “I think the real problem comes because the evidence is contested.” He later went onto say in his submission to IICSA, “in one CDM my understanding is that the evidence was completely contested.”
- 16.3.4 The Archbishop of York agreed to be interviewed for this Review. He stated he had some prior involvement with the survivor in relation to safeguarding matters in the survivor’s parish, this had been in March 2013. On 7 June 2013, the Archbishop received a letter from the survivor, the letter related to matters pertaining to the survivor. The survivor made reference to the fact he was unhappy at the comments made by the Bishop of Sheffield in a letter to him, and also the treatment he had received from the Bishop and some members of staff in his Diocese. The survivor enclosed a copy of the letter dated 1 June 2013, sent to the Bishop of Sheffield so that the Archbishop could, “see for yourself and get a good true idea of what has been going on.”
- 16.3.5 The Archbishop was asked about the allegations of abuse made by the survivor in the letter and why he did not act on the letter. He stated he received legal advice from his Provincial Registrar on receiving the letter and was advised by his Registrar to concentrate on matters of a safeguarding complaint relating to the survivor at the time. The Archbishop believed he was told by his Registrar: “Your role in all of this must not be confused.” The Archbishop was advised by his Registrar just to acknowledge the letter, which he did on 2 July 2013. The Archbishop stated that in his view it was clear that the Church policy at the time, *Responding Well to those who have been sexually abused 2011* (paragraph 4.5), meant that any disclosures made by the survivor to the Bishop of Sheffield should have been dealt with by him - he was the person responsible

for dealing with such matters. The Archbishop believed the Diocese responsibilities were clear and it was his contention that he had “no authority to deal with safeguarding disclosure relating to another Diocese.” He had presumed the Bishop of Sheffield would deal with the matters raised in the survivor’s letter because he had dealt promptly with other safeguarding matters. He commented that, with hindsight, this presumption was perhaps mistaken.

- 16.3.6 When asked by the Independent Reviewer had he thought to follow up with the Bishop of Sheffield to see if he had acted on the letter the survivor had sent as a copy on the back of another letter to him, he stated he had not. The Archbishop stated his role was quasi-judicial and not one of policing disclosures made to another Diocesan Bishop. The Archbishop was of the view that the survivor would have been familiar with safeguarding policies and procedures and the complaint process, and he assumed the survivor would have instigated those had he wanted to do so.
- 16.3.7 The Archbishop stated that as he was copied into the letter sent by the survivor to the Bishop of Sheffield, as opposed to it being sent directly to him, had he considered intervening in any way he would have been accused of “interfering” or being an “interloper.” He stated, had the survivor written to him directly, he would have advised him to make a complaint and arranged pastoral care, and also taken advice from his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser, who was employed via the local NHS Trust at the time. The Archbishop stated it was not uncommon during his time as Archbishop of York to be copied into letters, and on occasions where he had looked to intervene, it had been made clear to him that he had no authority to do so.

Analysis

- 16.3.8 The letter the Archbishop received was not one of an allegation of abuse, but an allegation that the survivor had disclosed his sexual abuse as a youth to two senior Clergy (and in the case of one of the Clergy twice), and they had not provided him with the care he was entitled to as set out in Church guidelines and policies.
- 16.3.9 Whilst the Independent Reviewer understands that the Church of England is not a single entity, rather it consists of many essentially autonomous office holders and each Diocese is ultimately responsible for ensuring good safeguarding arrangements, the Independent Reviewer’s view is the Archbishop of York could have exercised some authority over the Bishop of Sheffield in this case.
- 16.3.10 The Archbishop of York surely has a role as one of the most senior Clergy in the Church of England of leading by example and encouraging others to do so.
- 16.3.11 The Archbishop of York and the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote the foreword for *Promoting a safe church 2006*, which clearly states: “An adult disclosing abuse is in a vulnerable state, above all they need someone to listen to them and also to believe them. They may need to be heard in different contexts and over several years.”
- 16.3.12 The Archbishop’s legal advice on receiving the survivor’s letter was to simply acknowledge the letter and not act on it. The fact that the Archbishop was dealing with other legal Church-related matters relating to the survivor should not have been a reason why there was not an acceptable response from the Archbishop or his staff in relation to the survivor’s historic allegations of abuse.

- 16.3.13 In the Independent Reviewer’s opinion, the Archbishop of York could have written to the Bishop of Sheffield to ensure he was responding to the survivor and ensuring he was being offered the necessary support. He should also have copied his letter to the survivor to the Bishop of Sheffield as well.
- 16.3.14 If the Archbishop of York felt unable to do that, then the Independent Reviewer sees no reason why he could not have written to the survivor directly (or asked someone to do it on his behalf) to ascertain what action and support the survivor wanted – that would have been a morally defensible position.
- 16.3.15 The Independent Reviewer acknowledges the dynamics of the Church of England and has noted the views of the Archbishop of York that he believed he had “no authority” to act in this matter, and held the view that “no-one is above the law.” The Archbishop of York would also contend he could not impose his will or opinions on others, that the “nature of authority should be observed”, and that the letter was not a disclosure to him as he was only copied in.
- 16.3.16 The Independent Reviewer’s professional opinion, however, is that no Church law excuses the responsibility of individuals not to act on matters of a safeguarding nature. The survivor had sent a copy of a letter to the Archbishop of York where he was clearly saying he had already disclosed twice to the Bishop of Sheffield his non-recent abuse and the Bishop had not acted on this. The Independent Reviewer cannot see how the Archbishop of York could have believed the Bishop of Sheffield would act on the survivor’s disclosures of abuse, given he had not previously.
- 16.3.17 The Archbishop of York should have sought advice from his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser at the time as to how to proceed with the letter sent from the survivor.
- 16.3.18 The survivor’s allegation that he disclosed his abuse to the Archbishop of York, and he did not act on this, is substantiated.

16.4 Bishop of Beverley

- 16.4.1 There was limited information available in relation to this disclosure.
- 16.4.2 The survivor alleged that the Bishop of Beverley failed to act on his written disclosure of abuse when he was copied into a letter sent to the Bishop of Sheffield dated 1 June 2013, where the survivor stated he had been sexually abused as a child by a priest.
- 16.4.3 In his verbal submission to IICSA, the survivor stated that he copied his letter to the Bishop of Sheffield and to the Bishop of Beverley who did not reply back to him.
- 16.4.4 The Bishop of Beverley was interviewed for this Review. He stated when he received a copy of the letter dated 1 June 2013, sent to the Bishop of Sheffield, he was last on the list of those copied in; the Archbishop of York and the President of Tribunals were copied in above his role. The Bishop stated he took pro bono legal advice on receiving the letter and was advised he had no jurisdiction in the matter and that the Bishop of Sheffield had responsibility for dealing with the letter. As a result of this legal advice, he took no action in relation to the letter. He added that his role as Bishop of Beverley was one of supporting traditionalist parishes in the Northern Province; this included the survivor’s parish. The Bishop stated he had been aware of “problems” in the survivor’s parish and had offered to support him previously, but that offer was not taken up. He

did not believe the survivor would have responded to any contact from him had he made it.

16.4.5 Analysis

- 16.4.6 The Bishop of Beverley received a letter from the survivor which not only disclosed he had been abused, it also stated two members of Clergy had failed to support the survivor.
- 16.4.7 The Bishop of Beverley sought legal advice on receiving a copy of the letter. That advice was to not act on the letter.
- 16.4.8 The letter was also sent to the Archbishop of York and was copied to the President of Tribunals who could be perceived to be in a more “senior” position of authority than the Bishop of Beverley.
- 16.4.9 The Independent Reviewer could not see any reason why the Bishop of Beverley could not have written back to the survivor to clarify what action he wanted him to take, if any. That would have been a reasonable position to have taken.
- 16.4.10 The survivor’s allegation that he disclosed his abuse to the Bishop of Beverley, and he did not act on it, are substantiated.

16.5 President of Tribunals

- 16.5.1 The letter of 1 June 2013 to the Bishop of Sheffield was also copied to the President of Tribunals, albeit with no clear address identified.
- 16.5.2 The Deputy Legal Advisor to the Archbishop Council and General Synod was requested to check to see if they could confirm whether the President had received the letter and, if so, if any response had been made.
- 16.5.3 The Deputy Legal Advisor confirmed there was no record of the letter dated 1 June 2013. At that time files were not kept for correspondence that was not related to an actual application to the President; this was the case in this instance.
- 16.5.4 The President of Tribunals was also sent a letter dated 7 June 2013 from the survivor which had a clear and correct address for the President of Tribunals’ office. This was a response to a letter sent by the President of Tribunals to the survivor. In this letter the survivor stated: “I have clearly been bullied out of office and having revealed abuse as a youth at the hands of a priest treat abominably.”
- 16.5.5 The Deputy Legal Advisor to the Archbishop Council and General Synod confirmed that they had discovered a letter, dated 7 June 2013, from the survivor to the office of The President of Tribunals.
- 16.5.6 The President of Tribunals was contacted by the Provincial Safeguarding Adviser at Bishopthorpe Palace to see if he was able to assist the Independent Reviewer in relation to his knowledge of this case.
- 16.5.7 He stated he had no recollection of the particular case mentioned and was therefore unable to assist with the Independent Reviewer’s request. He went on to say the only way he could refresh his memory of any letter said to be sent to him nine years ago would be to be shown relevant records in the files in Church House.

- 16.5.8 The Independent Reviewer is aware that whilst material, which is associated with this case is held at Church House, it is not complete nor comprehensive and cannot be relied upon.
- 16.5.9 As there was no evidence of either of the letters being seen personally by the President, this was not pursued further.

16.5.10 Analysis

- 16.5.11 The Independent Reviewer has been unable to confirm that the President of Tribunals had sight of either the letter dated 1 June 2013 or 7 June 2013, so she cannot substantiate that the President failed to act on any disclosures made by the survivor.

17. Further Disclosures of Abuse in September 2014

- 17.1 **This section relates to events in the Diocese of Leeds in 2014, and any reference to the Diocesan Director of Ordinands and the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser hereafter is to the incumbents at the time.**
- 17.2 During interviews with the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser Leeds, the Independent Reviewer was told and shown a written note that on 30 September 2014, the Diocesan Director of Ordinands (who worked in the same office) went to see her to discuss a disclosure made by the survivor. The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser could not recall the exact details, but there was no mention of Trevor Devamanikkam's name.
- 17.3 The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser's advice to the Diocesan Director of Ordinands was to advise the survivor to go to the police. She stated she told the Diocesan Director of Ordinands to make a note he had done so.
- 17.4 The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser believed she did not follow up with the Diocesan Director of Ordinands to see if he had done as she had suggested; she was of the view this was an "Informal piece of advice." However, having reflected on this matter and made further enquiries, she discovered a notebook record dated 1 October 2014. This note suggested a message had been left for the Diocesan Director of Ordinands for an update, but it is unclear what, if anything, happened.
- 17.5 The Diocesan Director of Ordinands was contacted by the Independent Reviewer, and whilst he initially engaged with the Review, he then subsequently asked that any information shared should not be used in this Review, at the request of the survivor who made the disclosure.
- 17.6 It was explained to him that information received from Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser would still be used for this Review.
- 17.7 The Independent Reviewer does not know whether the Diocesan Director of Ordinands did share the advice given by Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser with the survivor.
- 17.8 There is a chronology document, provided by the Leeds Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser, which suggests the Diocesan Director of Ordinands and the survivor spoke before Christmas 2014. This might indicate he did speak again with the survivor, but this is unclear.

17.9 **Analysis**

- 17.10 It appears the survivor made a further disclosure of abuse to the Diocesan Director of Ordinands in September 2014; it does not appear that Trevor Devamanikkam was named.
- 17.11 The Diocesan Director of Ordinands took the correct action in speaking with the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser who advised that the survivor be encouraged to go to the police.
- 17.12 The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser did make a brief note in her notebook around this conversation. After further enquiries, the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser also discovered a notebook record dated 1 October 2014, suggesting a message had been left for the Diocesan Director of Ordinands for an update, but it is unclear what, if anything, happened.
- 17.13 It is unclear whether the survivor was advised by the Diocesan Director of Ordinands to report his allegations to the police or not.
- 17.14 The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser accepted she should have followed up with the Diocesan Director of Ordinands, to make sure the advice she gave had been acted on, and, whilst it appears she may have attempted to follow this up, there was no record of any outcome.

18. Written Disclosure of Abuse 19 February 2015 to the Diocese of Leeds

- 18.1 **This section relates to events in the Diocese of Leeds in 2015, and any reference to incumbents hereafter is to those who held the post at the time.**
- 18.2 A letter before action which detailed a civil claim was received by Leeds Diocese in February 2015. This claim was for personal injury and loss from solicitors acting on behalf of the survivor. The letter stated the survivor was abused by Trevor Devamanikkam as a child.
- 18.3 This was the first time the Independent Reviewer had seen Trevor Devamanikkam named in writing prior to the survivor's CDM submissions in 2016.
- 18.4 This Civil Claim preceded the survivor going to West Yorkshire Police to make his complaint against Trevor Devamanikkam; this did not take place until 1 May 2015. It is unclear when the survivor disclosed the details of his abuse to his solicitor. In one of his responses to a CDM complaint he took out against the Bishop of Doncaster, he states he made contact with a solicitor in April 2014 who was to advise him when, in their opinion, the appropriate time was right to report his abuse to the police.
- 18.5 The Independent Reviewer considered what actions Leeds Diocese took before the survivor went to the police in May 2015.
- 18.6 The Bishop of Leeds and his Registrar were interviewed for this Review.
- 18.7 The Independent Reviewer was made aware that civil claims of abuse by incumbents should be addressed to the PCC as this is the body which holds the relevant insurance, and not to the Diocese which does not hold insurance cover for such claims. This is often not understood by lawyers unfamiliar with the Church.
- 18.8 The Registrar told the Independent Reviewer that it was clear from the letter of claim that the date of birth given, and the date of the alleged abuse, would have meant that the survivor was

- an adult at the time of the alleged abuse. Accordingly, he telephoned the survivor's solicitors and followed this up with a letter of 12 March 2015 to clarify this and some additional points.
- 18.9 In a follow-up interview with the Independent Reviewer, the Registrar stated he was fairly certain that, in his conversation with the survivor's solicitors in March 2015, he had asked them if the matter had been reported to the police. The Registrar acknowledged that he could not provide any documentary corroboration.
- 18.10 The survivor's solicitors confirmed in a letter dated 17 March 2015 that the survivor's date of birth they had provided was incorrect, and they provided the correct date of birth.
- 18.11 The Registrar subsequently sent the letter of claim to the Diocese insurers. The Independent Reviewer was told that there is very little contact with the insurers after that, only if they required further information as part of the claim would they be in touch with the Diocese.
- 18.12 The Registrar made contact with the Records office and Archived services and travelled to collect the relevant papers. He secured a copy of Trevor Devamanikkam's licence which confirmed his position when in the Diocese.
- 18.13 The Registrar recalled this process would have been two weeks at most. He also recognised no checks to the pension authorities had been made at that time which could have confirmed whether or not Trevor Devamanikkam was in receipt of a pension.
- 18.14 The Registrar in Leeds also emailed the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser on 12 March 2015.
- 18.15 In this email, he attached a copy of the survivor's solicitor's letter to her and stated: "Simply for information." He also attached copies of letters he had sent to the Bishop of Leeds and the Joint Diocesan Secretary regarding the civil claim.
- 18.16 The email from the Registrar goes onto say, "I am notifying you since it may be that Trevor Devamanikkam is still alive, but as he is not in Crockford" - (this is a clerical directory containing information on Clergy and locations where they have served) – "I wonder whether he is dead, and his name may therefore form part of deceased Clergy file."
- 18.17 At this point, Leeds Diocese were not aware of whether Trevor Devamanikkam was alive, hence this comment.
- 18.18 In his letter to the Joint Diocesan Secretary, the Registrar asks her to notify the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser concerning the allegations, but he did in fact copy her in any way to the correspondence. He also enclosed a copy of the survivor's solicitor's letter to the Joint Diocesan Secretary.
- 18.19 In his letter to the Bishop of Leeds, the Registrar informs him that he had written to the insurers, and he also asks whether Trevor Devamanikkam's blue file (confidential Clergy file/main personnel file) or if any other records are held at the Bishop's office. As Trevor Devamanikkam had left the Diocese 30 years previously, it became clear that the Bishop's office would not hold any such records. The Registrar also enclosed a copy of the survivor's solicitor's letter.
- 18.20 In discussion with the Independent Reviewer, the Registrar wondered on reflection whether, because the letter they received came from the survivor's solicitors and not from the survivor himself, this led to a set of responses and actions within the Diocese which otherwise may have been different.
- 18.21 The Registrar believed the response from the Diocese had been prompt and entirely appropriate in response to a civil letter of action detailing a claim for damages. However, the response from the Diocese would have been different had the allegations and the reporting of the abuse come from the survivor direct and not through his lawyers. This restricted what could have been done,

- for example, he could not contact the survivor direct but could only do so through his lawyers. The comment from the Registrar is that, to an extent, the letter from the lawyers for the survivor acted as a “barrier” to direct communication with the survivor at this early stage.
- 18.22 The Joint Diocesan Secretary was interviewed as part of the Review.
- 18.23 She recalled that she did receive information regarding the claim made by the survivor.
- 18.24 It was her experience that when civil claims for compensation came into the Diocese, they were “way down the road.”
- 18.25 She believed her assumption regarding this claim would have been that the allegations would already have been investigated and the financial claim for compensation was a consequence of those investigations.
- 18.26 She commented that, had she thought for one minute that the allegations had not been reported to the statutory authorities, she would have acted to make sure they were reported; she was sorry this had not happened in this case.
- 18.27 The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser was interviewed as part of the Review.
- 18.28 She had no previous knowledge or involvement with Trevor Devamanikkam. Her first knowledge of him was when she was copied into the solicitor’s letter, sent on behalf of the survivor via an email from the Leeds Registrar on 12 March 2015.
- 18.29 The Independent Reviewer discussed the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser’s response and actions to receiving the solicitor’s letter and her involvement in this case.
- 18.30 The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser believed the letter was sent to her for information only and to consider whether a deceased case review was needed. She did not believe at the time that she was expected to act on the letter.
- 18.31 During the Learning Lessons Review, it became evident to the Independent Reviewer that there were differing views and experiences of the effectiveness and inter-relationship between the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser and the Senior Leadership Team at that time. These perceived differences may or may not have impacted the decisions made following receipt of the letter of civil claim.
- 18.32 The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser stated the Diocese of Leeds was created in 2014, following the dissolution of the three Dioceses of Ripon and Leeds, Wakefield and Bradford. The new Diocesan office in Leeds was not opened until 2016, and so, at the time the letter of claim was received in 2015 by the new Diocese, the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser was not physically located in Leeds and was working from the old Diocesan offices in Wakefield. The fact that she was not physically located in Leeds presented challenges to her.
- 18.33 The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser confirmed to her knowledge no-one checked if Trevor Devamanikkam was deceased or alive. No enquiries were made with the pension authorities or where he lived.
- 18.34 It appears to the Independent Reviewer there was an assumption Trevor Devamanikkam might be deceased.
- 18.35 It was not until 4 June 2015 (after the survivor made his disclosures to West Yorkshire Police on 1 May 2015), that the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser contacted Oxford Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser. She was informed that Trevor Devamanikkam was alive and, in a follow-up email to her on 6 June 2015, the Oxford Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser stated Trevor Devamanikkam had no permission to officiate, and he had found an address for him in Oxford.

- 18.36 The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser could not recall what made her contact Oxford but believes it might have been at the request of the West Yorkshire Police.
- 18.37 The first LADO meeting to discuss the allegations in relation to Trevor Devamanikkam was held on 28 July 2015. It is unclear why it took the local authority that long to arrange given the survivor made his allegations to the police on 1 May 2015. There are clear timescales for allegations to be responded to.
- 18.38 Once the statutory agencies became aware of the allegations against Trevor Devamanikkam, they were responsible for investigating the complaint and ensuring appropriate safeguarding arrangements were in place if needed, in relation to any risks Trevor Devamanikkam might have posed whilst those investigations were ongoing.
- 18.39 The Leeds Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser attended the first LADO meeting, there were a number of recommendations from the meeting which included:
- The investigating police officer to ascertain if Trevor Devamanikkam had any current contact with children, and any voluntary/church or other positions. If it became known that this was the case and Trevor Devamanikkam was in regular contact with children, this information would be discussed with the Child Protection Unit as a matter of priority with referrals being made to local children's services.
 - Police to liaise with Oxford Police re any background information re Trevor Devamanikkam prior to interview.
- 18.40 The Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser attended a further LADO meeting and also became a member of the National Safeguarding Core Group meetings when they were established.
- 18.41 Finally, the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser reflected on the case and was of the view that, regrettably, there was no collective opportunity taken to consider and agree what action should be taken.
- 18.42 **Analysis**
- 18.43 This letter of claim was received before the survivor reported the allegations to West Yorkshire Police on 1 May 2015. It is the only written evidence that mentioned Trevor Devamanikkam by name prior to the police involvement.
- 18.44 It seems somewhat unusual that a claim for personal injury and loss was submitted by the survivor's solicitor prior to reporting the allegations to West Yorkshire Police (albeit the survivor had previously reported his allegations to South Yorkshire Police in 2013).
- 18.45 The Independent Reviewer understands that Leeds Diocese provided IICSA with full details of the claims made against Trevor Devamanikkam, but were not called to participate in the hearing. The Independent Reviewer has not seen any reference to the letter of civil claim in the survivor's published evidence to IICSA in July 2019. The Independent Reviewer is left wondering why there was no complaint made by the survivor or his legal team for the failure of the Diocese to act on the disclosure made in the letter of civil claim dated 1 May 2015.
- 18.46 The National Safeguarding Team Core Group meetings did not discuss this disclosure either until the 13 June 2017 Core Group, which was after Trevor Devamanikkam's death.
- 18.47 It would appear that Leeds Diocese made an assumption that the allegations had been referred already to the police in relation to the survivor, and there was a lack of clarity as to whether Trevor Devamanikkam was still alive. Furthermore, it is accepted by the Diocese that no contact

- was made with the pension authorities which may have given information relating to Trevor Devamanikkam's status.
- 18.48 Whilst the Diocesan Registrar believes he verbally asked the survivor's solicitor if the allegations had been reported to the police, there is no written evidence to confirm checks were made by the Diocese as to whether that was the case.
- 18.49 Whilst some enquiries into Trevor Devamanikkam's ministry were made in relation to his time in the Diocese, there appear to have been no checks made to ascertain his possible whereabouts. This did not happen until the police investigation began in June 2015. A check with the pension authorities might have provided the Diocese with detail of Trevor Devamanikkam's whereabouts.
- 18.50 The Diocese were in possession, albeit for a short period of time, of a letter of civil claim in which there was a written disclosure of abuse with a named abuser. The Diocese at the time did not follow the policies and guidance in place, in particular *Responding Well to those who have been sexually abused 2011*.

19. The role of the National Safeguarding Team – Core Group meeting

- 19.1 There were six Core Group meetings between 3 August 2016 and 11 January 2018. The Independent Reviewer has had sight of the minutes of the Core Group meetings, but is not confident they are necessarily final agreed minutes or that those who attended are an accurate record either. A number of the minutes contain factual inaccuracies which may or may not have been known at the time of the meetings.
- 19.2 The Chair of the Core Group and a number of Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers who attended these meetings were spoken to by the Independent Reviewer.
- 19.3 The Chair of the Core Group stated she had little experience of chairing National Safeguarding Team Core Group meetings. The Chair had only been in her interim support role for a matter of weeks, knew nothing about the case, and the National Safeguarding Team at the time was a small team. The senior casework manager, who was also present at the meeting, did not wish to chair the Core Group as she was leaving her post.
- 19.4 The Chair made contact with the survivor after the first Core Group meeting to introduce herself. She offered him the opportunity for support and counselling; this was declined because the survivor was already in receipt of support from a specialised charitable organisation.
- 19.5 **The First Core Group meeting 3 August 2016**
- 19.5.1 Whilst the first Core Group meeting made reference to the letter sent by the survivor's solicitor to Leeds Diocese in 2015, which details the abuse and names Trevor Devamanikkam, there appeared to have been no discussion around the actions taken by Leeds Diocese, given that the allegations were not reported to West Yorkshire Police until May 2015. This appears not to have been discussed until much later in June 2017.
- 19.5.2 There is evidence the Core Group were aware support had been offered to the survivor and declined, but no support had been offered to Trevor Devamanikkam.

- 19.5.3 The Core Group recognised they needed to find where the survivor was now living and for the relevant Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser to extend an offer of support to him.
- 19.5.4 The notes of the meeting evidence Core Group members asking staff at Bishopthorpe Palace why the Archbishop of York had not responded to the allegations made by the survivor in his letter of June 2013, or followed them up with the Bishop of Sheffield.
- 19.5.5 The minutes confirm that the Archbishop of York had been told by his Registrar not to respond directly to the allegations of abuse or investigate this as it was believed the Diocese of Sheffield would follow up on the letter which the survivor had sent to the Bishop of Sheffield. He also did not follow this up with the Bishop of Sheffield as it was assumed he would respond to the survivor.
- 19.5.6 The first Core Group also suggest an apology to the survivor may need to be considered.

19.6 **Second Core Group meeting 23 September 2016**

- 19.6.1 The meeting again refers to an apology needing to be considered to be addressed by each Diocese to the survivor.
- 19.6.2 There is reference to both the Core Group Chair and the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser Leeds having been in contact with the survivor and him declining support from the Church. He was still receiving support from the charitable organisation.
- 19.6.3 The Chair of the Core Group spoke with the Bishop of Sheffield, he confirmed he had two telephone conversations with the survivor, and during one of the calls the survivor had mentioned he had been abused. The Bishop did not believe the survivor wanted him to act on the disclosure.
- 19.6.4 The Bishop was also asked about the letter 1 June 2013. He told the Chair that, as he was adjudicating on a complaint against the survivor, he had not thought it appropriate to respond back. He recognised with hindsight he should have done.
- 19.6.5 He did suggest he had spoken to his Chaplain and Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser about the letter.
- 19.6.6 The Chair of the Core Group subsequently spoke with the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser in Sheffield, who stated she had no knowledge of the allegations. The Chair also attempted to contact the Chaplain but received no response back.
- 19.6.7 The Core Group was also aware of the second written letter of disclosure, and collectively the Core Group members agreed they had evidence of two written and one verbal disclosure of abuse that had not been acted on in accordance with the policies and guidance at that time.
- 19.6.8 One of the recommendations from this Core Group meeting was for the National Safeguarding Team to send a communication to Bishops and senior staff impressing the importance of not assuming a disclosure was being handled elsewhere, and to raise concerns with relevant Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser if encountering a safeguarding concern.
- 19.6.9 The Independent Reviewer attempted to find out if such a communication went out as there was no evidence from subsequent minutes this was actioned.
- 19.6.10 The Independent Reviewer was provided with a letter sent to all Clergy by the Church of England, dated 12 December 2016.

19.6.11 This letter refers to the Elliott Review and recommends senior officeholders should receive training on how to handle disclosures of abuse. It follows on that training has been commissioned by the National Safeguarding Team and asks people to make diary space when they are contacted with dates. The Independent Reviewer does not believe this letter is linked with the recommendation made by the Core Group on 23 September 2016, but if it was, it was nearly three months after the recommendation was made.

19.7 Third Core Group meeting - 2 June 2017

19.7.1 There was a significant gap of nine months between the second and third Core Group.

19.7.2 This appeared to be because the police investigation was still ongoing.

19.7.3 There is reference that the Chair of the Core Group was made aware on 8 May 2017 that Trevor Devamanikkam was to be charged with the offences against the survivor.

19.7.4 The Chair of the Core Group also spoke with the survivor that day and offered him support for the upcoming court case. The survivor did not want any support, he was receiving support from a charitable organisation, Victim Support and Witness Support.

19.7.5 The Core Group agreed the Leeds Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser would be the person to offer the survivor support if he needed it.

19.7.6 The Core Group also references support to Trevor Devamanikkam, but it is unclear what support was proposed.

19.8 Fourth Core Group meeting - 13 June 2017

19.8.1 This Core Group meeting followed Trevor Devamanikkam's death.

19.8.2 The Chair of the Core Group had contacted the survivor on 7 June, he was aware of Trevor Devamanikkam's death as he had been informed by the police. He was offered support but declined it.

19.8.3 The Core Group were also made aware of an email sent from the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser at Leeds on 9 June 2017, following a conversation she had recently had with the Deaconess who was at St Aidan's Parish in 1984.

19.8.4 The Deaconess had been contacted by Trevor Devamanikkam in May 2017, he told her that he had been diagnosed with bipolar and he had tried to keep that information private. This appears to be the first time the Core Group were aware of any information in relation to Trevor Devamanikkam's mental health.

19.9 Fifth Core Group meeting - 13 September 2017

19.9.1 At this meeting, the Core Group agreed a National Independent Learning Lessons Review should be recommended.

19.9.2 There was also a recommendation for the Chair to check if the Health Service were going to undertake a review into the events surrounding Trevor Devamanikkam's death.

19.10 Final Core Group meeting - 11 January 2018

19.10.1 There is reference to the Chair of the Core Group meeting with the Bishop of Sheffield. He indicated he would be happy to meet with the survivor once the outcome of the complaints against him were finalised.

- 19.10.2 The Chair of the Core Group had also spoken with the survivor over the Christmas period as she had been concerned about him.
- 19.10.3 The notes also reference a donation of £500 being made to the charitable organisation that was supporting the survivor at that time, which had been arranged via Leeds Diocese.
- 19.10.4 There is reference again that the survivor did not want any support from the Church.
- 19.10.5 The minutes also highlight that West Yorkshire Police had indicated appropriate safeguards would be put in place when the summons was served on Trevor Devamanikkam.
- 19.10.6 There was a recommendation for the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser Oxford to check with Oxfordshire Local Authority as to whether a multi-agency safeguarding adult review was being considered in relation to Trevor Devamanikkam's death.
- 19.10.7 There was reference in these minutes to some draft Terms of Reference and a request for comments back the following month.
- 19.10.8 There should have been a further Core Group meeting 1 March 2018, but this does not appear to have taken place.
- 19.10.9 There is evidence that the Chair of the Core Group did email the Chief of Staff at Bishopthorpe Palace in August 2019 and stated that, as Chair of this Core Group, the Archbishop of York should issue an apology to the survivor on behalf of all of the Bishops who had been involved in the Northern Province.
- 19.10.10 It appears that the Archbishop of York was considering meeting with the survivor, but the Independent Reviewer is not aware of any meeting taking place between the two of them or any written apology having been sent.
- 19.11 **Analysis**
- 19.12 The involvement of multiple Dioceses in the Core Group meetings and the challenges of everyone meeting in person at that time were evident.
- 19.13 The Chair of the Core Group had little experience of chairing such a meeting and the resources to support her in her role were limited.
- 19.14 The task of sending draft minutes to those involved and collating a final agreed set of minutes appeared not straightforward.
- 19.15 The Core Group meetings did attempt to coordinate the information known about the survivor's disclosures and what responses he had been given and the support offered to him.
- 19.16 There was less focus on support to Trevor Devamanikkam, checks had been made which confirmed Trevor Devamanikkam did not have permission to officiate nor was there any evidence to suggest he was attending any place of worship.
- 19.17 Some Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers and Church officers had differing views as to whether a Church of England worshipping assessment or agreement should have been put in place with Trevor Devamanikkam, even though there was no evidence he was engaged in any worship, and he certainly was not practising.
- 19.18 The Core Group did not consider Leeds Diocese response to the February 2015 letter until June 2017. It is not clear why.

- 19.19 The Core Group did consider whether the statutory agencies had considered reviews into Trevor Devamanikkam's death and followed this up with those agencies; this was good practice.
- 19.20 The Independent Reviewer was aware from speaking with a number of the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers who attended the Core Group meetings that there was clear frustration once they were aware the survivor had disclosed his abuse to some senior Clergy, and they had not acted on his disclosure.
- 19.21 It appeared that as the survivor had made complaints against Clergy under the CDM, they were advised they had to await the outcome of the CDMs, before any action could be taken against any member of Clergy.
- 19.22 As the CDM did not proceed against most of the Clergy as they were deemed "out of time", there were no consequences for those involved, with the exception of the Bishop of Bradford and Trevor Devamanikkam. In the case of the Bishop of Bradford the matter was investigated further and no action was taken under CDM. In the case of Trevor Devamanikkam the CDM was pended in light of the police investigation.
- 19.23 Some of the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers found that difficult to cope with and have felt powerless.
- 19.24 The National Safeguarding Core Group appeared to have no authority, were not listened to and their suggestion and recommendation that an apology should be given to the survivor appears not to have happened.
- 19.25 It would appear there was a particular reluctance to apologise to the survivor whilst the police were investigating possible Misconduct in Public office in relation to some Clergy.

The Second part of the Terms of Reference relates to the support to the survivor and Trevor Devamanikkam

20. Support to survivor

- 20.1 There is no evidence to suggest the survivor received any pastoral support in relation to the substantiated disclosures of abuse he said he made during 2012 and 2013. The first evidence the survivor was offered pastoral support from the Church was in May 2015 when the West Yorkshire Police investigation began. This was offered by the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser in Leeds to the survivor via the police officer investigating his allegations.
- 20.2 The survivor had by then already accessed his own support via a voluntary organisation specialising in support to survivors of sexual abuse, and declined the Church offer.
- 20.3 The survivor was offered pastoral support when he made a complaint in August 2016 to the Bishop of Leeds relating to the abuse he had suffered by Trevor Devamanikkam. He was written to by the Bishop of Leeds on 19 September 2016, the final paragraph of the letter states: "I note that the Registrar has already addressed with you the matter of your personal support and that, should you change your mind and wish for me to arrange this, I will do so readily." This would suggest the survivor declined any offer of support from Leeds Diocese at the time.

- 20.4 The Independent Reviewer is also aware that the Bishop of Leeds did correspond on a number of occasions with the survivor in relation to the contribution towards his counselling, and did offer to meet with him in a letter dated 26 May 2018.
- 20.5 The National Safeguarding Team Core Group minutes also reference offers of support to the survivor, and there is evidence that he had a number of telephone discussions over many years with numerous staff including staff at the National Safeguarding Team, the Provincial Safeguarding Adviser at Lambeth Palace, the Bishop of Lambeth, and the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser at Leeds.
- 20.6 The Bishop at Lambeth also offered to meet the survivor and his Member of Parliament (MP) at Westminster in 2017, but did not receive a response back from his MP.
- 20.7 There is evidence that the Church continued to check whether the survivor wanted any support from the Church.
- 20.8 The survivor appears to have continued to receive support from the voluntary organisation until July 2019, when the organisation closed.
- 20.9 It is evident that the survivor contacted numerous Church officers and Clergy over the years to discuss both the responses to the complaints he made and the subsequent outcomes. He would have been increasingly frustrated by the outcomes of his complaints and the fact there were no consequences in relation to those he complained about.
- 20.10 Both the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser Leeds and the Chair of the National Safeguarding Core Group spent time with the survivor as well, discussing what had happened to him.
- 20.11 The survivor and his solicitor met with the Archbishop of Canterbury in November 2016. The Archbishop of Canterbury followed this up with a further letter to the survivor in July 2017, which states: "I am deeply sorry for the abuse that you have suffered and for your description of how this has been dealt with by the Church."
- 20.12 **Analysis**
- 20.13 The survivor did not receive any pastoral support when he disclosed his substantiated abuse in 2012 and 2013. He should have received support and been encouraged to report his allegations to the police.
- 20.14 Once the police investigation began in May 2015, the offer of support from the Church was made.
- 20.15 The survivor was offered pastoral support when he made his complaint against Trevor Devamanikkam. It would appear he did not take up that offer which did not surprise the Independent Reviewer, given the survivor's experiences of the Church's response to his disclosures. There is evidence that offers of support continued to be made from the Church to the survivor, but he chose not to take up the offers.
- 20.16 The survivor maintained it was agreed that Leeds Diocese would pay for all of his counselling. This is disputed by the Chair of the Core Group and Leeds Diocese. Leeds Diocese did make a donation of £500 to the voluntary organisation he was receiving support from, at the request of the Chair of the Core Group.
- 20.17 The Independent Reviewer understands that the charitable organisation provided free support to the survivor. In his evidence to IICSA in July 2019, the survivor indicated that the charitable organisation providing the support had recently closed. It would appear from the Independent

Reviewer's conversation with the survivor in January 2020, he had been funding his own support.

21. Support to Trevor Devamanikkam

- 21.1 There were no known relatives of Trevor Devamanikkam to speak to during this Review. The Independent Reviewer did, however, make contact with some friends who knew him well who agreed to speak with her.
- 21.2 They described Trevor Devamanikkam as a very private person who had only a few friends.
- 21.3 It appeared his friends provided him with considerable support, particularly when he was unwell. They would often liaise with mental health professionals when they were concerned about him, and they tried to support him when they became aware of the allegations against him and his court appearance.
- 21.4 The friends appeared to have some knowledge of his time in ministry. They stated he had moved positions on a number of occasions, and they believed he may have attempted to take his own life when he was a Naval Chaplain.
- 21.5 His friends felt he received little support from the Church when he returned from ministry in Europe in 1996. They described him as being in a "dreadful state."
- 21.6 One of Trevor Devamanikkam friends did confirm to the Independent Reviewer that he had told her that the allegations of sexual abuse against him were true.

22. Support from the Church of England

- 22.1 There is no evidence to suggest that Trevor Devamanikkam was provided or offered any support when the West Yorkshire Police investigation began in May 2015. Whilst there were checks to find out where he lived and whether he had permission to officiate, the Independent Reviewer has not seen any evidence to suggest he was offered or received support. There clearly would have been a matter of timing regarding any support as the police did not interview Trevor Devamanikkam until September 2015.
- 22.2 On 11 August 2016, the survivor made a complaint against Trevor Devamanikkam. This was received by Leeds Diocese on 14 September 2016. The Bishop of Leeds wrote to Trevor Devamanikkam on 22 September 2016, making him aware a complaint had been made by the survivor and the details of the complaint would be sent to him by the Diocesan Registrar. The letter goes on to say, "You may wish to receive care and support at this time and so I will ensure that you have all the support and care that you may need... I have asked X (retired Archdeacon) to provide you with care and support on my behalf and he will be contacting you very shortly." The letter also contained the address and the email and telephone numbers for the retired Archdeacon.
- 22.3 In October 2016, Leeds Diocese became aware that Trevor Devamanikkam was in a private psychiatric unit in Bradford and promptly arranged a pastoral visit. The Independent Reviewer spoke to the member of Clergy who undertook that visit as part of this Review. It should also

- be noted that, when it was clear that Trevor Devamanikkam was to return to Oxford, it was the Bishop of Leeds who initiated and organised ongoing pastoral support for him.
- 22.4 Once Trevor Devamanikkam returned to hospital in Oxford, the Head of Pastoral Care at the hospital was made aware he had been admitted to Sandford Ward and arrangements were made for one of the hospital Clergy to visit him. This happened on a number of occasions up until Christmas 2016.
- 22.5 The Head of Pastoral Care also reported that a retired Archdeacon had contacted the hospital enquiring as to whether Trevor Devamanikkam was an inpatient or not. The Head of Pastoral Care stated he was unable to confirm due to patient confidentiality.
- 22.6 There is written evidence that the retired Archdeacon arranged to support Trevor Devamanikkam, and he did make telephone contact with him on a number of occasions and also spoke with him. He contacted Trevor Devamanikkam by phone on 1 January 2017 and 7 January 2017, but had no reply. On 8 January 2017 he did to speak with him, whilst he was still in hospital; Trevor Devamanikkam said “he was improving.” The retired Archdeacon attempted to contact Trevor Devamanikkam one more time, but he heard nothing back from him. He did comment “I always said to Trevor Devamanikkam let me know if you want me to come and see you.”
- 22.7 The Bishop of Oxford also made checks in relation to Trevor Devamanikkam when he became Bishop in July 2016. He received assurance that Trevor Devamanikkam did not have permission to officiate, he was not attending church, and he was also being offered pastoral support via the retired Archdeacon, but had indicated he did not want any support.

Analysis

- 22.8 Trevor Devamanikkam did not appear to receive any offers of pastoral support until the survivor’s complaint was made in 2016. He was then offered pastoral support by the Bishop of Leeds.
- 22.9 He was visited whilst in hospital in both Bradford and Oxfordshire, and attempts were made to contact and engage him on a number of occasions with limited success.
- 22.10 Trevor Devamanikkam should have been provided with pastoral support once the police investigation commenced and the police agreed that support could be offered.

23. Health Involvement

- 23.1 The Independent Reviewer felt it important to understand Trevor Devamanikkam’s mental health history given he took his own life, in particular the support he received from Mental Health professionals and other statutory partners as well as from the Church of England.
- 23.2 Most of the information was gathered from the Coroner’s Inquest and the National Health Service (NHS) Trust providing his care.
- 23.3 At the Inquest, Trevor Devamanikkam’s Consultant Psychiatrist stated that the “bulk of his history was derived from his first admission to hospital in Lincolnshire [in 2009] and was barely added to during successive assessments with him.” She stated he was unable to recall many details about his childhood in Harrogate or his life at home with his family when growing up. He believed his parents to be dead and his father was his stepfather. He was an only child, single,

- never married and had no children. He said he was a “chaplain in the Navy for 30 years” and retired in 1994. He repeatedly reported having no close friends or support networks and had taught English at a summer school in Oxford.
- 23.4 The Consultant Psychiatrist reported that “collateral information from friends described a ‘breakdown’ in 1979 whilst he was working as the rector of a council estate in Bradford... it appeared to be related to a period of stress after two choir boys had been burnt in a football stadium fire.” [The Independent Reviewer believes this date is incorrect].
- 23.5 The Consultant Psychiatrist’s involvement with Trevor Devamanikkam began in August 2015. She stated he had previously been admitted to a hospital in Lincolnshire, between 4 November and 7 December 2009, under Section 2 of the Mental Health Act 1983. She stated this was “what seemed to be his first episode of mania.” He had apparently impulsively bought a property in Oxfordshire and at least three cars. During his admission to the hospital in Lincolnshire, he absconded several times, made allegations of sexual assault and committed arson on the ward; he did not engage with treatment. The risk assessment at that time noted he was at “Risk of financial exploitation, risk to self from driving dangerously and risk to others from driving without concern for safety of others.” Ten days after his discharge from hospital in Lincolnshire he was reported to be “chaotic and irritable and driving against medical advice.” He was assessed again under the Mental Health Act but absconded mid-assessment.
- 23.6 In February 2010, two months after absconding from Lincolnshire, he was found to be living in Witney Oxfordshire. He had registered with a General Practitioner, and, as a result of his psychiatric history, he was referred urgently to the Community Mental Health Team.
- 23.7 The next medical evidence/key event was on 1 September 2011, when he was admitted to John Radcliffe hospital having stabbed himself in the chest with a kitchen knife. He refused to go with the ambulance crew to hospital and was escorted by the police. He was described as having “clear suicidal intent and expressed regret he had not done sufficient damage to achieve this goal.” He was informally admitted to hospital and discharged on 5 October 2011. His care subsequently transferred to the Older Adult Service in March 2012. He was discharged from this service in 2013 after “A period of uneventful Outpatient follow-up.”
- 23.8 The Consultant reported there was information from collateral sources that Trevor Devamanikkam had cycles of becoming depressed in one place, then moving on. Sources also gave a history of alcohol abuse whilst in the Navy and for which he may have had treatment. Trevor Devamanikkam was reviewed regularly in clinic. The Consultant obtained further background from one of Trevor Devamanikkam’s friends who suggested he had been discharged as the Naval Chaplain, possibly after a suicide attempt, then appointed as a vicar in Spain, but was sacked after a year. He moved back to Harrogate where he became depressed and drank heavily, and he then moved to Lincolnshire.
- 23.9 On 22 September 2016, a Mental Health nurse visited Trevor Devamanikkam to discover him on the phone clearly involved in an internet-related fraud to access his bank account. The nurse was able to go with him to the bank to rescue the situation, a safeguarding alert was also raised by the Mental Health nurse. It is unclear what happened to this alert.
- 23.10 On 29 September 2016, a Mental Health professional visited Trevor Devamanikkam, he was leaning out of his window half naked, shouting with slurred speech. A consultant psychiatrist was called and attended and when they entered his flat, Trevor Devamanikkam was on the phone to a representative of the President of Tribunals. Trevor Devamanikkam showed two

- letters to the consultant, dated September 2016, from the Bishop of Leeds referring to accusations of a serious nature which had been made about him as well as the statement of the accuser – (this was the complaint that the survivor took out against Trevor Devamanikkam for the abuse he had suffered).
- 23.11 On 1 October 2016, whilst waiting to be admitted to hospital, Trevor Devamanikkam was visited by Health staff and was reported to be rambling about his deposition to the President of Tribunals and a Queen’s Counsel. Trevor Devamanikkam’s presentation led to a detention under Section 3 of the Mental Health Act. He was admitted to a psychiatric unit in Bradford on 2 October 2016 as there were no beds available in Oxford. He remained there until his transfer back to Sandford Ward in Oxford, where his risk of financial vulnerability was discussed. Trevor Devamanikkam mentioned he was in the middle of a court case, and he had a meeting with his lawyer, but he did not wish to discuss it.
- 23.12 An email from a Health professional dated 8 November 2016 to his Consultant Psychiatrist states: “There is some internal serious Church investigation going on regarding alleged sexual abuse from him to a clergyman which happened years ago, he would need support going through the process as this could be a potential trigger for another relapse... How could this be arranged ... could his advocate help with this... He was struggling to deal with the letter about this and was quite stressful when X and Y saw him in a muddled state.” Trevor Devamanikkam’s Consultant Psychiatrist replied, “I wasn’t aware of these allegations of abuse - where does this information come from? What is the process you think he may need support for? Again, what is he aware of in terms of any investigation? What sort of support will this be from the CPA yesterday? Ongoing CPN/CTS or anything over and above what we would plan anyway for his discharge? Are police involved? Is anyone taking a lead in sorting out the Social Care issues, I am CC in Z in case she has any perspective on the Social Worker front in planning discharge.” The reply back was “I am really shocked this was not known to you and the ward and can only apologise on behalf of the Team.”
- 23.13 On 9 November 2016, the Community Mental Health Manager and the Consultant in Old Age Psychiatry met with Trevor Devamanikkam to discuss the facts and implication of his legal situation. He made it clear he did not want to discuss the matter, he told them the issue was long-standing and he had a solicitor who “had been very involved” in supporting him and remained involved. He stated he was not sure how the issues would play out in the future in terms of timescales, but “he was optimistic of a positive conclusion.” He told the Consultant and Community Mental Health Manager “he felt confident that this matter was not a significant factor in any aspects of his mental wellbeing”. Discussions took place between Trevor Devamanikkam and Health professionals around setting up an “alert system should the legal case begin to impact on his mental health”. Trevor Devamanikkam suggested his solicitor knew of his mental health condition, it was also suggested to him by Health staff that he could set up alerts with his friends as well. Trevor Devamanikkam initially stated that Health staff could not speak with his friends about him but, on 16 November 2016, he told Health staff he was removing “the ban” on ward staff contacting his friends if his health deteriorated.
- 23.14 There was also a suggestion from one of Trevor Devamanikkam’s friends that the Crown Prosecution Service might not press charges against him and that he was less preoccupied by the case. One of his friends was dealing with his solicitor in relation to the case.
- 23.15 Trevor Devamanikkam had a Mental Health advocate at this time as well.

- 23.16 On 7 December 2016, he was discharged from his section but placed on a Section 5(2) and this was then converted to a Section 3 of the Mental Health Act 1983 the next day. He was subsequently discharged from hospital on 16 January 2017.
- 23.17 The Consultant Psychiatrist's last contact with Trevor Devamanikkam was on 3 April 2017.
- 23.18 On 25 May 2017, Trevor Devamanikkam's Mental Health Care Coordinator rang him following a call from one of his friends who had told her Trevor Devamanikkam "had issues in his personal life which are very traumatic." She stated he had to attend court imminently and had no defence solicitor. He had told his friend he feared he would be sent to prison. Trevor Devamanikkam declined a visit from the Mental Health Care Coordinator, but then agreed to a visit to see him on 7 June 2017.
- 23.19 On 5 June 2017, a friend of Trevor Devamanikkam rang the Deputy Team Manager Older People Services to say he was having a "meltdown." Trevor Devamanikkam was due to attend at Bradford court the following day (his friend said she could not divulge the reasons why he had a court appearance). The Deputy Team Manager asked if he was represented by a solicitor and was told by his friend he did not have one because he had told her it was not necessary as he was "going to plead." The friend did not define what she meant by "plead". It was agreed that the Care Coordinator would visit Trevor Devamanikkam that day and, depending on his presentation, an assessment under the Mental Health Act may be needed, and a consultant was to be available later that day if needed. The Deputy Team Manager also contacted Trevor Devamanikkam's care provider who confirmed they had seen him that morning, she also contacted the Development Manager where he lived. The Development Manager mentioned a letter that Trevor Devamanikkam had given her that day, but she declined to divulge what it said; she did say she thought his bipolar was coming back.
- 23.20 Trevor Devamanikkam was visited by his Care Coordinator on 5 June 2017. Her evidence to the Coroner stated: "he appeared relaxed and calm, he did have his dressing gown on which was unusual, he denied when asked if he had any worries or stresses, the Care Coordinator asked if there was anything she could help him with and he asked her to do some shopping which she did." He declined a further visit in a few days.
- 23.21 The Care Coordinator spoke with the Development Manager at the retirement apartment. She said Trevor Devamanikkam had given her some information, but she was unsure whether she should share it.
- 23.22 The Care Coordinator fed back her findings to her Deputy Manager who agreed they would discuss Trevor Devamanikkam at the Community Mental Health Team meeting the next day.
- 23.23 Trevor Devamanikkam's Consultant Psychiatrist told the Coroner's Inquest that assessments undertaken in relation to Trevor were "always in the context of significant concerns about the risk of disengagement... he would periodically withdraw permission for health staff to contact friends." She stated he had a history of "significant manic episodes and a few years later a significant depressive episode during which time he attempted to stab himself in a serious attempt to end his life". He presented "as a very private person reluctant to discuss his previous psychiatric history and giving very little personal history additional to that obtained at his index admission." She also stated that "Assessments were also affected at times when we were asked by third parties not to disclose contact from them, third parties also did not provide details of his life on the basis of protecting his confidentiality which with hindsight may have been relevant

in care Management.” The Consultant went on to say, “Despite the many opportunities to discuss adverse life events, he actively declined to use them.”

24. West Yorkshire Police Involvement

- 24.1 Trevor Devamanikkam was interviewed by West Yorkshire Police in relation to the allegations the survivor made at a police station in Oxford on 21 September 2015.
- 24.2 He was a voluntary attendee and was interviewed under caution but not under arrest; this afforded him the same rights and entitlements as an arrested person. It was decided at the time there was no necessity to arrest him; as he was not arrested, no bail could be applied on his release.
- 24.3 When asked by the Independent Reviewer what arrangements were in place for his welfare, West Yorkshire Police replied:
- 24.4 “At this time there was no duty to carry out any formal risk assessments for voluntary attendees. However, on 31st July 2018 changes were made to the police and Criminal Evidence Act Codes of Practice...” now “every interviewed person must have a pre interview risk assessment completed to ensure that any vulnerabilities are highlighted, and appropriate measures are taken to provide support/adjustments for the interviewed person. If as a result of a risk assessment the decision was taken the suspect was not fit to be interviewed, then alternative arrangements would be made. A post interview risk assessment would also be conducted to ensure the person was not at risk to themselves or others when they left the police station. As TD was interviewed as voluntary attendee in 2015... this provision was not in place.”
- 24.5 The police investigation continued throughout 2015/2016. Numerous interviews took place with individuals, there was considerable delay in the Church of England locating Trevor Devamanikkam’s “blue file” (Personnel /HR type file). This was not located until July 2016.
- 24.6 On 10 May 2017, the Crown Prosecution Service approved the charging of Trevor Devamanikkam. West Yorkshire Police confirmed with the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser Leeds that Thames Valley Police would serve the summons and address any immediate safeguarding concerns.

25. Thames Valley Police Involvement

- 25.1 Thames Valley Police provided the following information relating to the force’s involvement with Trevor Devamanikkam:
- 25.2 26 July 2016 - Adult protection (no details provided to the Independent Reviewer)
- 25.3 4 August and 1 October 2016 - Missing persons reports re Trevor Devamanikkam
- 25.4 6 June 2017 - call to visit Trevor Devamanikkam’s flat where he was found deceased. [This visit resulted from the actions of the Senior Caseworker, National Safeguarding Team, who was concerned by the failure of Trevor Devamanikkam to appear at court. The Senior Caseworker subsequently contacted the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor in Oxford who reported the concerns to the police].
- 25.5 The Independent Reviewer has also seen references to the survivor having said he contacted Thames Valley Police two weeks before Trevor Devamanikkam’s death and him asking them to

do a welfare check as he had seen comments by Trevor Devamanikkam on a Google search posted by him saying “this is how it ends.” The information provided by Thames Valley Police above does not reference that, so it is unclear whether that was received or acted on.

26. Oxford Local Authority

- 26.1 Oxfordshire Local Authority involvement with Trevor Devamanikkam related to the involvement of Approved Mental Health Professionals (AMHPs) undertaking assessments in relation to his mental health.
- 26.2 An assessment report, dated 2 August 2016, referenced the following in relation to Trevor Devamanikkam: “Self-neglect,” “witnessed driving erratically and mounting the kerb,” “over spending,” “found naked on the floor in a deep sleep,” “vulnerable to financial exploitation,” “reckless driving putting members of public at risk.” A further AMHP assessment dated 6 June 2017 mentions “He has the support of a care package when he is at home”, and goes on to say “he has a history of self-harm and risk of financial exploitation from others... He needs support to administer/supervise his medication as he has a history of poor compliance.”
- 26.3 Trevor Devamanikkam was Section 117 eligible which entitled him to free care and support if required.
- 26.4 The Independent Reviewer is aware that, following a recommendation from the National Safeguarding Team Core Group dated 11 January 2018, the Oxford Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser was to enquire whether a Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) was being considered by Oxfordshire Safeguarding Adult Board (SAB). An email dated 14 February 2018 from the Oxford Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser to the Chair of the National Safeguarding Team Core Group states: “A brief note to confirm that I have spoken to the Business Manager at the Oxford Safeguarding Adults Board, who has consulted with the Chair of the board and the mental health lead... whether a Safeguarding Adult Review had been considered. There had been no previous question raised to prompt consideration of a case review related to TD’s death. The inquest, held on 4 October 2017 recorded a verdict of suicide. The Oxford Mail report of the inquest includes reference to a suicide note from TD, received by the Manager at Otters Court, where TD lived, the day before his death. It is reported that TD had said that he had changed his mind about suicide when spoken to. A Psychiatric professional who conducted an assessment visit on the same day did not have knowledge of the suicide note or the charges faced by TD. The setting where TD lived was not a Care Home, but owner-occupied retirement apartments run by McCarthy and Stone, with some support offered on an individual basis. As such it is not subject to the same regulatory framework and requirements as a Care Home. The conclusion of our discussion was that the case is unlikely to meet the criteria for a Safeguarding Adult Review, although this is based on limited knowledge of the nature and extent of the involvement of mental health services.”
- 26.5 As part of the Learning Lessons Review, the Local Authority were contacted by the Independent Reviewer and asked if they had considered Trevor Devamanikkam’s death for a Safeguarding Adult Review. On 5 October 2020, they replied that the Oxford Safeguarding Adult Board had not received any Safeguarding Adult referral in relation to him.

26.6 **Analysis of Statutory Agencies Involvement**

- 26.7 Oxfordshire Mental Health Trust, Oxfordshire Local Authority and Thames Valley Police were all aware of Trevor Devamanikkam's mental health to varying degrees, and they were aware of his vulnerabilities and the risks to himself.
- 26.8 Oxfordshire Mental Health Trust were responsible for his mental health treatment and wellbeing.
- 26.9 Some staff working at the Mental Health Trust were aware of the allegations and pending court case against him, and had tried to discuss this with him.
- 26.10 The Independent Reviewer is aware that following Trevor Devamanikkam's death, the Health Trust did consider whether a Serious Untoward Incident (SUI) investigation and review should take place in relation to his death, but concluded not to undertake a review.
- 26.11 Thames Valley Police had knowledge of Trevor Devamanikkam's previous mental health episodes. In fact, one of the officers who attended his flat on the day he died was able to confirm his identity having spent several hours the previous year with him whilst waiting for his admission into hospital.
- 26.12 West Yorkshire Police indicated that any safeguarding concerns would be addressed when Trevor Devamanikkam was served with the summons to attend court. It is unclear what, if anything, Thames Valley Police did to address any concerns in relation to Trevor Devamanikkam or what information West Yorkshire Police had around Trevor Devamanikkam's mental health.
- 26.13 Oxfordshire Local Authority had knowledge of Trevor Devamanikkam as well. There is email evidence that the Oxford Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser had a discussion with the Safeguarding Adults Service Manager, who it appeared had discussed the case with the Safeguarding Adult Board Chair and the Mental Health lead. It appears collectively there was a view that it was unlikely to meet the criteria, albeit based on limited knowledge, and no safeguarding adult referral was therefore made by any agency or organisation. However, the outcome of these discussions would not have precluded any agency or individual from submitting a safeguarding referral.
- 26.14 The Independent Reviewer's professional opinion based on the information she has read is that Trevor Devamanikkam was a vulnerable adult, and as such a referral for a Safeguarding Adults Review should have been completed so that the involvement of statutory agencies in his care was considered to see if any lessons could have been learnt from his death. The Review would have also considered the support offered to Trevor Devamanikkam by the Church.
- 26.15 During the representation stage of the draft Learning Lessons Report and after discussion with the Oxfordshire Safeguarding Adult Board Chair and interim Director of Adult Services, the Independent Reviewer submitted a referral to the Oxfordshire Safeguarding Adult Board for their consideration, as to whether to undertake a Safeguarding Adult Review in relation to Trevor Devamanikkam.

27. Recent Development within Church of England Safeguarding

- 27.1 The Independent Reviewer is aware there have been significant developments in safeguarding within the Church of England and numerous recommendations made as a result of previous

Learning Lesson Reviews and Independent Reviews, including the Gibb Review and the IICSA, which considered the Church of England as part of their inquiry. These include:

- The Diocese and National Safeguarding Team are much better resourced now in relation to safeguarding and training, albeit there is disparity in resources in each Diocese.
- Safeguarding policies and practice guidance have been updated and strengthened, including the support that is to be provided to those who face allegations.
- There is a national Register of Clergy which includes all Clergy who are authorised to carry out ministry in the Church of England.
- A new case management/records system is being rolled out across all Dioceses, it will have the function to search and check other Diocese records.
- There are victim and survivor engagement groups.
- There are proposals that Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers should become Diocesan Safeguarding Officers and they should take decisions on safeguarding matters without the approval of Diocesan Bishops as they are best placed to decide what action should be taken.
- There are recommendations for the introduction of national arrangements for the appointment, management and supervision of Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers or Diocesan Safeguarding Officers. This may help to increase the independence and provide an outside route from the Diocese through which concerns could be raised by them.
- The Church of England is developing national proposals for a redress scheme which will provide a single point of entry for victims and survivors of abuse, and will include financial compensation, support, acknowledgment of wrongdoing, and support for rebuilding lives.
- The CDM has been subject to review during 2021/2022 and, if agreed, will lead to the introduction of Clergy Conduct Measures accompanied by Statutory Codes of Practice, which will respond to different levels of misconduct and complaints. This will include failing to follow safeguarding policies and guidance. There will also be no time limits on making a complaint in relation to serious misconduct.
- There will also be a requirement for Clergy to comply with the new codes of Practice and to consult with Diocesan Safeguarding Officers.

28. Conclusions

- 28.1 The survivor was sexually abused by Trevor Devamanikkam, he was a child at the time.
- 28.2 There is evidence the survivor disclosed his abuse in 2012 and 2013 to some senior members of Clergy, and they failed to act on his disclosures.
- 28.3 The survivor was not supported to refer the disclosures to the police, nor provided with pastoral care and support at the time.
- 28.4 There was a further written disclosure in 2015, which was not acted on by Leeds Diocese.
- 28.5 It appears that in 2012 and 2013, some senior Clergy prioritised their own involvement in CDM complaints over those that related to matters of safeguarding.

- 28.6 Whilst the Review has not been made aware of any further allegations against Trevor Devamanikkam, the failure to support the survivor in reporting his allegations to the police in 2012 and 2013 meant that safeguards could not have been put in place to protect others.
- 28.7 The survivor made a number of complaints under the CDM against those senior Clergy he alleged he disclosed his abuse to. Most were dismissed out of time and were therefore not investigated. There were no consequences for those involved.
- 28.8 None of the complaints made by the survivor involved those investigating the matters speaking directly to those involved.
- 28.9 There appears to have been a reluctance on the part of some senior Clergy to formally apologise to the survivor. Whether this was because he was not believed or because an apology might have had implications for the senior Clergy is unclear.
- 28.10 Trevor Devamanikkam appears to have been a private person who had few close friends who supported him well. They would contact Health services when they were concerned about him.
- 28.11 He had a history of mental illness and was well known to Health services, their involvement was always balanced with concerns around his disengagement.
- 28.12 Trevor Devamanikkam was receiving support from Mental Health services right up until the day before he took his own life. Those services also knew of the allegations against him and had attempted to discuss those with him; other statutory agencies had involvement with him as well.
- 28.13 Trevor Devamanikkam appeared to have received no support from the Church of England when the police investigation began in 2015, but was offered support once the CDM complaint was made against him by the survivor in 2016, which he appeared to accept on a couple of occasions.
- 28.14 The Independent Reviewer was impressed by the concern shown and the recognition of the seriousness of the situation by the Senior Caseworker, National Safeguarding Team, at the failure of Trevor Devamanikkam to appear at court on the 6 June 2017. The Senior Caseworker subsequently contacted the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor in Oxford who reported the concerns to the police.
- 28.15 It is unclear whether the approach taken by statutory agencies in relation to Trevor Devamanikkam's arrest and subsequent charging could have been better coordinated and whether his death could have been avoided. A Safeguarding Adult Review could have been an opportunity to look at this in detail and would have included the Church of England in that Review.

29. Recommendations

- 29.1 The Church of England should make a formal apology to the survivor for their failure to act on his disclosures of abuse and their failure to support him at that time.
- 29.2 The Church of England should ensure the survivor has the support and counselling he needs in order to rebuild his life.
- 29.3 The National Safeguarding Team should review its approach to how it commissions Independent Learning Lessons Reviews when it involves more than one Diocese. They should consider whether each Diocese should do their own Learning Review and then appoint an Independent

- Reviewer to consider all of the information and provide an overarching report, or whether, in complex cases, two Independent Reviewers should be appointed.
- 29.4 There should be some clear timescales for all Dioceses to provide information for Learning Lessons Reviews in order that these Reviews can be undertaken promptly.
- 29.5 Whilst recognising the dynamics of the Church of England, there should be clear guidance to all Clergy and Church officers as to what they should do and who they should take advice from within their own Diocese, any other Diocese or Church body, if copied into an allegation of abuse.
- 29.6 The Church of England and National Safeguarding Team should assure themselves that current Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers know how, and who, to escalate concerns to if Clergy are ignoring their advice.
- 29.7 Complaints of a safeguarding nature against Clergy which continue to be made under the current measures should involve speaking directly with those involved as well as following up in writing.
- 29.8 The National Safeguarding Team should remind all staff of the process to follow in relation to risk assessments where there are allegations against Clergy who are no longer authorised to carry out ministry.
- 29.9 The National Safeguarding Team and the Church of England should be reminded about the retention and destruction policies for written records.
- 29.10 The Church of England and the National Safeguarding Team should remind all staff and Clergy of the importance of recording and documenting all disclosures of abuse and advice given.
- 29.11 If the Oxfordshire Safeguarding Adult Board determine that a Safeguarding Adult Review should take place in relation to the death of Trevor Devamanikkam, then the NST should share this Learning Lessons Review report with the Board to assist their review.

30. The Independent Review Author

- 30.1 Jane Humphreys is a former Director of Children and Director of Adult services with over 30 years' experience of working within the public sector.
- 30.2 Jane has chaired a number of multi-agency Boards including Children and Adult Safeguarding Boards and has undertaken a number of complex investigations in the public sector.
- 30.3 Since retiring, Jane has provided support and challenge to a number of Local Authorities across the country and has sat on a number of Improvement Boards and been a non-Executive Director on a Children Trust Board.
- 30.4 Jane also undertakes work on behalf of the Local Government Association (LGA) as a Children Improvement Adviser and has led a number of LGA peer reviews.