

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

Decision notice

Date: 05 June 2017

Public Authority: Chief Constable of Dyfed-Powys Police
Address: Police Headquarters
PO Box 99
Llangunnor
Carmarthen
Dyfed
SA31 2PF

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant has requested anonymised information about recorded murder offences from Dyfed-Powys Police ("DPP"). DPP provided some information but withheld the remainder citing sections 40(2) (personal information), 30(1)(a) (investigations and proceedings) and 38(1)(health and safety) of the FOIA. The Commissioner's decision is that section 40(2) is partially engaged; she finds that section 30(1) is engaged but that the public interest in disclosure outweighs that in maintaining the exemption; she finds that section 38(1) is not engaged.
2. The Commissioner requires DPP to take the following steps to ensure compliance with the legislation:
 - disclose the information withheld for cases (4), (5) and (6).
3. DPP must take these steps within 35 calendar days of the date of this decision notice. Failure to comply may result in the Commissioner making written certification of this fact to the High Court pursuant to section 54 of the Act and may be dealt with as a contempt of court.

Background

4. The complainant has advised the Commissioner that she requires the requested information for ongoing research. She has provided the following background information about the work she is undertaking:

"The request has been sent to all forces in the UK as part of a piece of research I am conducting through Teesside University (ethical approval from the university ethics board has been provided for the study). Although the Office for National Statistics presents data on homicide cases annually in their crime report, the data is usually aggregated for 50-69 year olds and 70 and over. Whilst the number of homicides is broken down into small age groups, the characteristics of victims/offenders and offences is not. This means we have a gap in our understanding of offences against older people, which is exacerbated by the lack of academic research in this area. The only available studies are from outside of the UK, mainly the USA, and have used small localised samples or drawn data from specific contexts which limit understanding. However, their research has suggested the homicide offences involving older adults (aged 60+) may have unique characteristics not observed in those involving younger people. In order to develop effective prevention initiatives, we need to understand the different characteristics and patterns of homicide offences in different contexts involving different victims. For example, offences occurring in a care home are likely to be different to those occurring outside nightclubs. The aim of my study is therefore to fill the existing gap in evidence with a view to developing a better understanding of these offences to inform policy and practice, including the police. This is the first study of its kind in the UK and will be published in a peer-reviewed journal, as well as being presented at conferences. A briefing note of the findings will be made publically available and the research is featuring in a BBC Radio 4 File on 4 programme in the next few months".

Request and response

5. On 24 November 2016 the complainant wrote to DPP and requested information in the following terms:

"I am writing to request anonymous information about recorded homicide/murder offences that have been recorded by your constabulary between 1st January 2010 and 31st December 2015.

I have attached two data request forms which has been designed to try and make this process as easy as possible. The first requests

anonymous aggregate level data on the number of homicide/murder offences recorded during this period (January 2010-December 2015) and the proportion involving a victim aged 60 or older. The second requests anonymous individual level data for cases recorded involving a victim aged 60 and over”.

6. The complainant clarified her request on 24 November 2016 adding:

“Further to my request sent 24 November, please note the following points of clarification:

1. I am seeking data on all homicide offences (according to the counting rules, incorporating murder, manslaughter and corporate manslaughter)

2. I am not seeking any data on sexual offences ...”.

7. DPP sought further clarification on 2 December 2016. The complainant responded as follows:

“Many thanks for your email. I am trying to get an idea, in the first part of the request, of the total number of homicides recorded by your force in each year and then in the second table, the number of cases where the victim was 60 and over. So if you recorded 20 homicides each year, that would go in the first table, and if 2 each year involved a victim aged 60 or older, this would go in the second table. Then, for the second document I sent, I am interested in the characteristics of those cases involving a victim aged 60 or older”.

8. Following an extension to consider the public interest, on 29 December 2016 DPP responded. It provided some of the information requested but refused to provide the remainder citing the following exemptions: 30(1)(a)(investigations and proceedings), 38(1)(a)(b) (health and safety) and 40(2)(personal information).

9. Following an internal review DPP wrote to the complainant on 12 January 2017. It maintained its position.

Scope of the case

10. The complainant contacted the Commissioner on 16 January 2017 to complain about the way her request for information had been handled. The Commissioner required further information which was provided on 13 February 2017.

11. The complainant advised that she had sent the request to 46 police forces and that, apart from one force which was still considering its position due to the volume of data it holds, DPP was the only force

which had refused to provide all the data. She clarified that the request was for:

"... anonymous data on victim and offender gender, age group, ethnicity group, method of killing and location (i.e. home, care home) of homicide offences involving a victim aged 60 and over recorded between 1st January 2010 and 31st December 2015."

12. She did not accept that the application of sections 30 and 38 was justified because the data related to homicides, which she considered:

"... inherently 'public' in the sense that coroner inquests and murder trials are both open to the public and press to attend, and also because some, if not all, of the information is already likely in the public domain due to media/press reporting".

13. She did not accept the citing of section 40 because no identifying information or personal information had been requested as her request had specified "*anonymous*" data.

14. She further added that:

"The force have not offered any suggestions on amending the request in order to provide the data. For example, it may be that removing ethnicity data or location of the murder would have removed the need for the force to apply these exemptions, but this was not offered. However ... given it is extremely likely this information is already in the public domain, I feel there is no reason to refuse to provide the anonymous data requested".

15. The Commissioner will consider the citing of exemptions below.

Reasons for decision

16. The remaining withheld information in this case relates to 6 homicides involving victims aged 60 or over. The complainant has clearly requested "anonymised" information, which she has asked to be provided in a "tick box" format covering the following categories (see annex for copy of answer sheet provided by complainant):

- *gender of victim (self-defined);*
- *ethnicity of victim (self-defined);*
- *gender of perpetrator / suspect;*
- *ethnicity of perpetrator / suspect;*
- *age of victim at the time of the offence;*
- *age of perpetrator / suspect at the time of the offence;*
- *relationship of perpetrator / suspect to the victim;*

- *location of the murder* (NB not address-related);
- *method of killing*.

17. DPP has provided a small amount of this information which includes the gender of 4 victims, the gender of 3 perpetrators / suspects, the ages of all the victims, the ages of 4 perpetrators / suspects, two locations and one method of killing. It is noted that the 'self-defined' ethnicity of the victims is not recorded and is therefore unavailable.
18. DPP has also confirmed to the Commissioner that all 6 cases are 'solved' and have therefore been closed.
19. It is also of note that DPP has disclosed the actual ages of all of the victims as well as that of 3 of the suspects / perpetrators, which is not what was requested. The complainant sought ages in bands rather than precise ages which would have made reidentification unlikely. However, unfortunately this information has already been disclosed so the Commissioner will necessarily proceed on that basis.
20. DPP has numbered the 6 cases from (1) to (6) and provided details for each on this basis. The Commissioner will refer to the cases using the same numbering system to avoid any confusion.
21. The Commissioner has had sight of the withheld information.

Section 30 – investigations and proceedings

22. This has been cited in respect of all of the cases, for differing reasons as follows:

- Case (1) - relationship, location and method;
- Case (2) - relationship, location and method;
- Case (3) - relationship and method;
- Case (4) - relationship;
- Case (5) - victim gender, perpetrator / suspect's gender, age and ethnicity, relationship, location and method;
- Case (6) - victim gender, perpetrator / suspect's gender, age and ethnicity, relationship, location and method.

23. Section 30(1)(a) of FOIA states:

"Information held by a public authority is exempt information if it has at any time been held by the authority for the purposes of –

- (a) *Any investigation which the public authority has a duty to conduct with a view to it being ascertained -*
 - (i) *whether a person should be charged with an offence, or*
 - (ii) *whether a person charged with an offence is guilty of it".*

24. In the Commissioner's view, the phrase "at any time" means that information is exempt under section 30(1)(a) if it relates to an ongoing, closed or abandoned investigation.
25. In order for the exemption to be applicable, any information must be held for a specific or particular investigation and not for investigations in general. Section 30(1)(a) is a class based exemption; if information falls within its scope there is no need for a public authority to demonstrate some level of prejudice in order for the exemption to be engaged.
26. In this case, the Commissioner is satisfied that the withheld information relates to specific, criminal investigations, which had all concluded by the date of the request. Clearly, as a police force DPP has a duty to conduct investigations of the sort described in section 30(1)(a). The Commissioner is therefore satisfied that the exemption is engaged.

The public interest test

27. Section 30(1) is a qualified exemption and is therefore subject to the public interest test under section 2(2)(b) of the FOIA.

Public interest arguments in favour of disclosure

28. DPP has argued that:

"Disclosure of the information would improve the public's knowledge and understanding of the investigatory process and, as all police investigations are publically funded, would show how public funds are being spent. Murder investigations are highly emotive and attract large media interest, therefore disclosure of the information would show the public that the investigation had been conducted properly".

Public interest arguments in favour of maintaining the exemption

29. DPP has argued:

"This exemption covers information held at any time for the purpose of an investigation, whether the case is ongoing, closed or abandoned. In addition to this, there are already in place established procedures for disclosure when to do so would aid an investigation, for example an appeal for witnesses through media channels. Disclosure of the requested information would prejudice how investigations are carried out in the future, which in turn would undermine an individual's right to a fair trial. This would hinder the prevention and detection of crime which would affect the forces future law enforcement capabilities".

Balance of the public interest

30. The general public interest served by section 30(1) is the effective investigation and prosecution of crime. The police service is charged with enforcing the law, preventing and detecting crime and protecting the communities it serves. Anything which interferes with its ability to deliver this service will clearly be against the public interest.
31. As mentioned above, the complainant is of the view that the data requested is "inherently public". This is because it relates to murders which involve trials that both the public and press may attend, and also because much information is likely to be in the public domain due to media/press reporting; the same applying to any related inquests. Having searched online for the murder details herself the Commissioner agrees with the complainant that the type of information being withheld under this exemption is generally available for most of the cases.
32. Additionally, the information requested is at a very low level and does not divulge much detail about any of the 6 murder cases, indeed there is considerably more information already available online for most of them.
33. In support of disclosure, DPP has argued that this would benefit the public regarding its understanding of investigatory processes, how funds are spent and how the investigations were conducted; however, the Commissioner does not agree. The requested information is only a brief record of points about the murders which the complainant has asked to be provided by way of a "tick box" questionnaire and she does not accept that disclosure would serve any of these purposes. The investigations are completed and the level of information requested would not disclose details about costs or how the investigation was actually done.
34. DPP has argued against disclosure as it believes that this would affect its ability to appeal for witnesses, prejudice future investigations, undermine the right to a fair trial and hinder future law enforcement capabilities. However, the requested information is basic and does not reveal any sensitive operational information. It does not require the disclosure of details about any of the associated investigations, how they were undertaken or any witness-related information. DPP does not explain, nor is it obvious, how disclosure could hinder future cases or undermine fair trials and how witnesses could be dissuaded from cooperating with the police. Again, the Commissioner does not find that any of these arguments are relevant to the information requested and considers them to be generic in nature rather than specific to each case.
35. Whilst it is noted that DPP has tried to customise its responses to the Commissioner in respect of each of the 6 cases, it has based its position solely on its own press releases given at the time of each investigation.

It has not taken into account that the cases are "solved" or that there is a considerable amount of information readily available. Rather, it has indicated that it does not consider that there is any remaining public interest in the cases because they are completed.

36. The complainant has advised why she has requested the information, as cited in "Background" above. It is clear that there is a specific legitimate interest in requiring it which is based on a 'gap' in information which is currently available. Clearly the results of such research may facilitate better understanding of murders involving elderly people and could have valuable results for the wider public once all the data has been collated and evaluated. As already mentioned, all other forces except one – which has specific reasons for not complying to date – have provided the requested information in full and the information requested from DPP is the remaining 'piece' which would allow an accurate picture to be built.
37. The arguments provided by DPP do not reflect the information requested and the Commissioner is not convinced by them. However, she does find there to be public value in favour of disclosure of the information based on the complainant's submissions.
38. Based on the reasoning above, the Commissioner is satisfied that the public interest in disclosure outweighs that in maintaining the exemption. She therefore finds that the information withheld solely under this exemption should be disclosed.

Section 38 – health and safety

39. DPP has cited section 38(1)(a) to the same information to which section 30 was applied. Section 38(1)(a) of the FOIA states that information is exempt if its disclosure would, or would be likely to, "... *endanger the physical or mental health of any individual*".
40. Consideration of this exemption involves two stages. Firstly, the exemption must be engaged as a result of endangerment to physical or mental health being at least likely to result. Secondly, this exemption is qualified by the public interest, which means that the information must be disclosed if the public interest in the maintenance of the exemption does not outweigh the public interest in disclosure.

The endangerment test

41. In order to engage this exemption DPP must demonstrate that there is a causal link between the endangerment and disclosure of the information.
42. DPP must also show that disclosure of the withheld information in this case would or would be likely to have a detrimental effect on the

physical or mental health of any individual. The effect must be more than trivial or insignificant.

43. DPP explained to the complainant that:

"To release any information into the public domain at this stage, whereby there has been no previous disclosure by the force concerning the victim (albeit deceased) could cause physical or mental harm to the health of any surviving relative of the deceased as to publish this information would create difficult and painful memories to family members at a time when those family members may well be within the healing process, through time, in coming to terms with what happened to their relative some time ago.

In the ICO DN FS50431011 (The National Archives (TNA) June 2012) the Complainant requested the case file of a murder in 1952 of a shopkeeper. The Commissioner stated that he had "previously accepted an individual's mental wellbeing to fall within the scope of section 38. In this he includes emotional and psychological wellbeing, including the likelihood of causing significant upset or distress". He then went on to state that "even with the passage of time there is still a duty of care to the family and to some of the people involved in the investigation".

Is the exemption engaged?

44. In order to engage the section 38 exemption, a public authority must be able to evidence a causal relationship between the potential disclosure and the identified prejudice.
45. The Commissioner accepts that coming to terms with the murder of a family member is obviously distressing and the insensitive handling of the related information collated in a murder case has the potential to endanger the physical or mental health of those parties concerned. Were graphic details of the crimes the focus of this request then the Commissioner may find some justification in citing this exemption. However, the level of information that has been requested is very low and there is generally much more graphic detail already available on line for these cases.
46. The Commissioner notes the decision notice which has been cited by DPP as an example for engaging this exemption. However, in that case the information which was found to be exempt under section 38(1)(a) was graphic in nature and included photographs of the crime scene, a post mortem and a medical report, for a specific named murder. She considers the information requested in this case to be of a different nature and quality, comprising only the ticking of boxes in a questionnaire format for 6 closed murder case investigations.

47. Having considered the arguments put forward by DPP, alongside the withheld information itself, the Commissioner is not satisfied that DPP has demonstrated a causal link between the potential disclosure and endangerment. It follows that she does not find the exemption engaged.
48. As the exemption at section 38(1)(a) is not engaged the Commissioner has not gone on to consider the public interest test in respect of the exemption.

Section 40 – personal information

49. This exemption has been cited in respect of the following :
 - Case (1) - the perpetrator / suspect's ethnicity;
 - Case (2) - the perpetrator / suspect's gender, ethnicity and age;
 - Case (3) - the perpetrator / suspect's ethnicity;
 - Case (4) - the perpetrator / suspect's ethnicity.
50. Although not cited by DPP, the Commissioner considers it also relates to the following which was withheld under 30(1) and 38(1):
 - Case (1) - relationship, location and method;
 - Case (2) - relationship, location and method;
 - Case (3) - relationship and method;
 - Case (4) – relationship.
51. Section 40(2) of the FOIA provides that information is exempt from disclosure if it is the personal data of an individual other than the requester and where the disclosure of that personal data would be in breach of any of the data protection principles.

Is the requested information personal data?

52. The first step for the Commissioner to determine is whether the requested information constitutes personal data, as defined by the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA). If it is not personal data, then section 40 cannot apply.
53. The definition of personal data is set out in section 1 of the DPA. This provides that, for information to be personal data, it must relate to an individual and that individual must be identifiable from that information.
54. Information will relate to a person if it is about them, linked to them, has some biographical significance for them, is used to inform decisions affecting them, has them as its main focus or impacts on them in any way. From the definition above it follows that information that does not relate to and identify an individual, is not personal data.

55. The first question for the Commissioner to consider is whether the requested information is personal data as defined in section 1 of the DPA. Therefore, for the purposes of considering the application of section 40(2), the Commissioner must first establish if the disclosure of the withheld information could reasonably lead to the identification of a person by another individual.
56. Regarding the application of section 40, DPP have advised the Commissioner:

"... although Section 40 Personal Information would not be applicable to the victim, due to the fact that they are deceased; there will be the victims' family that require consideration for disclosures of this nature. The Police have to be mindful of the fact that responding to this request moves away from what you can find online to what is fair to disclose. For example, the family of a victim of murder in 2005 may not want to have details (that would be identifiable) disclosed into the public domain again by the police".

57. The Commissioner does not accept that the requested information is the personal data of any surviving family members as this information has not been requested and nothing within the withheld information relates to any party other than the victim and the suspect / perpetrator.

Is any party identifiable in cases (1) to (4)?

58. A test used by both the Commissioner and the First-tier tribunal in cases such as this is to assess whether a 'motivated intruder' would be able to recognise an individual if he or she was intent on doing so. The 'motivated intruder' is described as a person who will take all reasonable steps to identify the individual or individuals but begins without any prior knowledge. In essence, the test highlights the potential risks of reidentification of an individual from information which, on the face of it, appears truly anonymised.

59. The ICO's Code of Practice on Anonymisation¹ notes that:

"The High Court in [R (on the application of the Department of Health) v Information Commissioner [201] EWHC 1430 (Admin)] stated that the risk of identification must be greater than remote and reasonably likely for information to be classed as personal data under the DPA".

60. In summary, the motivated intruder test is that if the risk of identification is "reasonably likely" the information should be regarded as personal data.

61. The Commissioner has undertaken internet searches based on what DPP would need to provide to the complainant in order to respond to the request. In doing so, without using the names of any parties as these were not requested, she has located details of cases numbered (1) to (3); these searches provided the names of perpetrators / suspects and all other details requested other than their ethnicity. The case numbered (4) was not found, not even with an inclusion of the actual name of the victim. She will therefore consider these two different categories of data separately.

The 3 identifiable perpetrators / suspects

62. The Commissioner was able to readily find these murders based on a simple search including the years of the offences and the ages of the victims. She here again notes it is unfortunate that DPP had already disclosed the actual ages to the complainant as they were not requested and, had the data only been provided within the bands asked for, then the searches undertaken would have been less conclusive.

63. Information which would answer the request is fully available online, with the exception of the declared ethnicity of the suspect / perpetrator. The Commissioner is therefore satisfied that the withheld information is the personal data of the suspect / perpetrator in each of these cases. She will consider this further below.

The unidentifiable perpetrator / suspect

64. The Commissioner was unable to trace any detail of this murder, even with the additional knowledge of the victim's name. Whilst there may or may not have been an inquest into the matter, and other records may be available somewhere other than on the internet, the Commissioner does not consider that there is sufficient detail requested by the complainant which would allow this further identification to be undertaken.

65. Based on the lack of information which is readily available, the Commissioner is satisfied that the perpetrator / suspect cannot be identified and it is not their personal data. The section 40(2) exemption is therefore not engaged in relation to case (4).

The Commissioner's view

66. Although not cited by DPP, as the regulator of the DPA the Commissioner has considered the type of personal data that has been requested in cases (1) to (3). Section 2 of the DPA sets out what categories of personal data are classed as "sensitive" for the purposes of that Act. These include personal data as to the commission or alleged commission by the data subject of an offence and also their racial or

ethnic origin. Therefore, the personal data in question here is also "sensitive".

67. This means that the information can only be disclosed if to do so would be fair, lawful and would meet one of the DPA Schedule 2 conditions and, because it is sensitive personal data, also one of the DPA Schedule 3 conditions. If disclosure would fail to satisfy any one of these criteria, then the information is exempt from disclosure.
68. Therefore, even if the Commissioner found that disclosure would be generally fair, and there was a suitable Schedule 2 condition, this would not allow for the disclosure of the information if she found that no Schedule 3 condition could be satisfied. She has proceeded on the basis that she accepts that it is possible that disclosure in this case could reasonably be considered to be fair, due largely to the fact that much of the information is generally available in the public domain, and that the complainant has a legitimate interest in requesting the information which would fulfil Schedule 2, and has therefore gone on to consider the applicability of the Schedule 3 DPA conditions. If there is no relevant Schedule 3 condition then a full consideration of any data protection principle or any Schedule 2 condition is unnecessary.

Is there a relevant Schedule 3 condition?

69. The Commissioner's general view is that the two conditions in Schedule 3 that might apply in relation to disclosures made under the FOIA are the first condition, which is that the data subject has consented to disclosure, and the fifth condition, which is that the data subject has already deliberately made the personal data public. Consent has not been sought, and DPP is not required to seek this. Furthermore, the Commissioner does not consider that reports by the media and details about court cases or inquests can be considered to be steps made by the data subject to deliberately make public their personal data, rather these are the natural consequences of the events that have happened. The Commissioner is therefore aware of no evidence that the first or fifth condition is met.
70. As explained above, the complainant in this case is conducting research at a University. Paragraph 9 of the Data Protection (Processing of Sensitive Personal Data) Order 2000 (the "Order") allows for the processing of sensitive personal data if the processing:
 - (a) is in the substantial public interest;
 - (b) is necessary for research purposes (which expression shall have the same meaning as in section 33 of the Act);
 - (c) does not support measures or decisions with respect to any particular data subject otherwise than with the explicit consent of that data subject; and

- (d) does not cause, nor is likely to cause, substantial damage or substantial distress to the data subject or any other person.
71. The Commissioner has therefore considered whether or not this would permit disclosure under the FOIA.
72. Disclosure under the FOIA is purpose blind and to the world at large. Therefore it cannot be argued that, under the FOIA, the disclosure is justified solely for the purpose of research. If the information were to be disclosed under the FOIA, it is disclosed to the world and the purpose of that disclosure would be to respond to the FOIA request and not the research.
73. In conclusion, the Commissioner finds that no condition in DPA Schedule 3 is met. Therefore, disclosure of this sensitive personal data would be in breach of the first data protection principle. The finding of the Commissioner is that the exemption provided by section 40(2) is engaged in respect of the data withheld for cases (1), (2) and (3) and DPP was therefore not obliged to disclose it.

Other matters

74. It is unfortunate that DPP did not disclose the data as requested by the complainant. Had it provided the ages in the bands as requested it is likely that the Commissioner would not have considered the data to be 'personal data' as the risk of reidentification would be significantly reduced. However, because it failed to respond in the 'anonymised' way asked for by the complainant this has resulted in her being denied the full data which she requested and has received from all but one other police force, which remains an ongoing consideration. It is particularly unfortunate if this impacts on her overall research and the conclusions she can make.
75. It may be possible for DPP to make a disclosure which is limited to the researcher only outside the terms of the FOIA. The processing could be considered under paragraph 9 of the Order and DPP would have to consider whether it could meet all of the conditions under paragraph 70 above. This would appear to be a practical way forward.

Right of appeal

76. Either party has the right to appeal against this decision notice to the First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights). Information about the appeals process may be obtained from:

First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights)
GRC & GRP Tribunals,
PO Box 9300,
LEICESTER,
LE1 8DJ

Tel: 0300 1234504

Fax: 0870 739 5836

Email: GRC@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk

Website: www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber

77. If you wish to appeal against a decision notice, you can obtain information on how to appeal along with the relevant forms from the Information Tribunal website.

78. Any Notice of Appeal should be served on the Tribunal within 28 (calendar) days of the date on which this decision notice is sent.

Signed

Carolyn Howes
Senior Case Officer
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

- For each of the incidents that you refer to in question 2 above (where the victim was aged 60 or over at the time of the offence) please fill out the attached form. Please anonymise this data and use either a number or a reference for each case. Please complete one form per incident except where there is more than one perpetrator – in these cases please use the same reference number and complete multiple forms.

Murder of older people – individual incident details
Year of incident:.....

Anon ref number (e.g. numeric or your ref)	Gender of victim	Ethnicity of victim (self-defined)	Gender of perpetrator / suspect	Ethnicity of perpetrator / suspect (self-defined)	Age of victim at the time of the offence	Age of perpetrator / suspect at the time of the offence	Relationship of PERPETRATOR / SUSPECT to the victim	Location of the murder	Method of killing
1.	Male Victim <input type="checkbox"/> Female Victim <input type="checkbox"/>		Male Perpetrator <input type="checkbox"/> Female Perpetrator <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> 60-69 <input type="checkbox"/> 70-79 <input type="checkbox"/> 80-89 <input type="checkbox"/> 90-99 <input type="checkbox"/> 100 or over	<input type="checkbox"/> 16 or under <input type="checkbox"/> 17-19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20-29 <input type="checkbox"/> 30-39 <input type="checkbox"/> 40-49 <input type="checkbox"/> 50-59 <input type="checkbox"/> 60-69 <input type="checkbox"/> 70-79 <input type="checkbox"/> 80-89 <input type="checkbox"/> 90-99 <input type="checkbox"/> 100 or over <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	Partner or husband <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Child <input type="checkbox"/> Grandchild <input type="checkbox"/> Other family member <input type="checkbox"/> Un-related carer <input type="checkbox"/> Friend <input type="checkbox"/> Neighbour <input type="checkbox"/> Acquaintance <input type="checkbox"/> Stranger <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Victim home <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Perpetrator home <input type="checkbox"/> Victim & Perpetrator's home <input type="checkbox"/> Care home, hospital or nursing home <input type="checkbox"/> Public outside location <input type="checkbox"/> Public indoor location <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	Asphyxiation / choking / suffocating <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Stabbing <input type="checkbox"/> Firearm/gun <input type="checkbox"/> Assault with weapon <input type="checkbox"/> Assault without weapon <input type="checkbox"/> Poisoned <input type="checkbox"/> Drowning <input type="checkbox"/> Strangling <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown