

Incident Report to Community

We have used role labels throughout rather than names to preserve confidentiality: Owner/Initial Investigator, Second Investigator (Safety Officer), Reporting Party, Reported Party, Witness.

Please note that where appropriate we have highlighted in dark blue text responses that are already in action, or feedback on plans.

Background

This section sets out the relationships and context relevant to assessing power dynamics in this case.

	Casa Kink Owner / Initial Investigator	Consent Monitor	Safety Officer	Reporting Party	Reported Party	Witness
Casa Kink Owner / Initial Investigator		Friends Consent Monitor	Friends Safety Officer Accountability Officer (personal to Nita) Consent Monitor Educator and Experience Facilitator	Client Educator at Casa Partner launching business at Casa	Tour Whore Educator at Casa (non-kink) Regular transport to and from the venue. Occasional overnight stays at the Owner's home, pending collection of the Reported Party the following morning.	Client
Consent Monitor	Friends Consent Monitor		Co-Consent Monitors	Friends	Friends	In a Pack
Safety Officer	Friends Safety Officer Accountability Officer (personal to Nita) Consent Monitor Educator and Experience Facilitator	Co-Consent Monitors		No known relationship	No known relationship	No known relationship
Reporting Party	Client Educator at Casa Partner launching business at Casa	Friends	No known relationship		Friends at time of incident	Friends

Reported Party	Tour Whore Educator at Casa (non-kink) Regular transport to and from the venue. Occasional overnight stays at the Owner's home, pending collection of the Reported Party the following morning.	Friends	No known relationship	Friends at time of incident		Friends, sometimes play partners
Witness	No known relationship	In a pack	No known relationship	Friends	Friends, sometimes play partners	

Why This Matters

All people involved in this matter had personal relationships with multiple others. In a community this size and this connected, this is not uncommon and makes the managing of reports challenging. This raises considerable power-dynamic concerns and has been a considerable driver of some of our process changes. See the Action Plan below.

Safety Officer's Report Summary (Anonymised)

Prepared by the Second Investigator. Shortened from the original for length and anonymised.

Incident date: Thursday, 26 March 2026
Reported to Consent Monitor: May 2026
Report Received by Casa: 15 July 2026
Parties: Reporting Party, Reported Party, Witness

Background & Negotiation

- The parties negotiated over several days beforehand. The Reported Party was familiar with the Reporting Party's preferences from prior interaction.
- The Reported Party had observed an earlier session between the Reporting Party and another person, and told the Reporting Party she would avoid the already-marked areas from that session.
- Both agreed to a "no bratting" rule.
- The Reporting Party stated that the negotiation was as a 'service top' playing with a 'service bottom'.
- The Reported Party had no recollection of the 'service' element of their play.

The Play Session

- The Reported Party used a crop.
- A Witness was present for the early part of the session, but left before the session concluded. The Witness corroborates an initial skin check and a stated intention to avoid bruised areas, but was not present for the later, disputed part of the session.
- The Reported Party states they checked in throughout using a pre-agreed intensity scale and adjusted when strikes registered above the negotiated level.
- The Reporting Party states no consistent pain-level checks occurred, that strikes landed on skin already bruised from an earlier session that evening, and that the resulting bruising and hematoma lasted roughly three weeks. We did not ask for medical reports as we believe reporters.
- The reporting party states that they experienced some actions as bratting, which had been agreed as a boundary for both parties. They state that they asked the Reported Person to not give instructions and when the instructions continued they ended the play

- The Reported Party states that they ended the session when they noticed that the reporting party had withdrawn into themselves. They ended with a final grouping of strikes, and the reporting Party was asked to count the final strikes. It is understood that this counting of the last strikes is what was understood to be bratty topping or the 'baiting' the reporting person had mentioned.

Aftercare

- Aftercare took place, accounts differ on whether it was adequate.

Reporting

- An informal report was provided by the Reporting Party to a Casa Consent Monitor in May.
- The consent monitor was not sure whether to report it or not and it was brought to the Owner in July.
- Formal Report left at Casa by Consent Monitor on 14 July. Owner received it 15 July.
- The Owner began the initial investigation on 20 July before handing it to the Second Investigator once a conflict of interest was identified.

Safety Officer's Observations

- Some core facts are largely undisputed.
- Areas of disagreement are pain-check frequency, communication about prior bruising, and the "bratting" question.
- The Reported Party's acknowledged that their relative inexperience may have shaped how their communication style was perceived and that this may have been seen as bratty topping.
- The countdown of the final group of strikes may also have been perceived as bratty-topping, they were intended as a way to complete the scene.
- Overconfidence, combined with an existing personal relationship between the two parties, may have affected the reported person's judgement during the final grouping of strikes. This should have stopped as soon as they saw the withdrawal of the Reporting Party.
- One prior formal report had been raised about the Reported Party and a different kind of play, it was brought by the Reported Party themselves and it was addressed through support from more experienced tops as well as research, reflection and observation.

Recommendations

- Clarify Casa's language distinguishing casual "pick-up plays" from formal "service" roles. This has been implemented:
 - *A top is a top, a bottom is a bottom, regardless of their 'service' to their play partner. At Casa all casual play is pick up play and will be referred to this way to avoid any confusion. We have NO service tops or bottoms who provide service to Casa.*
 - *For events like the Curious (Newbies) Collective we will use the term "Experience Facilitators" to refer to the folk who offer experiences to the community. This includes offering up their body for play as well as offering their top skills (top and bottom).*
 - *Unless it is a case of personal identity, e.g. "Jo is a service sub", I would really avoid at all costs using Service Top or bottom, it creates a kink dispensary feeling and more than that seems to be accompanied by an assumption of skill and experience.*
- Develop community workshops on impact safety, skin integrity, and managing repeat or overlapping play in one evening.
 - *In progress*
- Provide the Reported Party with structured guidance on technical skill, consent practice, and pacing, in line with the Reporting Party's stated preference for a community-focused resolution over punitive isolation.
 - *When / if the reported party returns to the kink scene and / or Casa we will provide this education and more for free whilst they build skill under guidance.*
- The Reported Party to step back from any crew/volunteer roles for a period of 12 months at which stage it can be reviewed.
 - *The reported party has already stepped down from their role as a Tour Whore at Casa*

- Update and Refresh Consent Monitor training on taking reports to close the reporting-delay gap this case exposed.
 - *Updated Safety Manual drafted, now with Consent Monitors for review, which will lead to updated training and documentation.*
- Offer a neutral, mediated conversation between the parties only if and when the Reporting Party feels ready.
- Share this report and supporting evidence with the Safety Network for independent review.
 - *Done and much feedback received. Much appreciation to those who spent time on this review in order to help us improve our processes and responses.*

Feedback Received from the Safety Network

Feedback was received from a number of people in both the Cape Town Safety groups. Some feedback has resulted in changes to this document and others have been summarised into themed points.

Fairness, kindness and impartiality of the investigation

- Some consensus that the initial investigation could not be considered fair or impartial, given the Owner's relationship with the Reported Party. Feedback is that this should have triggered immediate handover. *See actions below for the process review we are considering.*
- Some feedback suggested that the case was not dealt with kindly for the Reporting Party. *We are undergoing a considerable review of our processes and education in order to ensure we can more easily identify conflicts of interest and ensure all parties involved in a report are dealt with compassionately.*

Treatment of and support for the Reporting Party

- The Reporting Party did not feel supported and felt interrogated rather than heard. (This from writings on Fetlife)
 - *Casa acknowledges that this process was poorly handled from the start and this includes the manner with which the Reporting Party was communicated with.*
 - *We (Casa) should have acknowledged receipt of the report as soon as received*
 - *We should have outlined the full process and timing for all parties so they would understand the process that would be followed.*
 - *We should have identified the conflict of interest immediately and allocated a Safety Officer to handle the investigation from the start.*
 - *We should have explained to the Reporting Party that the reason we did not need to see their photos is because we believe survivors.*
 - *We did explain to the Reporting Party that questions were being asked in order to identify the areas of education the Reported Party needed as this was what the Reporting Party had asked for as an outcome. This was communicated in a manner that lacked compassion.*
- Concern was raised about the Consent Monitor who handled the investigation being suspended pending an investigation. It was raised that this is perceived as retaliation.
 - *This is part of an ongoing investigation into why the report was not handled for two months and the manner in which the Consent Monitor created the report. Further details cannot be shared at this point.*
- Concerns raised about a proposed/actual community discussion of the incident proceeding without the Reporting Party's informed consent.
 - *The decision to hold this briefing was because the Reporting Party was demanding transparency in the midst of the investigation. We felt an understanding of our process would alleviate some feeling of 'hiding the truth'. We asked the Reporting Party if they would like us to cancel or postpone and when they responded 30mins before the event, we cancelled it immediately.*
 - *We acknowledge that this meeting was ill-advised and will not succumb to public pressure to release information until such time as a report is ready.*

Proportionality of recommendations

- Recommendations for the Reported Party (time away from responsibilities, funded retraining) were broadly seen as reasonable.
- The most significant gap raised across multiple responses was the Owners role and conflict of interest.
We are going through considerable review of our process and have asked some of the Safety Network to assist with example policies and processes.

Structural and process recommendations

- Distribute report intake so no single person controls all disclosures.
Our intake is already distributed, all Consent Monitors can take a report and people can submit their own anonymous report online. It is the allocation of the case and investigation that needs broadening.
- Protections against retaliation for reporting or corroborating.
- A defined pre-scene injury assessment standard beyond a visual check, and a required post-scene welfare check-in where distress was noted. *(under advisement)*
- Make the Consent Policy more visible on the Casa website. *(done)*
- Consistent, documented turnaround times for handling reports. *(these are documented in our full Safety Handbook, under review with Consent Monitors)*

Broader proposal

- One responder proposed a cross-venue (possibly cross event, not just venue) accountability network. They are suggesting separate venue accreditation and individual registration tiers?
Casa is a part of an effective Safety Network in Cape Town. We will continue to make use of this for sharing safety information and support.

Casa Action Plan (Prioritised by Importance and Urgency)

Action	Priority
Define and publish the Owner's automatic recusal rule	Urgent Critical
Confirm the Safety Officer to be the backup decision maker for cases where the owner is recused	Urgent Critical
Finalise updated investigation	Critical
Enable Consent Monitors to share concerns/patterns with each other, not just report upward	Quick Fix
Document and publish current floor-monitoring ratios and stopping authority	Exists in multiple documents
Develop a documented anti-retaliation policy for reporters/corroborators	Important
Develop a pre-scene injury assessment standard and required post-scene welfare check-in, with medical/harm-reduction input	Under Advisement
Move the Consent Policy to its own tab on the website	Done
Publish a reporting-process flowchart with turnaround times	Drafted, CMs reviewing
Clarify 'service' roles at Casa alongside experience facilitators to avoid people believing someone has experience without asking questions.	Done
One Safety Member suggested a cross-venue accreditation network.	Casa Kink will not participate in anything along these lines until such time as it is clear how it works and who controls it.