

Threat Assessment and final report

19.01.2025



We have no indication of an immediate threat to Paloma M., her family and her business.

- Incidents 1 & 2 are not related.
- Incident 1 is considered an action of opportunistic adversary which was provoked by weak security management and hostile security environment.
- Incident 2 was the result of the unfriendly (yet, not aggressive) behavior of Paloma's neighbors.

1. Introduction & Objectives

Purpose:

The assessment aims to evaluate the emerging risks and threats facing the client, their partner, and their family considering a series of security incidents, and to determine potential mitigative actions.

Scope:

The report considers three incidents:

1. A break-in and arson attempt at the beauty salon (Incident 1).
2. The vandalism of the client's partner's vehicle with dog waste (Incident 2).
3. Another reported incident involving the partner's car near her office (Incident 3).

Additionally, the report explores the suspected connection between the incidents and the client's belief that a former employee, Ms. Eileen [REDACTED], may be involved.

CONCLUSION

General Observations Across Incidents

1. Key Differences in Method and Motive:

- Incident 1 demonstrates emotional or professional hostility, and a clear intent to cause property damage.
- Incident 2 exhibits impulsiveness, lack of sophistication, and parallels common neighborhood frustrations over minor conflicts.

2. No Overlap in Evidence or Perpetrator Profile:

- The cautious and goal-oriented demeanor of the arsonist does not align with the impulsive, emotionally driven nature implied in the vandalism case.

3. Circumstantial Gap:

- Lack of time, location, or behavioral links suggest no common adversary orchestrated both incidents.

In this report, we provide the client with a risk assessment, an analysis of alternative hypotheses, and a security assessment checklist designed to identify and implement measures that support the management and mitigation of identified threats.

2. Identification of Threats

Types of Threats:

- **Physical Threats:** Break-in, arson attempt, and potential harassment.
- **Operational Threats:** Safety of business operations and potential damage to reputation.
- **Psychological Threats:** Intimidation and heightened stress for the client and their partner.

Threat Actors:

1. **Arsonist:** A male individual between 45-60 years of age, involved in Incident 1.
2. **Vandal(s):** Identity unknown; associated with Incident 2.
3. **Suspected Individual (Former Employee):** Former employee of the client's partner who has been implicated without substantial evidence thus far.

THREAT TYPES	ASSOCIATED THREAT ACTORS	IMPACT DESCRIPTION
PHYSICAL THREATS (BREAK-IN, ARSON, HARASSMENT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business adversaries • Adversaries to the family (personal enemies) of Paloma • Troublemakers, Vandal(s), Delinquents 	Break-in or arson could damage properties; harassment poses direct risks to safety.
OPERATIONAL THREATS (BUSINESS SAFETY, REPUTATION)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business adversaries / Competitors • Suspect (or other former/current employee(s) unhappy with working conditions, attitude or salary) 	Damage to business reputation or disruption of safe operations is possible.
PSYCHOLOGICAL THREATS (INTIMIDATION, STRESS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adversaries to the family (personal enemies) of Paloma • Business adversaries 	Client and his partner might face intimidation, stress, or psychological effects.

Threat actors

Business adversaries / Competitors

There is strong competition among beauty salons in the area. The density of hairdressers and nail salons here is 0.17 higher than in Soho and 0.33 higher than the average density of hairdressing salons across Greater London.



Mapping of competitors around [Wavelength Spa, 51 Great Portland St, London](#) [Interactive map.](#)

Wavelength Spa was opened in summer of 2024¹. Previously these premises were occupied by another salon. We do not know the reason why it was closed, why the previous owner decided to sell the business.

Wavelength Spa provides room for rent² and shares premises with other (at least one) beauty project lead by [Duda Padilha](#) (of Brazil origin)³.

Conflicts with competitors possess a single but important defining characteristic: an act of aggression is typically followed by a negotiation process that establishes the positions of the parties involved and sets the stage for a resolution of the conflict, often accompanied by a reassessment of these positions. For example, a conflict might arise from one competitor's desire to acquire the premises. In such cases, the time between incidents should be minimal, typically measured in days, rarely in weeks, and never in months.

Adversaries to the family (personal enemies) of the Client

Client has not reported any conflicts or tensions with individuals in her close circle, such as relatives, family friends, or other family members. Identifying any potential adversaries within this group without Paloma's active cooperation is both challenging and time-consuming.

Our investigation, which did not specifically focus on these conflicts and did not involve direct interviews with Paloma or her family, faced significant limitations and was unlikely to yield comprehensive results.

However, we conducted an extensive review of Client's public activity, as well as the activities of her friends and social media connections.

¹ <https://langhamestate.com/news/two-new-boutique-salon-openings-great-portland-street/>

² https://www.openrent.co.uk/properties-to-rent/great-portland-street-london?term=Great%20Portland%20Street,%20London&prices_min=386&prices_max=1926&viewingProperty=11

³ <https://www.dudapadilhabeauty.com/>

Based on this analysis, we can say that, to the best of our knowledge, Client is not currently involved in any conflict that could escalate into physical threats or harassment.

Troublemakers, Vandal(s), Delinquents

The category "Troublemakers, Vandals, and Delinquents" refers to individuals who engage in unlawful activities without clear motives, driven purely by mischievous or malicious intent. This group typically represents petty offenders who lack the courage or capability to commit serious crimes unless operating as part of a group or gang. Such offenders are challenging to apprehend unless caught in the act, as there is often no logical connection between their crimes. Furthermore, their actions are frequently devoid of rational motives, with misconduct being carried out for its own sake.

This group is frequently associated with hate crimes, as vandalism and hate-related offenses often share similar underlying motives.

According to data from the Metropolitan Police, the area surrounding 51 Great Portland Street experienced an 18.24% reduction in the overall crime rate in December 2024 compared to December 2023.

But still there were 300+ reported crimes of this type in December 2024. The table includes hate crimes committed in 1000 m² area with the center at 51 Great Portland St, London W1W 7LE, UK.

Hate crime	122	
Racist and Religious Crime	94	
Racist Crime	76	
Homophobic Crime	25	
Faith Crime	20	
Antisemitic	9	
Islamophobic Crime	6	
Transphobic Crime	4	
Disability Crime	3	

Initially, it was our belief that arson was intentionally committed.

However, newly uncovered circumstances, accompanied by the absence of any similar incidents during the first weeks of 2025, incline us to consider the possibility of an unintentional act.

We can't ignore also the possibility of racist crime, but still the likeliness of this type of hate crime is rather low.

Below are the key factors that lead us to this conclusion:

- **Lack of Passive Security Systems**

The premises were not equipped with adequate passive security measures. For instance, window awnings, which are considered both necessary and sufficient to prevent glass breakage and subsequent fire-setting, were notably absent⁴.

- **Absence of Surveillance Cameras**

There were no external security cameras to capture the perpetrator's approach to the premises. Additionally, as far as we are aware, no internal surveillance cameras were installed to record the actions of the suspected arsonist inside the facility.

- **Reduced Visibility from the Street**

The entrance to the salon is not visible from the street. This lack of visibility creates an environment that is highly conducive to criminal activity, potentially encouraging someone to commit such an offense with a reduced fear of being observed or apprehended.

In November 2024 the Langham Estate (construction company and operator of the building where Whumman SpA is renting the office) has appointed Corps Security for providing physical security guarding with remote monitoring and response.

According to the public announcement, *"Corps Security will provide services for 56 sites across the estate, with 18 new colleagues transferring to the company. Corps Monitoring will provide technologically advanced security systems and remote services. Corps Consult will also provide*

⁴ Note: According to historical images of the premises rented by Whumman SpA, there were metal awnings for windows. It seems that they were uninstalled by Whumman SpA for unknown reasons or they were not closed during the day of Incident 1.

ongoing consultancy and routine security reviews, surveys and audits depending on the estates' requirements"⁵.

To mitigate risks related to opportunistic adversaries, troublemakers, vandal(s), delinquents, Client may authorize **VGRM**. It will be easier to solve issues related to CCTV installation with the company providing centralized services to the owner of the real estate. This is not the only option available, but likely the easiest.

The suspect employee (or other former/current employee(s) unhappy with working conditions, attitude, or salary)

Winnipeg Co. has a very easy to trace national background. Employees of the salon are of LATAM or Asian origin. This HR strategy itself requires appropriate security measures.

Based on prior experience, we have observed that conflicts within multicultural employee groups tend to be more intense and challenging to manage. Working in a foreign cultural environment inherently presents its own set of stresses.

Matters such as dismissals, salaries (including bonuses), and working conditions are often perceived by employees as particularly sensitive, personal, and high-risk. It is currently unclear whether all employees of Winnipeg Co. have proper work permits issued. If any employees lack valid permits, a dismissal could be perceived as a direct threat to their financial stability and personal safety.

In the public and semi-public domains there're no complains of current or former employees of Winnipeg Co.

To mitigate this risk, we recommend compile a comprehensive list of all employees working for Winnipeg Co. Ensure that this list includes not only full-time staff but also those working on a part-time basis.

Next, perform thorough screening of all employees to assess potential risks. This process should encompass, at a minimum, basic OSINT (Open-Source Intelligence) research, alongside a review of relevant datasets such as criminal records, civil records, and any existing debts.

Having analyzed the data, identify groups or individuals deemed to fall into high-risk categories. Take proactive measures to ensure that these groups are closely monitored and supervised by

⁵ <https://fmindustry.com/2024/11/04/industry-security-contract/>

... ..'s managerial team. This oversight will help mitigate potential risks and maintain a safe, productive working environment.

Finally, designate the most qualified and capable employee within to assume responsibility for managing HR-related risks. This individual should be supported with regular consultations and provided with access to specialized data that may be difficult for the average person to obtain.

Threat Scenarios

1. Further escalation by the suspected arsonist targeting the beauty salon or residence.
2. Increased harassment of the partner and family through vandalism and intimidation tactics.
3. Breach of safety due to insider actions (if Ms. Oliveira or others are involved).

Threat assessment matrix

Threat Scenario	Risk Level	Assessment Details	Probability
Further Arson Escalation	LOW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No subsequent incidents or direct threats recorded since the initial event No demands (e.g., vacating premises) have been made Decreasing probability of organized pressure on business with each incident-free day 	3-5%
Systematic Harassment	LOW-MEDIUM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Typically involves known antagonist Usually stems from personal disputes (divorce, inheritance, custody) No known long-term conflicts identified Would require presence of serious personal vendetta 	10-15%
Random Conflict Escalation	MEDIUM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential disputes with neighbors or local community Opportunistic harassment Could stem from business competition or local grievances More likely to be sporadic and unorganized 	15-20%
Internal Security Breach	HIGH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most probable scenario requiring immediate attention Requires thorough investigation of internal processes Focus on access control and insider threat mitigation 	40-50%

Threat Scenario	Risk Level	Assessment Details	Probability
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhanced monitoring of staff activities recommended 	

8. Conclusion

The incidents reported are concerning but lack clear evidence of being interconnected or part of an organized threat.

Enhanced security measures and ongoing threat monitoring will help mitigate potential risks.

9. Appendices

Beauty Salon Security Assessment Checklist

For self-mitigation of risks we recommend using the following checklist:

Category	Question	Response (Yes/No)	Results/Notes
1. Physical Security	Are all exterior doors equipped with high-quality locks (e.g., deadbolts)?		Very important
	Are windows secure (e.g., reinforced glass or locks)?		Very important
	Is there adequate exterior lighting around all entry points, parking areas, and pathways?		Very important
	Are there security patrols or a visible security presence nearby?		Desirable
	Are entry points monitored and restricted to authorized personnel only?		Desirable
2. Surveillance Systems	Are there CCTV cameras covering critical areas, both inside and outside?		Areas to monitor: Reception, entrance,



			workstations, storage rooms, parking lot.
	Are cameras functioning properly with no blind spots?		Very important
	Is the footage being stored securely and accessible for at least 30–60 days?		Desirable
	Are strategies in place to combat tampering, such as tamper-proof equipment?		Desirable
3. Alarm Systems	Is there an intrusion detection system installed for unauthorized access?		Very important
	Are motion-detection alarms or sensors in place in critical areas?		Desirable
	Does the facility have a panic button for emergencies, particularly in reception areas?		Desirable
5. Inventory Protection	Are storage and supply rooms secure with lock-and-key access?		Desirable
	Are valuable items kept out of sight after business hours?		Very important
	Is inventory checked and reconciled to identify discrepancies?		Desirable
6. Employee Procedures	Are there procedures for screening new employees, including background checks?		Very important
	Are staff aware of emergency and evacuation protocols?		Desirable
	Are there policies on reporting suspicious behavior/activity?		Desirable
	Are employee access rights clearly defined?		Very important



7. Customer Areas	Is the salon arranged to ensure clear visibility of customers and employees?		Desirable
	Is there a functional waiting area free of clutter?		Desirable
	Are customer belongings kept securely (e.g., designated lockers or safe spaces)?		Desirable
8. Cash Handling and Financial Security	Is cash stored in a safe during and after hours?		Very important
	Are funds transported safely, following protocols?		Desirable
	Are point-of-sale machines monitored for tampering or skimming devices?		Desirable
9. Emergency Protocols	Are emergency contacts (e.g., police, fire department) easily accessible?		Very important
	Are fire extinguishers installed, visible, and up to date?		Very important
	Are first-aid kits available and stocked?		Desirable
	Is there an evacuation policy/route clearly marked and communicated to staff and customers?		Desirable (but required by the Law)
10. General Risk Mitigation	Are personal customer interactions carried out in public/staff-visible areas?		Desirable
	Is there a procedure to vet unusual or suspicious customer behavior?		Very important
	Is staff trained in de-escalating conflicts or addressing emergencies calmly?		Very important
Final Review	Has a recent risk assessment been conducted (within the past 12 months)?		Desirable

	Are there plans for periodic re-evaluation of both physical and digital security measures?		Desirable
--	--	--	-----------

Measures indicated as “Very important” must be implemented in a shortest possible time. It is not a matter of disputes or hesitation.

- Luxottica Breach (2021): Exposed email: [REDACTED]@hotmail.com
- TAP Air Portugal (August 2022): Exposed name, gender, date of birth, email, physical address, and phone number.
- Luxottica (March 2021): Exposed similar data: name, gender, email, date of birth, physical address, and phone number.

Additional Platforms:

- Spotify: Registered
- Gumtree: Registered
- Dropbox: Registered
- Deliveroo: Registered

Data About Reported Incidents

- The husband reported a serious security incident involving their partner's (client) business (beauty salon), which experienced a break-in on the night of December 26, 2024, in London. During this incident, police stated that the intruder appeared to be intent on starting a fire in the business premises rather than stealing anything. [Incident 1]
- In the days leading up to the break-in, specifically on December 12, the partner's car was vandalized with dog waste, indicating possible harassment or targeted intimidation. Given these alarming events, the client is deeply concerned about the safety of both their partner and their family. [Incident 2]
- The partner/client reported that there was another incident with her car at another location, near her office. [Incident 3]
- The husband and his partner believe that the individual responsible for [Incident 1] may be the former receptionist of the beauty salon, Mrs. [REDACTED] (born January 20, 1993) [Suspected 1]. The rationale behind these suspicions has yet to be determined.

CURRENT STATUS AND SUMMARY

- Since her arrival in the UK, the client has been under close protection. During [REDACTED] the first three days, no security incidents have been reported, which is a positive sign indicating that, if a threat exists, it is not immediate.

- There has been no indication of hostile groups acting with a specific purpose. Any adversary typically acts with an objective in mind. Until such a goal is articulated, it would be premature to suggest the existence of a persistent threat.
- In 48 hours, we will revert with new information, update and preliminary results of analysis of alternative hypotheses.

SUMMARIES OF INCIDENTS

Incident 1: Arson in the office

- **Date and Time:** 24.12.2024; 05:26
- **Location:** Whymmer Spa, 54 Great Portland St, London W1W 7LE, UK
- **Description of the Incident:** An unknown individual attempted to set fire to the beauty salon's office.

Collected Information

- Short video footage of the incident
- Copy of MPS Crime reference number

Suspected Individual(s)

'ARSONIST'



The arsonist arrived at the scene on foot at 5:25 AM, walking along the left side of Santa Barbara Street. He was wearing a varsity jacket over his regular clothing, likely for concealment, along with a black beanie that obscured his face.

It is reasonable to assume that he was aware of the beauty salon's surveillance camera location, as he frequently glanced around and never turned directly toward the camera.

It is undoubtful that the only intention of his appearance was to make fire in this particular office.

The attempted arson occurred between 5:26 and 5:27 AM, after which he left the scene in an unknown direction.

Comment of the video footage provided by the member of The International Association of Forensic Criminologists

Profile of the Individual

1. Behavioral Traits:

- The individual displays characteristics typical of a petty delinquent, not a major criminal. They are not involved in large events, significant thefts, or organized crime.
- The subject shows signs of cowardice, indicating they feel scared or nervous about their actions. This suggests a personality that may be anxious and insecure in risky situations.

2. Social Background:

- It is likely that this individual comes from a troubled or dysfunctional background. Such environments can lead to antisocial behavior and minor criminal acts.
- The subject may have had previous encounters with law enforcement, as they seem familiar with the location.

3. Familiarity with the Scene:

- This was probably not the subject's first visit to the site. Their actions suggest they were confident and knowledgeable about the area.
- The individual was careful to check for people nearby and monitored traffic before carrying out the act. This indicates a level of planning, although it was done in an unprofessional way.

4. Observational Skills:

- The subject showed the ability to assess their surroundings, looking for witnesses and evaluating when it was safe to act. This level of awareness reflects some thoughtfulness, but lacks the skill of a more experienced criminal.

Conclusion

Arsonist can be viewed as a petty delinquent who is cautious rather than bold. His background and behavior suggest he might be struggling with personal issues related to his upbringing.

The team did not reach a definitive conclusion regarding the age of the Arsonist. In one of the frames, gray hair can be seen protruding from under the beanie, but this could also be dyed hair. The gender and ethnicity of the arsonist are clear—he is a white male. His age is preliminarily estimated to be between 45 and 60 years old.

The height of the Arsonist is approximately 175-180 cm when considering the height of the traffic light (according to the recommendations of the traffic police, the center of the temporary traffic light should be around 6.5 feet above ground level).

Witnesses

Strangers



These two young individuals witnessed the Arsonist and even had a brief interaction with him.



The driver of this car could spot something suspicious, but we failed to identify license plate of this truck.

Recommendations for further action

- Working in parallel with the police investigation we will continue the process of data collection and processing.
- We currently lack information regarding the arson incident itself. Specifically, we need to determine how the fire was ignited and how the arsonist accessed the office, assuming that he did enter the premises.
- We are in the process of establishing digital surveillance of the office of the beauty shop at 51 Great Portland Street, London W1W 7LE, UK. For this task we use Netlas.io and open-source-surveillance.us. Unfortunately, this will not help us to dig deeper in the Incident 1 because historical records of surveillance cameras are unavailable, and we already know

that on the social media there were no footprints of the Incident 1. It didn't attract any attention.

Incident 2: Vandalism

- **Date and Time:** 12.12.2024
- **Location:** 60 Randolph Ave, London W91BE, UK
- **Description of the Incident:** The partner's car was vandalized with dog waste

Collected Information

- Photos of dog's waste on the car
- Photos of partner's car parked next to the residential address

Pictures



Conclusion

We totally support our colleagues who tend to believe that Incident 1 and Incident 2 are not related.

Our reasoning:

- The use of canine excrement does not align with typical patterns of premeditated hostile actions. It is highly improbable that an adversary would deliberately collect and store such material, waiting for the opportunity to target the client's partner's vehicle. The nature of the vandalism suggests an impulsive response, likely triggered by parking-related frustrations.

- The psychological profile of individuals prone to serious criminal actions, such as arson attempts in office environments, differs significantly from those who would engage in minor acts of vandalism. While such individuals might resort to damaging vehicle components or breaking windows, they typically avoid methods involving biological waste.
- Regarding the alleged frequency of double parking in the location: Our analysis of Sentinel 1 satellite imagery covering October-December 2024 (yet, in total only 23 images) indicates only two documented instances of double parking, both appearing to be brief occurrences during peak periods. This evidence contradicts claims of widespread double parking practices in the area.

Recommendations for further action

- We haven't made the decision if we should go any deeper into Incident 2 or not. Obvious task is to identify dog breeders living near the house of client's partner and/or walking with their dogs in this area. This task will take quite a lot of time and resources with unclear outcomes.
- We kindly recommend that the client's partner consider refraining from parking violations in order to avoid potential issues with neighboring residents in the future.

Suspected individual

SANTOS DE OLIVEIRA ELLEN



Ellen Oliveira was born and raised in Brazil and holds a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration from Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Goiás, earned in 2015.

Ellen began her career at WH Jeans Ltda as an Assistant Sales Manager. From March 2015 to June 2019, she was responsible for managing client relations, overseeing inventory, and addressing customer inquiries. Her role contributed to streamlined operations and improved customer satisfaction.

In search of new opportunities, Ellen relocated to London, England, and took on the position of Team Lead at LEON Restaurants (Naturally Fast Food) from July 2019 to January 2021. She effectively led a diverse team, ensured daily restaurant operations ran smoothly, and managed customer service tasks that supported the restaurant's success.

From January 2021 to November 2023, Ellen worked as a Receptionist at BCC London.

- *BCC London is another beauty salon of the client's partner, located at 77A York St, London EC1A 1QZ, UK, not the one that had the Incident 1.*
- *When Ellen Oliveira worked for the client's partner, Wumman Spa was not even opened. It's opening dates back to summer 2024. We also know that Ellen Oliveira was not a receptionist at Wumman Spa (another lady was introduced to the public at the official Facebook page of Wumman Spa soon after the opening).*

She is fluent in both English and Portuguese. According to her own statement, she's currently unemployed.

It is worth noting that Ellen Oliveira has a relatively low public profile and has not yet established a significant career by the age of 32. To our knowledge, she is not married, and there is uncertainty regarding her relationship status.

An interesting observation is that Ellen prefers using Telegram over WhatsApp, which may raise curiosity, though it is not necessarily a cause for concern.

Alternative Hypothesis Analysis

Incident 1: Arson in the Beauty Salon Office

Hypothesis: The arson attempt was premeditated and carried out by an individual with a personal or professional grievance against the beauty salon.

- **Supporting Observations and Analysis:**

1. The arsonist's behavior demonstrated familiarity with the beauty salon's setup, including surveillance camera positioning, leading to the inference that the individual planned the attack.
 - Frequent glances and strategic avoidance of camera angles underline awareness.
2. The timing of the event (early morning hours) suggests the act was deliberate, intending to both avoid detection and maximize property damage.
3. Analysis of the individual's cautious but unprofessional behavior aligns with a petty delinquent profile rather than that of an organized criminal.
 - Anxiety and signs of insecurity detected in the footage suggest that this individual was not a bold or seasoned arsonist but someone under emotional strain or external pressure.
4. The choice of arson indicates a strong emotional or personal trigger—arson is often a crime of passion and retaliation rather than impulsivity.

Alternative Hypothesis 1: The arsonist has no prior connection to the salon and committed the act as part of an unrelated, random target practice or petty thrill-seeking.

- **Analysis:**
 - This hypothesis appears weaker: The arsonist showed familiarity with the setup and location, which rules out a purely random target.
 - His methodical approach and cautious behavior indicate strong intent directed at this specific site.

Alternative Hypothesis 2: The arsonist was attempting to cover up prior illegal activity in the salon's office.

- **Analysis:**
 - While not dismissible, no evidence currently supports this. The lack of break-in marks or signs of theft undermines this argument.

- Further investigation regarding the access method and ignition mechanism may clarify motives.

Incident 2: Vandalism of the Partner's Car

Hypothesis: The partner's car vandalism was an unrelated act of frustration likely stemming from parking-related conflicts with local residents.

- **Supporting Observations and Analysis:**

1. The vandalism used biological waste (dog excrement)—a method that aligns with impulsive and emotionally charged actions rather than calculated premeditated hostility.
2. Differences in psychological profiles of perpetrators:
 - Arsonists are often driven by deeply rooted personal grievances or purposes tied to revenge, destruction, or distraction.
 - Vandalism with dog waste points toward a trivial and impulsive response, often stemming from minor grievances (e.g., parking disputes or neighborhood rivalries).
3. Lack of evidence tying the beauty salon's affairs or the arsonist's actions to the partner indicates separateness between the two incidents.
4. Satellite imagery confirms no widespread double-parking, adding credibility to the inference that vandalism resulted from a rare instance of inconvenience/frustration rather than systemic issues.

Alternative Hypothesis 1: The vandalism was linked to the arson incident and intended to intimidate or threaten the involved parties.

- **Analysis:**

- This hypothesis is weak:
 - The use of dog waste is inconsistent with the patterns or messaging usually tied to criminal intimidation or retaliation.

- The method demonstrates impulsiveness rather than elaborate planning, unlike the arson attempt.
- No current evidence connects the two events (e.g., location dynamics, timing, or shared suspect profile).

Alternative Hypothesis 2: The vandalism was a deliberate personal attack targeting the partner but stemming from an entirely separate grievance.

- **Analysis:**
 - While plausible, there is currently no evidence suggesting this, beyond the mere incident.
 - Further investigation into the local circle or social dynamics of the partner may determine whether other disputes or conflicts could explain this scenario.