

The Criminal Appeal Reports (Sentencing) 1989

Editor
David Thomas, LL.D.

Consultant Editor
David Evans, Barrister

Editorial Contributor Maggy Pigott, M.A., Barrister

Volume 11

London ● Sweet & Maxwell 1989

This volume should be cited as 11 Cr.App.R. (S.)

ISBN 0 421 43570 4

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without the written permission of the copyright holder and the publisher, application for which shall be made to the publisher.

Reprinted 2000 by Antony Rowe Ltd, Reading

Divisional Court

Table of Cases

ADAMS (1985)	Corless (1989)
1989	Doyle (1988) 547, 548 Dunning (1987) 329, 332 Durkin (1989) 338 et seq.
BALL (1982) 362, 363 Barnes (1983) 182, 183 Barry and Barry 61, 62 Barrick (1985) 42, 43, 229, 231, 297, 298, 389, 390, 391, 420, 463, 464 Bashir and Azam (1988) 353, 354 Beaumont (1987) 223, 225 Benstead (1979) 432, 434 Best (unrep. October 5, 1987) 217, 217, 218, 219 Bennett (1968) 205, 215 Bilinski (1987) 38, 39, 41, 90, 91, 156, 169, 170, 298, 299, 300, 366, 367, 500, 501 Billam (1986) 109 et seq., 342, 343, 429, 431, 437, 438 Birch (1987) 524, 526 Bird (1978) 4, 5, 6, 273, 274, 276 Birtles (1969) 127, 129, 225 Blackmore (1984) 282, 284 Blackwood (1974) 203, 205, 212 Bleasdale (1984) 205, 212 Bleasdale (1984) 205, 212 Bleasdale (1984) 207, 221 Bleasdale (1984) 207, 271, 321, 322, 323, 338, 339, 341, 486, 487, 489, 491 Bradbourn (1985) 278, 280, 370, 371, 374 Brennan and Boyle (1980) 193, 194 Brown (1987) 463, 464 Buddo (1982) 254, 256 Butt (1986) 547, 548 Chambers (1983) 309, 312, 313, 222, 323, 338, 339, 312, 313, 322, 333, 339, 312, 313, 322, 333, 339, 312, 313, 323, 333, 339, 312, 313, 323, 333, 339, 312, 313, 323, 333, 339, 312, 313, 323, 333, 339, 312, 313, 332, 333, 339, 312, 313, 323, 333, 339, 312, 333, 333, 333, 339, 312, 333, 333, 333, 339, 313, 339, 312, 313,	EATON (1975)
Christopher (1985) 382, 383, 387 Christopher (1985) 107, 108 Clarke (1975) 99, 101 Clarke (1982) 250, 252 Clitheroe (1987) 137, 139 Cockburn (1967) 205, 215	Harey (1983)

Hassan and Khan (1989)	Mills (1987) 163, 164 Mills (1988) 111, 113 Moffett (1984) 303, 304 Moores (1980) 7, 8 Morgan (1987) 132, 136 Morgin (1988) 250, 253, 321, 323 Morris (1950) 16, 18 Morris (1961) 204, 205, 215 Morris (1988) 182, 183, 185 Mossop (1985) 229, 231, 419, 420 Mullervy (1986) 117, 118 Murray 281 Mustafa Fuat and others (1973) 395, 397 NAYLOR (1987) 460, 462 Newton (1982) 102, 104, 110, 122, 251, 267, 269, 345, 346, 337, 358, 360, 361,
571, 574, 575	478, 543, 564 et seq. Norman (1981) 382, 383, 387, 502, 505
	Nunn (1981)
INWOOD (1974)535, 536	(1500)
JAGODZINSKI (1986) 333, 334, 335 Jardine (1987) 472 Johnson (1986) 37, 38 Jones (1976) 204, 205, 215	O'BRIEN (1984)
Jones (1984) 479, 481, 580, 581, 582	Pal (1981)543, 544, 546
KAZMI (1985)	Palmer (1988)
Lamb (1967)	Powell and Carvell (1984)
Lloyd (1987)	R. v. Croydon Crown Court, EX PARTE MILLER (1987)
MAH-WING (1983) 250, 252 Malcolm (1987) 355, 356 Malick (1988) 295, 296 Marshall and others (1990) 36 Matthews (1987) 580, 581, 582 Mavji (1986) 16, 18 Mbatha (1985) 204, 205, 215 McControl (1973) 102, 215	Rigby and others (1988)
Mbatha (1985) 204, 205, 215 McCann (1972) 127, 129 McDonald (1983) 165, 166, 244, 245 MacDonald (1988) 506, 509 McDonald (1989) 410, 413 McElhorne (1983) 333, 334, 335 McFarlane and Burke (1988) 31, 33 McLoughlin (1985) 479, 481 McNamee (1985) 107, 108 Mcdway (1976) 239 Meggs (1989) 367, 369 Middleton (1988) 76, 78 Miller (1985) 42, 43	Royse (1981) 203, 205, 212 SMITH (1981) 482, 484 Smith (1986) 327, 328 Smith (1974) 204, 205, 213 Socratous (1984) 117, 118 Speake (1957) 203, 205, 213 Spence and Thomas (1983) 142, 143 Stabler (1984) 182, 183, 184 Stagg (1982) 410, 412, 413 Stanley (1987) 468, 469 Stewart (1984) 335

TABLE OF CASES

Stewart (Livingstone)(1987) 58, 59, 60, 94, 95, 96, 163, 164, 254, 256	Turner (1975)
Stokes (1983)	Underhill (1979)127, 129
Stratton (1988) 254, 256 Strong 438 Stuart and Williams (1979) 199, 201 Sullivan (1987) 182 et seq.	Verrier v. D.P.P. (1966)
Taylor (1986)	Webb and Davis (1979) 497, 499 Wheatley (1982) 487, 580, 581, 582 Wilbourne (1982) 517, 518, 521 Wilkinson (1979) 535, 536 Williams (1984) 83, 85 Williams (1989) 475
Tillett (1987)	Willis (1974)
Tolley (1979)	X v. The United Kingdom 211
Turner (1970)273, 274, 276, 277, 555 et seq.	YEOMANS (1988) 382, 383, 387, 502, 505

Table of Statutes

1861	Offences Against the Person Act (24 & 25 Vict., c. 100)	1973	Powers of Criminal Courts Act—
	s. 18 32, 144, 313, 314, 482, 566 s. 20 32, 50, 144, 194,		s. 14(3)417, 418 s. 20250, 252
	s. 47 193		(1) 318 s. 20A 316
1933	Children and Young Persons Act		s. 22 252
	(23 & 24 Geo. 5, c. 12) 33 s. 53 27, 33, 34, 173, 397, 473		s. 28
	(1) 259		(4)283, 497, 499
	(2)		s. 39 93
	396, 397, 416, 421,		s, 43 90, 92, 93, 253, 255, 256
	422, 423, 472, 473,	1976	Lotteries and Amusements Act
1952	549, 550 Prison Act (15 & 16 Geo. 6 & 1	1978	(c. 32)
1056	Eliz. 2, c. 52) 2	1000	s. 6(a) 573
1956	Sexual Offences Act (4 & 5 Eliz. 2, c. 69)	1980	Child Care Act (c. 5) s. 21(2)
	s. 37 412	1981	Companies Act (c. 62) 86
1959	Sched. 2	1982	s. 95
1707	c. 72)115, 209, 211	1702	197, 227, 280,
1961	s. 65		Pt. I 370, 375
1701	2, c. 39)		s. 1571, 572
1967	s. 39(3)		(4) 150, 151, 172, 196, 220, 248, 279, 305,
1701	s. 3111, 112		308, 345, 347, 370,
	Criminal Justice Act (c. 80) s. 60		374, 375, 393, 573 (4A) 171, 174, 196, 197,
	s. 61 397		198, 246, 247, 278,
	s. 67 422		303, 305, 308, 316, 318, 344, 345, 347,
	(1) 2		370, 375, 392, 393,
1968	Criminal Appeal Act (c. 19) s. 11(3) 215		424, 425, 427, 428, 540, 570, 572
1969	Children and Young Persons Act		(a)303, 375, 539
	(c. 54) s. 7 259		(b)375, 539 (c)226, 245, 316,
	(7) 259		347 371 379
	(7A)258, 259 s. 20A258, 260		(6)
1971	Misuse of Drugs Act (c. 38) 241		(4)305, 306, 308,
1971	Town and Country Planning Act (c. 78)		344, 345, 347,
	s. 60 408		s. 4 570, 572 s. 4 150
	(6)		(b)(i)
	(1) 407		s. 6 150
	(a)		s. 7(8)
1972	Road Traffic Act (c. 20)		s. 41 539
1973	s. 40(5)(b)	1983	s. 123 571 Mental Health Act (c. 20) 211,
210	(c. 62) 251	1700	454, 455
	s. 14 316 (1) 318		s. 2
	(a)		s. 3209, 210, 386 (2)(b)101

TABLE OF STATUTES

1983 1984 1986	Mental Health Act—cont. s. 12	1986 1987 1988	Drug Trafficking Offences Act— cont. s. 1(5)
	291, 292, 295,		(a)

Appellants

ALDERSON, Joseph Ernest	301	Daley, Delroy	242
Alfasatleh, Saliman	24	Davison, Donald John	570
Allyson, Paul Louis	60	Dawson, Kevin Michael	338
Anderson, Tim Joel	417	Di Palma, Paul	329
Andrew, Brian Godfrey	309	Dobson, Mark Alexander	332
Atkins, Gary Anderson		Dolby, Thomas Dean	335
Attorney-General's Reference (No.1 of		Duporte, St. Claire	116
1989) under Criminal Justice Act 1988	400	Durkin, Gary	313
Section 36	409		
Attorney-General's Reference No. 2 of	101	EATON, Spencer William	475
1989 (Darren Mark Major)	481	Eddy, Richard James	370
Attorney-General's Reference No. 3 of	101	Elliot, Leslie Ann	67
1989 (Peter Anthony Sumner)		Ellul, Michael Anthony	26
Attorney-General's Reference No. 4 of 1989			
Attorney-General's Reference No. 5 of		FALUADE, Olyinka Madupeula	
1989 (Mark Charles Hill-Trevor)	489	Farrell, Shaun Patrick	102
Au-Yeung, Chiu		Fisher, Darren William	302
Aucott Timothy Norman	86	Filton, Michael George	350
Aucott, Timothy Norman	377	Fleming, Leslie Robert	137
readender, rioniy	511	Freeman, Kevin Brian	398
D D 'W	107	Fung, Kwok Man	106
BAGGA, Raj Kumar	497		
Baker, Graham David		County David	ECA
Baldwin, Wayne		Gandy, David	
Barley, Edward William Noel		Gardner, Gerald Alfred Thomas	227
Barney, Caleb		Garnett, Leslie	321
Bartley, Neil	3	Garwood, Kevin Charles	141
Basalian, Eshagh	42	Gay, David John	553
Basra, Gurmail Singh	527	Gayle, Valerie Alexandra	435
Bell, Jermaine		George, Aquilina	431
Birch, Beulah		Georgeoulas, Napoleon	416
Bonnett, Claudette		Glide, David	319
Booth, Lee Timothy	258	Goodwin, Sarah Jane	194
Bostock, Kenneth	130	Gorman, John Paul	
Boxell, Michael John		Grav, Robert	123
Brown, Anthony		Greenwood, Linden Hames	81
Brown, Colin Settle		Griffiths, Ronald Paul	216
Bulmer, Ralph Henry Victor		Gyorgy, John Joseph	
Bush, William James		-787,	
Butcher, Norman Mark		***	20
Dutcher, Fromain mark	104	Hadjou, George	100
0	107	Harding, Mark Anthony	190
CAMP, Stephen		Harper, Terence	
Cenci, Jan James		Harris, Christopher James	
Chapman, Anthony John	222	Hassan, Mahmood	
Chapman, Stephen John		Hassan, Ozdai	
Charles, Stephen		Hawkins, Charles Henry	429
Chell, David Alan		Hearne, Raymond Francis	
Claxton, Donna Marcia		Hebron, David Jonathan	226
Colley, Mark		Hedley, Robert Edward	298
Conley, Ellis	541	Hill, Neil	530
Connery, Andrew Stephen	76	Holah, Steven Richard	
Corless, Wilfred James	47	Holcroft, David Gary	127
Costen, Sharon Elizabeth	182	Hopes, David John	38
Costley, Peter John		Howard, Steven James	583
Cotter, Shaun Francis		Hudson, Alan James	65
Cubitt, Robert Michael		Hurren, David Peter	277
Cumber, Frederick	470	Hurst, Michael James	365
Curry, Lee Johnson	395	Hussey, Alan Michael	

JACKSON-CRISP, Robert Stephen	267	Penn, David Christopher	86
Jacobs, Darren Anthony	171	Perry, Georgina	58
James, Benny George Thomas		Pettipher, Martin Robert	321
Jeffrey, Christopher Daniel	265	Petty, Justin Mark	316
Jones, Tony Stephen	125	Poole, Susan Christina Mary	382
Joyce, Christopher John	109	Powell Mark Steven	117
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Poyner, Dean	173
KEARNS, Michael Francis	232	Pritchard, Darren Mark	421
Keily, Joseph Terence		a sassana ay ac arrest transa irritation irritation	1 40 1
Kelly, Brian Joseph		RALF, Mandy Ann	121
Kelton, Tony Alan		Pagua Maga	170
Keung, Lau Kam	100	Reeve, Marc	1/0
Khan, Javed	148	Rehman, Abdul	5/12
Kinsella, Darren Paul	171	Rhoades, Mark Andrew	520
Kirk, Brian John		Riaz Mohammad	542
Krause, Steven Paul	361	Riaz, Mohammed	286
ikiduse, oteven i dui	501	Roberts, Debra Louise	575
Lane, Anthony John	547	Roberts, Gary Wayne	3/3
Lawrence, Justin Paul	500	Robinson, Adrienne Mary	110
Lawie Jacqueline Eurice	577	Pohean James Voith	70
Lewis, Jacqueline Eunice	157	Robson, James Keith	210
Lewis, Terence William	437	Pogora Hinka Stanbar David	219
Lloyd, Steven Lun, Li Kai	30	Rogers-rinks, Stephen David	234
Lun, Li Kai	492	Ross, Harvey Michael	324
Lutzo, Massimo	495	Rowe, Kevin John	342
		Commence	ran
Manders, Richard John		SAINSBURY, Joan	533
Manlow, Anthony William		Samuda, Stephen	4/1
Marchant, Steven Leslie	26	Sanderman, Paul Barry	
Marples, Valerie Marshall, Jason	462	Sant, Vicky	441
Marshall, Jason	30	Scott, Stephen Anthony James	240
Martin, Kim Linda		Scott, Stephen Anthony James	245
Mason, Nicholas Andrew		Scott, Frederick David	382
Mason, Norman Ernest		Seal, Martin	29/
Mason, Ronald James		Shamil David Anthony	201
Masters, Peter Garatt		Shervill, David Anthony	284
McCabe, James	154	Smith, Henry William	333
McDonagh, Thomas Gerard	94	Comitte Detailed	290
McDonald, Joseph Ronald	408	Smith, Patrick	444
McDonald, Peter George	6	Smith, Patrick O'Neill	200
McFarlane, Brian Wilfred Alan	99	Smith Torongo Corl	200
McGarvie, Douglas Sinclair		Smith, Terence Carl	333
McNair, Donald Niven	403	Smith-Bryant, Belinda Ruth Spencer, David Ian Stanley, Darren	226
McQueen, Robert Darren	303	Stanley Darran	116
Meggs, Eric William	162	Stapleton, Denzil McArthur	264
Miah, Sunny	103	Stayort Crant	122
Mitchell, Yvonne Jennifer	302	Stewart, Grant	132
Monks, Simon Alexander	370	Stuart, Augustus	89
		Stone, Harold	53/
NEEDHAM, Andrew Frederick		Stone, Philip Roger Clement	1/6
Norris, John Godfrey	69		
North, John Robert		Tantrum, Neil	
Norton, Leesa	143	Thompson, Nicola Suzanne	245
Norwood, James Alexander	479	Towler, David Ronald	354
Noy, Anthony William	42	Traille, Jacqueline Lee	229
Noy, Anthony William Nweke, Noubuisi Okonkwo	500		
		Vanes, Derek Valentine	147
OLLIVER, Michael Andrew	10	Vanes, Steven Mark	
Olliver, Richard George	10	Varney, Steven	549
		Vincent, Trevor Andrew	405
PALMER, Carlyle Churchill	407		
Panayioutou, Andronikus		WALKER, Christopher	100
Passmore, Anthony James	401	Wall, Gerald Joseph	111
Pearson, Shaun	391	Wesson, Barry Kenneth	161
	~/1	Tresouri, Durry iscinicin Transcription	LUI

APPELLANTS		vii
Whalley, John Gary 405 Wheeldon, Debbie Eileen Pamela 522 White, Ronald Clifford 186 Whitelock, David Frederick 439 Whitmore, Owen 288 Whitrid, James Anthony 403 Williams, Meirion 152	Wilson, Vernon James Withycombe, Andrew Philip Woods, Arthur Andrew Wright, Peter Wrest, Lee Alan	71 551 63
Wilson, John	YATES, Kenneth David	451

JOHN JOSEPH GYORGY

COURT OF APPEAL (Lord Justice Staughton, Mr. Justice Tudor Evans and Mr. Justice Owen): January 12, 1989

Probation order—time spent in custody prior to making of probation order subsequent custodial sentence imposed for offence in respect of which probation order made—whether appropriate to make allowance in sentence for time spent in custody.

A sentence of imprisonment, imposed for an offence for which the appellant had originally been put on probation, reduced, to allow for time spent in custody on remand prior to the making of the original probation order.

The appellant appeared before the Crown Court for various offences, having spent about seven months in custody on remand. A probation order was made in respect of those offences. He appeared again in the Crown Court several months later, for a number of further offences and to be dealt with for breach of the probation order. He was sentenced to a total of 13 months' imprisonment, which included six months for the earlier offences. The sentence was imposed on the assumption that the time spent in custody prior to the making of the probation order would count towards the sentence imposed for those offences, when this was not the case, as was made clear by section 67 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967.

Held: the sentence had been imposed on a misapprehension, and although it was richly deserved the Court would vary the appeal so as to give effect to the intentions of the sentencer.

References: Probation order—time spent in custody prior to making of probation order, Current Sentencing Practice D3.3(c); Archbold 5-439. Commentary: [1989] Crim.L.R. 513.

P. Forrest for the appellant.

STAUGHTON L.J.: John Joseph Gyorgy is now aged 25. He has a long history of drug addiction and of crime, although none of the crimes were of a very serious nature. Not long ago he was offered the chance to rehabilitate himself by the courts. He made little or no effort to take it. He was brought back and dealt with appropriately at Bristol Crown Court on September 8, 1988 by Mr. Malcolm David sitting as an assistant recorder. He was sentenced to a total of 13 months' imprisonment. He now appeals against sentence by leave of the single judge. His appeal is in a way, as we said to his counsel, the least meritorious that we have ever heard. But he has a technical point to support it. The assistant recorder took a mistaken view of the law, one which was apparently shared by counsel then appearing for Gyorgy and one which, in view of the complexity of some areas of the law, we can understand.

On November 30, 1987 he appeared at Bristol Crown Court and pleaded guilty to a whole range of offences: five offences of theft from a shop on different occasions (there were six but two of them were on the same occasion), one offence of burglary of a chemist and one of driving whilst disqualified. A probation order was made with a condition of medical treatment. The order was for two years. Gyorgy

had been seven months in custody in connection with those offences. He made little or no effort to comply with the probation order. He was in breach of it when he fell to be sentenced at Bristol Crown Court on September 8, 1988. He was also in further trouble for theft from a service station on December 8, 1987 of six filofaxes valued at £9.99 each, for driving whilst disqualified on the same day, and for four offences of failing to surrender to bail in January 1987, March 1987 and twice in March 1988. He asked for three offences to be taken into consideration, one of theft from a shop in March 1988 and another in May, and of theft from a car in March and April 1988.

The assistant recorder also referred to an offence in connection with some jeans, but in the papers before us we are not able to determine what that was. For the theft of the filofaxes and driving whilst disqualified, he was sentenced to six months' concurrent. For the four bail offences, one month concurrent on each but consecutive to the sentence of six months. The probation order was revoked, and six months was imposed for each of the offences for which that order had been made, concurrent with each other but consecutive to the other sentences. That made 13 months in all. That was a wholly appropriate sentence. But there is this passage in the transcript of the mitigation. Counsel said:

"Your Honour, as I have already indicated he spent just over two months on remand in custody primarily for these offences as your Honour has today to deal with him for the breach of a probation order. He had spent seven months in custody prior to that. That may be something the prison service will take into account when your Honour imposes sentence at the end of the day. (The assistant recorder): If he is sentenced in relation to all those offences that would be taken into account. (Mr. Taylor): Because he has spent that time in custody now and received a probation order—and your Honour has now revoked the probation order—and deal with it in some other way."

There is underlying that passage the assumption that the time spent in custody in connection with the offences for which a probation order was imposed would count. That assumption was wrong. See section 67(1) of Criminal Justice Act 1967

(not the Prison Act 1952 referred to in counsel's opinion).

"The length of any sentence of imprisonment imposed on an offender by a court shall be treated as reduced by any period during which he was in custody by reason only of having been committed to custody by an order of a court made in connection with any proceedings relating to that sentence or the offence for which it was passed or any proceedings from which those proceedings arose, but where the offender was previously subject to a probation order, an order for conditional discharge or a suspended sentence in respect of that offence, any such period falling before the order was made or suspended sentence passed shall be disregarded for the purposes of this section."

If the assistant recorder took the view that the seven months already spent in custody would count against the six months which he imposed for the offences for which a probation order had originally been made, it is odd that it did not occur to him that the sentence had already been served. At all events, clearly the sentence imposed by the assistant recorder was based on a misapprehension. Despite our view that it was richly deserved anyway, we have come to the conclusion that we ought to set it aside to the extent of achieving what the assistant recorder sought to achieve. That will now happen if we substitute such sentence as allows his immediate release which would otherwise not occur before March 22 of this year. We allow the appeal to that extent.

NEIL BARTLEY

COURT OF APPEAL (Lord Justice Staughton, Mr. Justice Tudor Evans and Mr. Justice Owen): January 13, 1989

Detention in young offender institution—theft from mail by postman—whether sentence of detention appropriate.

Six months' detention in a young offender institution reduced in a case of theft from the mail by a postman.

The appellant, aged 20, pleaded guilty to opening a postal packet and theft. The appellant was employed as a postman; he was seen to open a test package prepared by investigation officers, and stole another package, containing a calculator, valued at £11.

Sentenced to six months' detention in a young offender institution on each count concurrent. The appellant had lost his job as a result of the conviction, and as a result had been forced to sell the house which he was buying on mortgage.

Held: counsel conceded that a custodial sentence was inevitable, as a grave breach of trust by a public servant was involved in the case, but in the view of the Court, he had served a long enough sentence (having been in custody for twoand-a-half months) and the Court would substitute such a sentence as would result in his immediate release.

References: detention in a young offender institution, Current Sentencing Practice E2.; Commentary: [1989] Crim.L.R. 594.

B. Battock for the appellant.

TUDOR EVANS J.: On October 28, 1988, in the Crown Court at Canterbury, the appellant, who is now 21 years of age, pleaded guilty to opening a postal packet (count 1) and theft (count 2). He was sentenced on count 1 to six months' detention in a young offender institution. For theft, he received the same sentence concur-

rent. He now appeals against sentence by leave of the single judge.

On June 2, 1988, investigation officers from the Post Office Investigation Department specially prepared two postal packets. One was addressed to a Mr. Griffin and the other to a Mr. Gill. The addresses were in the area covered by the Dover sorting office where the appellant was employed. The packets were securely sealed and placed among other packets which were due to be handled by the appellant on the day in question. The investigation officers kept observation. The appellant returned to the sorting office after his first delivery run and the officers observed him holding the two packets. He sorted the one to Mr. Griffin properly, but the other one addressed to Mr. Gill was taken behind the sorting frames. It was opened and the appellant looked inside. He then replaced the back of the envelope and sorted it correctly. Those were the facts on count 1.

Later, a search was made for both packets by the investigation officers and only the one addressed to Mr. Gill was discovered. After the appellant had returned from his second delivery round, he was interviewed by a Mr. Ward, one of the investigating officers. He was asked about the package addressed to Mr. Griffin. The appellant admitted that he had had it and he said: "The calculator is at home." That was a calculator which had been inside the packet addressed to Mr. Griffin. When he was asked why he had opened the packet addressed to Mr. Gill, he said that he had done it because he was, as he put it, "just nosey."

The appellant was taken to his house where a search was conducted and the calculator and the cover of the packet in which it had been contained were found. He told the police that he was going to buy one of the calculators and on this occasion, he was tempted to steal. The calculator had a value of £11.

The appellant is now 21 years of age. He earned a substantial sum each week as a postman in the Dover area. He has one previous conviction for an offence of shop-lifting for which he was fined. According to the probation officer's report, the appellant was buying his house on mortgage, but as a result of employment consequential upon these offences and financial difficulties, he has been forced to put up the house for sale.

Mr. Battock accepts that an immediate sentence for this offence was inevitable, but he submits that the sentence of six months was too long. He makes the concession in relation to an immediate sentence because he accepts that a grave breach of trust by a public servant was involved in this case. We agree with him. On the other hand, the amount involved was very small and the appellant is still a young man with only one previous conviction to which we have referred. The effect of these offences upon him has been that he has lost his employment and he has had to give up the house that he was buying on mortgage.

It seems to us that the sentence of six months in respect of these two offences was too long in all the circumstances. In our view, the appellant has served a long enough sentence. Accordingly, we shall quash the sentences passed and substitute such sentence as will secure the appellant's immediate release. To that extent, the

appeal is allowed.

GERALD ALFRED THOMAS GARDNER

COURT OF APPEAL (Lord Justice O'Connor, Mr. Justice Caulfield and Mr. Justice Eastham): January 16, 1989

Delay—delay in proceeding with trial—defendant remaining abroad for substantial period—whether a ground for mitigating sentence.

Four years' imprisonment upheld for a series of burglaries, notwithstanding the fact that the appellant had absconded and been at large for several years before being sentenced.

The appellant pleaded guilty to five counts of burglary, involving both domestic and commercial premises and damaging property. The offences were committed in 1982 and involved the theft of property worth about £20,000. Following the burglaries, the appellant was arrested and committed for trial: he sold his mobile home and went with his wife to Italy, and later to the Republic of Ireland: during this time he attempted to gain entry to South Africa. The appellant was not convicted of any offence during this period, but was arrested and released in Italy. The appellant returned to England in 1987 and surrendered after some time. Sentenced to four years' imprisonment. Leave to appeal was given in the light of *Bird* (1987) 9 Cr.App.R.(S.) 77, in which a measure of leniency was extended to an appellant who absconded and led a blameless life between his absconding and the date of sentence.

Held: the Court paid full attention to the observations in *Bird*, but felt that the facts of the present case were not exactly analogous with *Bird*. Although the appel-

lant had not been prosecuted in Italy, it could not be said with confidence that he had led a blameless life since he absconded, nor could it be said that his return to England was wholly voluntary. The sentences could not be criticised for the offences for which they were imposed.

Cases cited: Bird (1987) 9 Cr. App. R. (S.) 77.

References: delay caused by defendant absconding, Current Sentencing Practice L6; Commentary: [1989] Crim.L.R. 512.

H. Harrop-Griffiths for the appellant.

CAULFIELD J.: This appellant is Gerald Gardner and he is 44. On March 20, 1987 at St. Albans, he pleaded guilty to three counts of non-domestic burglary, commercial burglary, and received two years' imprisonment concurrent on each count. He also pleaded guilty to two substantial domestic burglaries, and he was sentenced to four years' imprisonment on each count concurrent. There was also a plea to damaging property, which received a sentence of six months. All these sentences were concurrent. Five other offences of burglary were taken into consideration. The total period of imprisonment was four years.

He applied for leave to appeal and an extension of time, a matter of eight days, and after consideration by the learned single judge, the learned single judge said: "You pleaded guilty to these offences-two of them dwelling-house burglariesand you asked for others to be taken into consideration, and the sentences are in no

way excessive."

The facts are commonplace. Without detail of the burglaries, they were all goodclass burglaries. The houses that were burgled were fairly good-class houses in the Watford area. The commercial burglaries were places like filling stations. The total proceeds on the 1982 valuation of the pound sterling was in the region of £20,000.

After these burglaries the appellant was arrested and made admissions, and he was due to appear in the Crown Court. He was living in a mobile home with his wife. They decided to sell the mobile home, and with all their assets they went to southern Italy.

He was a slaughterman, was the appellant, by occupation, and he very soon obtained work in Italy as a slaughterman. While he was in Italy he must have been suspected of having committed some offence because, after a year in Italy, he was arrested on suspicion of burglary and held in custody for 10 days. Although no charge was preferred against him, his tools for his job, which included knives and guns, were confiscated by the police.

He could not return to his job, it is recited in the social enquiry report on the history obtained from him, and so he moved to the Republic of Ireland, where he obtained work with various building firms. He remained in Ireland with his wife

until 1987.

While he was in Ireland a step-daughter, who lived in the Isle of Wight, became seriously ill, so Mrs. Gardner went off to the Isle of Wight to look after her daughter while the appellant went to South Africa. Of course South Africa is fairly strict as regards permits to work and, on arrival there, it was discovered he had no permit to work, so he was sent to England.

Once he was in England, the appellant very quickly obtained work at London Airport. He had to leave because of difficulties caused by the Inland Revenue. He

took another job very quickly in Hayes, leaving for the same reason.

It was then that he decided to give himself up because he knew, he said, that until these outstanding matters were dealt with, there was no likelihood of his obtaining contentment with his wife and leading a normal life together.