

Community Safety Officer
Dudley Council
Brierley Hill Police Station
Bank Street
Dudley
DY5 3DH

27th July 2026

Dear

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Board

DHR QA Board Feedback for the Community Safety Partnership

TITLE OF DHR	Katherine
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP	Dudley
DATE REVIEWED BY QA BOARD	24 June 2026
DECISION	Publish with amendments
GOOD PRACTICE COMMENDED	• There is good use of research in the analysis section. • The QA Board noted the Chair's attempts to contact Katherine's daughter as part of the review.
FEEDBACK FOR FUTURE DHRs	• Please follow the report layout provided in the DHR statutory guidance. A large proportion of the feedback set out below relates to the structure of the review. • Please avoid using the term 'abusive relationship' (for example, at paragraph 16) since it does not describe who is doing what to who and fails to hold the abuser accountable for their actions. • Executive summaries should not be 50+ pages in length. In future, please ensure these are more concise.

	DHR SECTION	DHR QA BOARD FEEDBACK (improvements required before publication)
1	Title Page	No amendments required.
2	Contents Page	Please remove the fully worded recommendations from the contents table and reconfigure the document according to the structure set out in the DHR statutory guidance. Please apply the same feedback to the executive summary.
3	Pen Portrait	Please consider developing a pen portrait based on what was learned about Katherine whilst undertaking the review. The same feedback applies to the executive summary.
4	Condolences	No amendments required.
5	Confidentiality and Anonymity	The victim's real name is used at paragraph 52, please remove this to ensure anonymity.

6	Terms of Reference	• Please include these in the main body of the report. • Please state whether Katherine's family contributed to these.
7	Equality and Diversity	• Please move this section from the appendices into the main body of the report. • The protected characteristic of sex was significant in this case. Please develop this section to include an analysis of this.
8	Background Information	No amendments required.
9	Combined Chronology	No amendments required.
10	Overview	No amendments required.
11	Analysis	No amendments required.
12	Conclusions	No amendments required.
13	Lessons learnt and recommendations	No amendments required.
14	Timescales	Please move this section from the appendices into the main body of the report.
15	Involvement of family / friends / community	Some detail is provided in the background section. Please make this a stand-alone section and indicate whether AAFDA and Home Office leaflets were shared with Katherine's family.
16	DHR contributors	Please move this section from the appendices into the main body of the report.
17	DHR Panel	Please move this section from the appendices into the main body of the report and state whether panel members were independent.
18	DHR Author	Please move this section into the main body of the report.
19	Parallel Reviews	Please move this section into the main body of the report.
20	Dissemination	• This section is not included. Please add this, ensuring that the local Police and Crime Commissioner as well as the Domestic Abuse Commissioner are included on the dissemination list.

		Please indicate in the body of the report whether Katherine's family will be consulted about key dates to avoid publication and whether additional support will be needed at that time
21	Action Plan	Please indicate where overall responsibility for implementation of the action plan sits.
22	Has there been a request to withhold publication? <i>If Yes, include the reason for the request. Is it proportionate and appropriate?</i>	No requests to withhold publication.
23	Any other comments	- Please clarify if the panel considered how risk was managed in relation to Lester's parents. - Please conduct a thorough proofread prior to publication to correct grammatical and spelling errors throughout the document.

Domestic Abuse Related Death Review : Katherine (Dudley DHR 12)		
DARDR Section	Home Office QA Panel Feedback	Changes
Title Page	No amendments required	None
Contents Page	Please remove the fully worded recommendations from the contents table and reconfigure the document according to the structure set out in the DHR statutory guidance. Please apply the same feedback to the executive summary.	Final report follows QA panel request
Pen Portrait	Please consider developing a pen portrait based on what was learned about Katherine whilst undertaking the review. The same feedback applies to the executive summary.	Katherine's employers were approached to provide a pen picture based upon conversations with her work colleagues – pen portrait included in Overview report and Executive Summary
Condolences	No amendments required	None
Confidentiality and Anonymity	The victim's real name is used at paragraph 52, please remove this to ensure anonymity.	Removed
Terms of Reference	• Please include these in the main body of the report. • Please state whether Katherine's family contributed to these.	Terms of reference placed in body of report Katherine's family declined to be involved with the review and therefore did not comment on the terms of reference – added as footnote
Equality and Diversity	• Please move this section from the appendices into the main body of the report. • The protected characteristic of sex was significant in this case. Please develop this section to include an analysis of this.	Moved to main body of the report. The gendered nature of domestic abuse discussed at section seven

• Background Information • Combined Chronology • Overview • Analysis • Lessons learnt and recommendations	No amendments required to any of these sections	None
Timescales	Please move this section from the appendices into the main body of the report.	Moved to main body of the report.
Involvement of family / friends / community	Some detail is provided in the background section. Please make this a stand-alone section and indicate whether AAFDA and Home Office leaflets were shared with Katherine's family.	AAFDA could not engage with Katherine's daughter who chose not to engage with the DARDR.
DHR contributors	Please move this section from the appendices into the main body of the report.	Moved to main body of the report.
DHR Panel	Please move this section from the appendices into the main body of the report and state whether panel members were independent.	Moved to main body of the report.
DHR Author	Please move this section into the main body of the report.	Moved to main body of the report.
Parallel Reviews	Please move this section into the main body of the report.	Moved to main body of the report.

Dissemination	This section is not included. Please add this, ensuring that the local Police and Crime Commissioner as well as the Domestic Abuse Commissioner are included on the dissemination list. Please indicate in the body of the report whether Katherine's family will be consulted about key dates to avoid publication and whether additional support will be needed at that time.	Dissemination section included as directed Added - The Chair has attempted to contact Katherine's daughter through the last know email address at the point of publication, with no response received. Publication will not coincide with any significant dates or anniversaries.
Action Plan	Please indicate where overall responsibility for implementation of the action plan sits.	Implementation of the action plan sit with the Chair of the Community Safety Partnership Dudley
Has there been a request to withhold publication? If yes , include the reason for the request. Is it proportionate and appropriate?	No requests to withhold publication.	
Any other comments	Please clarify if the panel considered how risk was managed in relation to Lester's parents. Please conduct a thorough proofread prior to publication to correct grammatical and spelling errors throughout the document.	It was established by the DARDR that Lester returned to his mother's whenever the relationship with a partner or Katherine deteriorated. Lester's mother intervened on his behalf (paragraph 44) when she tried to persuade Katherine not to press charges, but she could have been coerced or have been acting through a parental desire to protect her son from criminal charges. In the chronology (2014-paragraph 33 and 2015 -paragraph 35) West Midlands Police decided not to arrest Lester for Breach of the Peace during domestic incidents with Katherine and an unnamed victim, and on each occasion, Lester proposed he return to his mother's address to preclude the need for arrest. The purpose of this would be to remove the offender to a location that would be

		sufficiently far away that a reoccurrence would be unlikely. In this case Lester's mother lived some twenty miles away and therefore that would be seen as suitable. This could however be seen as a potential ongoing risk of a breach of the peace being transferred to his mother. It is not possible to establish whether appropriate checks were conducted in relation to that address, or the individual, to identify whether there were reports or logs that could indicate Lester had previously posed such risk, to his mother or other occupiers. The address was in another force area and that would have required the WMP Force Control Room requesting intelligence checks, but this would be a relatively straightforward process. If there were concerning intelligence checks, officers would have had to identify an alternative address and in the absence of a suitable address, would have had no option but to arrest Lester. This issue was considered with the Police panel member from the WMP Review Team. It was his view that in 2026, best practice would be that officers should always carry out intelligence checks and alternatives be sought, if the proposed address was not suitable. This was identified learning in another West Midlands DARDR.
--	--	--