

The Criminal Appeal Reports (Sentencing) 1990/1991

Editor David Thomas, LL.D.

Consultant Editor
David Evans, Barrister

Editorial Contributors Maggy Pigott, M.A., Barrister T. Rees, M.A., LL.M., Barrister

Volume 12

London ● Sweet & Maxwell 1991

AUSTRALIA The Law Book Company Sydney

CANADA The Carswell Company Toronto, Ontario

INDIA
N.M. Tripathi (Private) Ltd.
Bombay
and
Eastern Law House (Private) Ltd.
Calcutta
M.P.P. House
Bangalore
and
Universal Book Traders
Delhi

ISRAEL Steimatzky's Agency Ltd. Tel Aviv

PAKISTAN Pakistan Law House Karachi

© Sweet & Maxwell Limited 1991

Divisional Court

Agnew v. Director of Public Prosecu-	R. v. Highbury Corner Stipendiary
tions 523	Magistrate ex parte Di Matteo 594
Director of Public Prosecutions v.	R. v. Selby Magistrates' Court ex parte
Corcoran 652	Frame 434
R. v. Burnley Magistrates' Court ex	R. v. Southwark Crown Court ex parte
parte Halstead 468	Ager 120

Table of Cases

ADAMS (1985)	Brown (1987)
Attorney-General's Reference No. 1 of 1989 (1989)	CAIRDS (1970) 36 Canniffe, Joseph (1989) 218 Carnwell (1978) 369, 740, 741 Chambers (1983) 110, 112 Chappell (1984) 695
1989 (1989)7, 8, 9, 481, 482, 511, 513 Attorney-General's Reference No. 3 of 1989 (1989)	Chatt (1984)
Attorney-General's Reference No. 4 of 1989 (1989)	Cline (1979)
Attorney-General's Reference No. 5 of 1989 (1989)	Conway (1985)
1989 (R. v. Thornton) (1990)638, 641 Attorney-General's Reference No. 9 of 1989 (R.v. Lacey) (1989)268, 270, 481, 482, 703, 704	Coope (1981) 600, 601 Courtie (1984) 281 Cox (1985) 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 640 Crossan (1987) 754, 755
B.W. v. Edgell (1988) 207, 212 Bainbridge (1979) 367, 369 Bancroft (1981) 176 Barley (1989) 657, 658 Barrick (1985) 39, 40, 357, 358, 622, 624 Bartholomew (1986) 731, 732	Cullen (1989) 469, 471 Cunliffe (1987) 767, 768 Customs and Excise Commissioners v. Menocal (1979) 211 Cuthbertson (1980) 183
Basra (1989)	DALEY AND WHITE (1987) 399 Daly (1981) 120, 121, 481, 482 Darvill (1987) 578, 580 Darwood (1973) 698, 699 Davies (1984) 657, 658 Davis (1986) 228, 229 Davison (1989) 24, 29, 135,
Billam (1986)	286, 287, 289, 412, 413, 414, 426, 427, 429, 607, 609, 612, 614 Dennehy (1990)
Bird (1987)	Dhunay (1986)
the Metropolis (1990)	722 Dobson (1989)
Bramble (1984)	Dunning (1984) 263, 265, 266 Durkin (1989) 299, 302, 303

EAGLETON (1982)	LAWRENCE (1981) 505, 507 Lawrence (1982) 652, 657 Lidster (1976) 595, 599 Littler and Dooley (1990) 608, 609, 612 Lloyd (1987) 452, 454 Lucas (1976) 595, 599
FARNDALE (1974)	
Faulkner (1987) 296 Fernandez (1980) 74 Fisher (1981) 648, 650 Fisher (1987) 30, 31 Fisher and Manlow (1989) 761, 764 Forest and Gray (1984) 616, 617 Freeman (1989) 569, 570 Friemel (1987) 559, 560 Funnell (1986) 490, 491, 492	McCabe (1988) 89, 90 McCarroll (1990) 608, 609, 613, 615 McClelland (1957) 155, 156 McCue (1987) 296 MacDonald (1988) 619, 621 McDonald (1983) 18, 19, 374, 375 McElhorne (1983) 757, 759 McGinlay and Ballantyne (1976) 326, 327 McGranigan (1987) 98, 100
GARNETT (1989) 589, 590 Ghuman (1984) 578, 580 Giboin (1980) 578, 580 Goodwin (1989) 604, 606 Gould (1983) 481, 482	McLoughlin (1985) 16, 17 Maguire (1956) 469, 470 Mah-Wing 91 Marsden (1990) 608, 609, 613, 615 Marsh (1987) 570, 571, 572, 578, 580,
Grant v. Edwards (1986)387, 389, 390 Green (1986)527, 529	589, 590 Marshall (1988)
HALEY (1983)	Mills (1988) 1, 3, 5, 6 Mitchell (1988) 514, 515, 517 Mitchell (1990) 608, 609, 612 Mobolaji (1990) 644, 645 Modeste (1984) 771, 773, 774 Morgan (1987) 162, 164
Hayden (1975)	Morris (1987)
Hedley (1989) 399, 406, 458, 460 Hessey (1987) 542, 543 Higson (1984) 216, 217 Hill (1980) 245, 246, 247 Hill (1988) 18, 19	Nazari (1980)35, 36, 72, 74, 752, 754 Newton (1982)115, 148, 215, 383, 415, 416, 417, 418, 454, 461, 463, 503, 547 Nodjoumi (1985)209
Holloway (1982)	Norman (1981)
Jackson (1988)	O'Connor (1981)
Jagodzinski (1986)	PARR (1981)
KANDHARI (1979)	Pedrick (1983)

TABLE OF CASES

R. v. Acton Crown Court ex p. Bew- LEY (1988)	Smith, Arthur (1981) 481, 482, 563, 567 Smith and Woollard (1978) 646, 647 Spence and Thomas (1983) 416, 418, 420, 421 Spura (1988) 72, 74, 75 Standford and Others (1988) 268, 269 Stevens (1986) 416, 418 Stewart and Others (1987) 543, 544 Stockwell (1984) 1, 3, 5, 6 Storey (1984) 749, 751 Strickland (1989) 38
Ager (1990) 322, 323, 629, 631, 761, 765 Raja and Bhatti (1985)	Sweeney (1986) 98, 100 TAVERNER (1974) 594, 597 Taylor (1987) 49, 50 Taylor v. Rajan (1974) 523, 526 Thomas (1985) 556, 557 Thompson (1977) 91
Robertson-Coupar and Baxendale (1982) 756, 757, 759 Robinson (1979) 237 Robson (1989) 349, 351 Rodenhurst (1989) 41, 43, 349, 351 Rubinstein and Grandison (1982) 665, 666	Thornton (1990) 638 Tisco (1990) 555 Townsend (1979) 527, 529 Turner (1975) 96, 97, 482 VALENTINE (1981) 648, 650
Sakhi (1984)	Vincent (1981)
Scully (1985)	Waterfield (1988)

Table of Statutes

1861	Offences Against the Persons Act (24 & 25 Vict., c. 100) 233 s. 18	1971	Immigration Act (c. 77) s. 3(5)(b)
	355, 576, 579, 681 s. 20	1972	(c. 78)
1933	s. 47	1973	s. 101(8) 524 Sched. 4 523 Powers of Criminal Courts Act (c. 62) 219, 369, 370, 694
	s. 53		s. 2(1)
1948	Companies Act (11 & 12 Geo. 6, c. 38)		s. 7
	Criminal Justice Act (11 & 12 Geo. 6, c. 58)		(1)
1953	s. 17(1)		(5)
	Eliz. 2, c. 14) s. 1(2)		s. 18
1956	Sexual Offences Act (4 & 5 Eliz. 2, c. 69) s. 12		(1)
1961	(1)		88, 152, 153, 671, 672, 673 s. 20(1)761, 764
1967	2, c. 39) s. 39(3)		s. 20A
	80)		(2)
1968	Treatment of Offenders Act (Nor- thern Ireland) s. 18		(1)
	Criminal Appeal Act (c. 19) s. 9		s. 30
	s. 11(3)		s. 35
	s. 50		s. 35(1Å)
	Firearms Act (c. 27)		s. 43237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 408, 594, 597, 598, 599, 600, 741
1969	s. 28		(1)240, 409, 595, 598, 599, 600
1970	(c. 54)		(a)
1971	(c. 31) s. 41(1)		(a)
17/1	s. 27		s. 43A

1072	B	1002	Criminal Justice Act cour
1973	Powers of Criminal Courts Act— cont.	1982	Criminal Justice Act—cont. . 1(4A)(a) 631, 761, 763, 764, 765
	s. 44 235, 236, 237, 596, 741	3	(b)137, 147, 359,
	(2)236, 237		362, 499, 501, 608
	s. 57 219		(c)23, 56, 137,
	s. 59		147, 285, 362, 412, 426, 427, 498, 607, 608, 609,
	s. 69(1)(a)		670, 705, 761, 765
1974	Health and Safety at Work Act		(5) 134, 139, 291, 439, 440
	(c. 37)		(6) 230, 231, 232, 318, 440
1076	s. 3(1)		(7)
1976	s 6		s. 2 128, 134, 136, 139,
	(1) 229		290, 291, 359, 364, 629
	(2) 229		(1)
	(a) 229		434, 439, 440 (2)
	(b) 229 (3) 229 (5) 229		(3)
	(5) 229		(4) 139, 140, 276, 362, 365
1979	Customs and Excise Manage-		(a) 630
	ment Act (c. 2) s. 170 239		(5)
1980	s. 170		(7)
1700	Certain Persons) Act		s. 9
	(c. 32) 132		(1)434, 439, 440
1981	Contempt of Court Act (c. 39) 437		s. 77
	s. 12	1983	Mental Health Act (c. 20) 163,
	(a) 437		208, 209, 210, 260, 311,
	(b)		312
	(2)		Pt. III
	(4) 437		s. 41
	s. 14(3)438, 439		s. 47309, 310, 314
	Supreme Court Act (c. 54)	1004	s. 60
	s. 43	1984	Food Act (c. 30) s. 8
	(2)63, 65, 206,	1985	Companies Act (c. 6)
	209, 443, 520, 521		s. 300 266
1002	(3)	1986	Drug Trafficking Offences Act (c. 32)58, 93, 94, 182,
1982	134, 276, 370, 426,		187, 191, 193, 194, 241,
	438, 439, 445, 617, 697		344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 377, 378, 379, 387, 388,
	s. 1		377, 378, 379, 387, 388,
	291, 319, 427, 437, 629 (1) 276, 318, 434, 439		398, 399, 403, 457, 458, 519, 562, 563, 582, 583,
	(4)20, 22,		643, 644, 645, 661, 662,
	134, 136, 139, 146, 173, 276, 277, 290, 291, 364,		715, 716, 720, 722, 734
	276, 277, 290, 291, 364,		s. 1
	426, 429, 439, 607, 611 761, 764, 765		379, 519, 521, 722 (1)519, 662
	(b) 20		(2) 59, 61, 183, 194, 378,
	(i) 22		388, 520, 566, 663, 716
	(ii)		(3) 183, 194, 520, 663, 716 (4) 184, 188, 191, 193,
	128, 132, 136, 139, 140,		194, 378, 388, 520,
	146, 147, 149, 172, 274,		566 663 716
	276, 277, 286, 290, 323, 365,		(c) 663
	366, 501, 607, 608, 611, 614, 670, 760, 761		(5)
	(a)		(a) 194, 520, 566, 663
	128, 136, 137, 140, 144, 146, 147, 322, 359,		(b)187, 188
	146, 147, 322, 359,		(i) 520
	362, 364, 608, 628,		(ii) 520

TABLE OF STATUTES

1006	Drug Trafficking Offences Act-	1986	Drug Trafficking Offences Act-
1986		1700	
	cont.		cont.
	s. 1(5)(c) 188		s. 5(7) 186
			(9) 198
	(6) 663		
	(7)		(a) 192
	(8)		(b)(i)192, 198
	(a)		s. 6(a)
	2 102 105 102 104		
	s. 2 182, 185, 192, 194,		(6)
	196, 347, 403, 566, 718		s. 8 199
	(1)		s. 9 199
	(a) 185 378 663 717		s. 11
	(b) 185, 567, 663, 717		(1)(b)
	(2)		270 270 724
	(2)185, 190, 192,		s. 14378, 379, 724
	195, 196, 197, 663, 664,		s. 38(1) 184
	717, 718, 721		(2)183, 185, 198
	(3)182, 184, 185,		(3) 184
	101 664 710 721		(7)184, 717, 721
	191, 664, 718, 721		(1)
	(a) 190		(13) 189
	(i)		s. 123 199
	(ii)		Company Directors Disquali-
	(b)192, 197		fication Act (c. 46) 266
	104 105 102 102		
	s. 3		s. 1
	195, 197, 198, 459,		s. 2 262, 263, 266, 267
	567, 568, 582, 584, 663,		s. 6
	664, 718, 719, 724	1988	Criminal Justice Act (c. 33) 146,
		1700	205 400 420 445
	(1)187, 196, 718		285, 409, 429, 445,
	(a)566, 716		596, 617
	(2) 195, 196, 567, 718		s. 1(4A) 289
	(3) 196, 718		(a) 289
	(4)		(b) 289
	s. 4 185, 188, 192, 194, 198,		(c) 289
	379, 459, 519, 520, 566, 568,		a 2(4A)
			s. 2(4A) 139
	663, 717, 722		s. 36
	(1) 185, 196, 378, 388,		511, 513, 515, 578, 649,
	399, 403, 520, 566,		704
	567, 717, 720		(1) 481
	(2) 187		s. 41 56
	(3)93, 94, 95, 185, 190,		s. 42
	102 104 107 109 279 270		
	192, 196, 197, 198, 378, 379,		s. 45 536
	388, 403, 520, 563, 566,		s. 69(1)595, 597, 598
	567, 717, 720, 722, 723		(a) 595
	s. 5		(i) 596
	458, 459, 460, 5 717		(ii) 596
	(1) 106 102 (1) 200		(11) 10111111111111111111111111111111111
	(1)		(b) 596
	459, 568, 716, 723, 724 (a)		(i) 596
	(a)186, 459, 717		(ii) 596
	(b)186, 717		s. 123 27, 28, 29, 57,
	(2)459, 717		70, 128, 134, 135, 139,
	(a) 568		173, 291, 362, 414, 427, 428,
	(b) 568		120 420 612 614 615 620 652
			429, 430, 613, 614, 615, 630, 652
	(3)185, 186, 198,		(3) 22, 146, 428,
	459, 460, 568		611, 614, 615, 652, 691
	(a)185, 568		(c) 671
	(b)186, 568		(4)615
	(4)		1A 615
	(a)190, 459		(14)(5)
			(1A)(5) 615
	(i)		1B 615
	(ii)		(4)(a)
	(b)186, 460		(4A) 414
	(5) 186		(a)129, 428
	(a)		
			(b) 428
	(b) 186, 388		(i) 428
	(6) 186		(ii) 428
	(b)186, 388		(c)29, 57, 428
			N A

TABLE OF STATUTES

1988	Road Traffic Offenders Act (c.	
	s. 34	654
	s 44 (1)	524

xviii

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

Appellants

Ace, Peter John		Cheek, Yvonne	258
Adams, John	393	Chin, Roy Wee Khui	745
Aitcheson, Mark Ian	419	Chrastny, Charlotte Barbara	71:
Appleby, Steven James	464	Christie, Paul Andrew	
Atkins, David John		Clarke, Mark Anthony	
Attorney General's Reference No. 7 of		Clarkson, Michael	
1989 (Paul Anthony Thornton)	1	Clayton, Kenneth John	
Attorney General's Reference No. 9 of		Clelland, Glen	697
1989 (Steven Lloyd Lacey)	7	Coleville-Scott, Brian James	238
Attorney General's Reference No. 1 of		Comiskey, David	562
1990 (John Cameron Atkinson)	245	Cook, Dean Anthony	374
Attorney General's Reference Nos. 3		Coulston, Mark Anthony	286
and 4 of 1990: Nos. 8 and 9 of 1990:		Cravioto, Joaquin Hernandez	7
Nos. 10 and 11 of 1990: No. 16 of 1990		Cripps, Roger Lewis	689
(Robert Leslie Dickson and others)	479	Croft, Raymond David	421
Attorney General's Reference No. 5 of		Crozier, Peter Michael Anthony	206
1990 (James William Bain)	514	Cruxton, Matthew John	740
Attorney General's Reference No. 13 of			
1990 (Trevor Bailey)	578	Danger Bohart Baul	200
Attorney General's Reference No. 15 of		Davies, Robert Paul	
1990 (Roy Francis Lambert)	510	Dearn, Franklin	727
Attorney General's Reference No. 17 of		Derby, Stafford Roy	500
1990 (Stephen John Peter Jones)	572	Devine, Michael	224
Attorney General's Reference Nos. 19		Dickens, David	
and 20 of 1990 (George Gerrard		Donovan, Dermot William Conolly	
McLoughlin and Vincent Clarke)	490	Doolan, Paul Russell	
Attorney General's Reference Nos. 21		Doucett, Eddy Jean Julian	303
and 22 of 1990 (Marcus Joel Nuttall	2.72	Dunn, Leslie Tucker	224
and Nathan Matthew Nuttall)	648	Dyer, Norman Ian	530
Attorney General's Reference No. 23 of		Dyer, ixorman fan	55,
1990 (Paul James Patrick Mellor)	575		
Attorney General's Reference No. 24 of	cn/	Easterbrook, Ronald Leonard	331
1990 (Lisa Veronica Ashley)	686	Edes, Zoltan Tibor	
		Edwards, Martin John	199
Baker, John		Elder, James Ford	337
Bannister, Stephen		Elwood-Wade, Roger David	51
Beddoes, Phillip Arthur		Emery-Barker, Henry Keith	78
Bednall, Ethel	37	England, Christopher Michael	98
Betts, Joseph Alan	54/	Enwezor, Bernard	661
Biggs, Simon James	341		
Boggs, Tracy Ann	549	FINKHOUSE, Jennifer Doris	17
Bolarin, Olusoji Olugbo	543	Flavin, Steven Thomas	
Bosanquet, Reginald	040	Fletcher, Tracey Jane	
Bramall, Michael Ernest		Frost, Neil	
Bramall, Norman		Furnell, Richard Anthony	306
Bray, Shaun Peter		a among resonance removely minimum.	500
Bristow, Robert Stephen		Service of the service of	
Brooks, Darryl Glen Burfoot, Adrian Keith	252	GALLAGHER, Patrick Kevin	
		Gannon, Christopher	545
Burton, Lawrence John	339	Gee, Mark	268
C. Dichard Stanhan	202	Gilbey, Raymond Giles	49
C., Richard Stephen Carlton, Matthew David	234	Gilhooley, Jane	1/2
Carthy Jason Farl	622	Gilliver, Michael David	/69
Carthy, Jason Earl	600	Giscombe, Stephen Robert	730
Chadwick, Peter		Goddard, Patrick John	1.53
Charters, Thomas		Grant Lee James Doon	132
Chebout, Omar	324	Grant, Lee James Dean	114
Cheoout, Ollar	344	Green, Nigel Morris	114

HALLETT, Paul David	552	Lorrraine, JayneLovatt, Stephen	219
Halliwell, Peter Ian	602	Loyatt Stephen	452
		Lovatt, Stephen	200
Harkess, Eric	300	Lowther, Jeffrey Ian	277
Harris, John Andrew			
Harrison, David Owen	522	M., Nigel John	455
Harvey, Vernon George	165	McCarroll, Stephen	147
Hawkins, Hugh David Healey, Lee Donald	161	McDaniel, Cliff	44
Harlay I as Donald	207	McDallet, Cill	467
ricalcy, Lee Dollaid	600	McDonald, Gregor Ian	437
Henderson, Ian	389	McDonnell, James	600
Hewitt, John Anthony	641	McDonald, John Leonard	408
Hewitt, Raymond Frederick	466	McGrath, Lance	204
Hicks, Adrian		McGlade, Peter	105
Hill, Melvyn William		MacKay, John Bunton Albert Shrimp-	100
		Mackay, John Bunton Albert Silling-	200
Hole, Lorraine	700	ton	246
Hollingsworth, Stuart Thomas	81	McKie, Ian Gary McVitie, James Francis	356
Hollywood, Paul	325	McVitie, James Francis	745
Holmes, Ronald	32	Magee, Gerald Patrick	493
Hook, Henry George	554	Makanjuola, Alhaja Basirat Molji-	17.
Horney James Charles	20	sola	613
Horney, James Charles Hoult, Peter	190	Maria Di T. I.	043
Hoult, Fetel	100	Marlow, Philip John	
Howard, Lee Joseph Patrick		Marsden, Robert Wayne	274
Howells, Aled Wyn	130	Masagh, George	568
Humphrey, Alan	339	Maskell, David John	638
Hunter, Paul Anthony		Mason Stephen Thomas	737
Hunter, William James	380	Mason, stephen thomas	101
Thurst Mishael John	272	Meah, Brian	401
Hurst, Michael John	3/3	Medland, Eric William	556
		Michael, Andrew Christopher	223
ISLEMANN, Horst Reiner	398	Miller, Tony	519
Izzet, Mustafa		Mincher, Kevin	592
	100	Mitchell, Nikki Lewis	
Lure David Thomas	(21	Mitter I as	610
James, David Thomas		Mitty, Lee	015
Jenkins, Paul		Mole, Mark Anthony	3/1
Johal, Harbinder	695	Moore, Archibald James Burke	384
Johnson, Julie	182	Morgan, Robert George	504
Johnson, Lisa Jane		Morris, Peter David	669
Johnson, Robert Seymour	271	Moulder Frederick Steven	301
Jones, David George	167	Moulder, Frederick Steven	75/
Jolles, David Ocorge	107	Mulicii, Nicholas Robert Nell	530
Jones, David James	218	Murphy, Dennis	220
Jones, Ronald Gordon	233	Murpny, Grazyna	0.3
Joseph, Anthony	531	Muscroft, Wayne Brian	41
		Murphy, Grazyna Muscroft, Wayne Brian Mussell, Kelvin John	607
K., Ian Stuart	451	The Company of the Control of the Co	
		NETHERCOTE, Kevin	740
K., John Peter Paul	700		
Karmois, Panayiotis Peter	213	Nicholson, Stephen	20
Keane, Kevin Fitzroy	132	Nunu, Alfred Uduarayama	134
Kelly, Keith Emmanuel	475		
Kent, John David Jack	242	Oakley, Andrew	215
Keston, Derek	93	Oates, Shawn Francis	742
Khabra, Ravinder Singh	587	Ord, Daniel William	
Vhon Mashad	252	Ord Ctankan Fraderick	1.4
Khan, Nashad	332	Ord, Stephen Frederick	14
King, Diane Susan Knibbs, Gordon Ralph	76	Osborne, Michael Stuart Owen, Arthur Anthony	22
Knibbs, Gordon Ralph	655	Owen, Arthur Anthony	561
Knight, Derek	319		
Komsta, Andrew	63	PALMER, Carlton Uriah	585
Komsta, Andrew Kouyoumdjian, Sarkis Agop	35	Palmer, Terence Patrick	550
Kyriakou, Georgina	603	Parkinson, Anthony	
	000	Parry Lockie	135
LEMATUY Patrick Francis Locanh	626	Parry, Leslie	05
LEMATHY, Patrick Francis Joseph	030	Parsiey, Darren Lee	498
Lemathy, Richard	636	Peddie, Stephen Richard	176
Liggett, Justin David	53	Peppard, Mark	88
Lightwater Valley Ltd	328	Peumans, Danielle Adrienne Marie	303
Lightwater Valley Ltd. Lincoln, Peter Alan	256	Philpott, Joanne	406
Littler, Darren and Others	143	Pike, Matthew Kenneth	
Lloyd, Paul Gabriel	354		
	224	Porter, Jeremy	311

Porter, Philip Ronald		Tickle, Andrew Tidiman, Ian Lee Tierney, Kevin	702
RADJABI-TARI Rasool, Ghulam Razzell, Peter Ernest Reid, Kevin John	771 142 423	Tiso, Ronald Leonard Todd, Thomas Tonks, Stephen Turner, Graham Rodney	127 287 110
Richards, Gary Richardson, Kevin Riley, Keith Robertson, Darren Robertson, Garge Trough	311 410 322	Turner, Keith	472 202
Robertson, George Trevor Robinson, James Robson, Steven Kenneth Ronaldson, Douglas Rowlett, Raymond Mark	542 387 91	Vaughan, Anthony Patrick	46
Samuels, Lloyd David		Walker, Gary	243
Sanck, Carl	155 344	Warth, Dean Robert	477
Scott, Alexander	23	Watson, James	760
Simpson, Barry James Simpson, Ruth Linda	674 431	Westwood, Brian Dennis	30
Singh, Gurmail Slee, Lyndon John James Smith, Catherine	136	Williams, Timothy James and Others Wilson, Anthony Alexander	415
Smith, Cyril Smith, Hanna Rose Mary	354	Windle, John William	150
Smith, Timothy	270	Witten, Derek Leslie	628
Thomas Staples, Daniel Victor Steed, Gareth Stewart, Alexander	334 230	Worgan, Gareth Owen Wortley, Gary Wragg, Peter David	747
Stokoe, Dennis Amos Stone, James Anthony and Others Suker, Jason Stuart	726 95	Young, Alan Joseph	243
Taylor, Mark Antony Taylor, Martin Stephen and Others Thomas, Frank David	679 665	ZAMAN, Ahmed	657

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REFERENCE NO.7 OF 1989 (PAUL ANTHONY THORNTON)

COURT OF APPEAL (The Lord Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Leggatt and Mr. Justice Hutchison): January 12, 1990

Rape—rape of former sexual partner—length of sentence—application of guidelines in Billam (1986) 8 Cr. App. R. (S.) 48.

Two years' imprisonment increased to four and half years in the case of a man convicted of raping a woman with whom he had previously had a sexual relationship.

The offender was convicted of rape. The offender met the complainant, then aged 16, in 1987: they lived together for about 18 months, and became engaged, but the relationship deteriorated and sexual intercourse ceased after December 1988. In February 1989 the offender asked the complainant to visit him, which she did. When she arrived at his flat, the offender lost his temper, pushed her across a room, dragged her over to a bed and removed her clothes before raping her. The complainant left the flat in a distressed condition. The offender contested the case on the ground that he did not realise that she was not consenting, but was convicted. Sentenced to two years' imprisonment.

Held: the Court had to determine whether the sentence was so far outside the proper limits of what a sentence for this type of crime should be as to merit interference. The fact that the Court would have passed a more severe sentence than the sentencer imposed was not enough: the question was whether the sentence was so far out of line as to be outside the proper limits of a judge's undoubted discretion. This was what was meant by "unduly lenient." The sentencer had been referred to Stockwell (1984) 6 Cr. App. R. (S.) 84 and Cox (1985) 7 Cr. App. R. (S.) 422, but not to Billam (1986) 8 Cr. App. R. (S.) 48, or Berry (1988) 10 Cr. App. R. (S.) 13, Mills (1988) 10 Cr. App. R.(S.) 369, and Workman (1988) 10 Cr. App. R.(S.) 329. The first two cases were decided before the guidelines for sentencing in cases of rape were set out in Billam. In Stockwell and Cox sentences for the rape of a separated or divorced wife were reduced to two years and three years respectively, in both cases on a plea of guilty. In Berry, decided after Billam, a sentence of six years was reduced to four for the rape of a former cohabitee, the Court recognising that while Cox made plain the significance of a previous settled sexual relationship, the cases did not provide guidance as to the correct level of sentence, as they antedated Billam. In the two later cases, sentences of four years and five years were upheld, in each case for the rape of a woman with whom the appellant had had a previous sexual relationship. The way in which the Court approached the present case was this: the mere fact that the parties had lived together over a period of time and had regular sexual intercourse did not license the man to have sexual intercourse with the girl willy-nilly once that cohabitation had ceased. It was however a factor to which some weight could be given, as was indicated in Berry. The earlier, pre-Billam cases of Stockwell and Cox gave very little assistance. The feature of this case which singled it out from the others was that there was no plea of guilty. The Court had come to the conclusion that the sentence was outside the proper limits of the judge's discretion in such cases and was unduly lenient. The Court would substitute a sentence of four and a half years' imprisonment.

Cases cited: Stockwell (1984) 6 Cr. App. R. (S.) 84, Cox (1985) 7 Cr. App. R. (S.) 422, Billam (1986) 8 Cr.App.R.(S.) 48, Berry (1988) 10 Cr.App.R.(S.) 13, Mills (1988) 10 Cr. App. R.(S.) 369 and Workman (1988) 10 Cr. App. R.(S.) 329.

References: rape, Current Sentencing Practice Commentary B4-1.3(E); [1990] Crim.L.R. 436

J. Bevan for the Attorney General; A. Dalgleish for the offender.

LORD LANE C.J.: This is a reference under section 36 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988. It arises in the following circumstances.

On September 15, last year at St. Albans Crown Court the offender was sen-

tenced to two years' imprisonment for rape after a plea of not guilty.

The facts of the case, in so far as they are relevant, are these. The offender is now 31 years of age. When he was 28 he met the complainant, who was then a young girl of 16, in the summer of 1987. From April of that year, or thereabouts, they lived together until Christmas of 1988. In June 1988 it seems they became engaged, but the relationship thereafter deteriorated. On about December 27, the victim left. That was the end of the relationship so far as sexual intercourse was concerned between them.

The complainant wished thereafter that they should simply remain friends, but the offender seems to have had the wish to renew the sexual relationship with the girl. There was an occasion in January 1989 when they had met together but no sexual intercourse took place.

On February 23, the offender telephoned the girl asking her to visit him and she did so. He apparently did not answer the door, probably because he was under the influence of drink inside the flat. However the next day he renewed the invitation and she accepted once again and went along to the flat. It was then that events took place which gave rise to this prosecution.

The complainant thought that the offender was somewhat tense, "uptight" was the expression used, and he started to talk about the break in their relationship and plainly started to lose his temper, because he kicked an electric fire across the room. Then started a series of violent acts, although perhaps not of extreme violence. He pushed her or kicked her across the room. She declined to remove her jacket as he wished her to and he seized her by the lapels and threw her down. At that stage, according to her, he told her that she would hate him for what he was about to do. When he gave evidence he asserted that although that expression had been used, it was at the end of the incident that it was used and not at the beginning, as the girl suggested.

She was then dragged over to the bed where her clothes were removed. She tried to stop him pulling off her jeans by raising her legs up to her shoulder, and then curled herself up on the bed in order to protect herself from the assault and to protect herself from what no doubt she feared was about to happen. He held her by the wrists and forced her legs apart and in short he penetrated her with his penis. He did that for short periods of time on two occasions. She had not said "no" in so many words, because, according to her, she was scared not only by what was going on but by what his behaviour had allegedly been in the past. When it was all over, according to her, she was told to wipe her eyes and once again made the remark, according to her, that she would hate him for what he had done.

She left the flat. She was in a distressed condition. She had a bleeding lip, which was noticed by one of the people she met outside the flat and she had a tender point on the back of her head due to what had happened during the course of this incident.

The offender pleaded not guilty to this offence. But in order to put that properly in its context, it is fair to him to point out that this was not an all out attack upon the girl's credibility, as one sometimes regrettably finds in these cases, but he was

advancing the proposition that although it may be that she was not consenting, he was firmly and genuinely of the belief that she was consenting and that accordingly what he was doing was not without her consent and approval.

The complainant told a friend what had happened and, to cut a long story short, eventually the police were called in. The offender was interviewed on a number of occasions. He admitted sexual intercourse immediately but denied rape. He said on one occasion he knew that she did not want sexual intercourse, but nevertheless he believed that when it came to it she was not withholding her consent.

The primary defence was, as I have indicated, that he did not realise that she was not consenting. I read a passage from the summing up where the judge is dealing with what the offender himself had said:

"He said. 'She had tears in her eyes but she wasn't bawling or crying. She never said she didn't want sex and if she had I would have stopped. I got off, she got dressed and left. When she left,' he said, 'I said she had reason to hate me.' He said, 'I said that because I was confused. I didn't think things had gone right. I didn't think she was not consenting. She didn't seem totally happy about the whole thing. If she had told me to stop I would have done."

That in brief summary was the situation which the judge had to assess when determining what sentence to pass.

It is submitted by Mr. Bevan, who presents this reference, that the sentence of two years' imprisonment was so far outside the proper limits of what a sentence for this type of crime should be as to merit interference by the Court. On the other hand Mr. Dalgleish submits to us, correctly, that a judge has a discretion and the mere fact that this Court may believe that the sentence is too short, or would have passed a sentence itself more severe than that which the learned judge passed, is not enough.

With those sentiments we agree. What we have to determine is whether this sentence is so far out of line as to be outside the proper limits of a judge's undoubted discretion when sentencing for a criminal offence. That, in our judgment, is what

"unduly lenient" in these circumstances means.

It is plain from what the judge said in the sentencing remarks that two cases had been drawn to his attention. Those were the cases which he mentions, of Stockwell (1984) 6 Cr. App. R.(S.) 84 and of Cox (1985) 7 Cr. App. R.(S.) 422. He mentions a number of cases of "similar facts"—those are the words that he uses—but he does not specify which, if any, of those other cases he had referred to himself or had been drawn to his attention. Mr. Dalgleish's recollection is that those were the only two cases which were mentioned, and also Mr. Dalgleish's helpful recollection is that the judge was not referred to the well known case of Billam (1986) 8 Cr.App.R.(S.) 48, or to the other cases to which we have been referred on this reference, namely Berry (1988) 10 Cr.App.R.(S.) 13, Mills (1988) 10 Cr.App.R.(S.) 369 and Workman (1988) 10 Cr.App.R.(S.) 329. It is perhaps necessary in those circumstances—I hope we may be forgiven for doing so—to take a look at some of those cases in order to see what help we can get from previous decisions of the Court.

First of all we refer to the two cases to which the learned judge makes reference, namely Stockwell and Cox. It should be said at the outset that each of those two cases was decided pre-Billam, Billam being the well known guideline case in which this Court endeavoured to set out principles by which courts should be guided in dealing with offences of rape.

Stockwell was a case where three years' imprisonment was reduced to two in the case of a man who had raped his wife following their separation after a period of 10

years of marriage. The headnote reads: