



JUDICIARY OF
ENGLAND AND WALES

The Queen

-v-

John Kenneth Collins

Daniel Jones

Terence Perkins

Carl Wood

William Lincoln

Hugh Doyle

In the Crown Court at Woolwich

Sentencing remarks of HHJ Kinch

9th March 2016

I want to thank all counsel for their efforts to assist me by providing material in advance of the hearing and for the helpful bundle of sentencing material that has been compiled.

INTRODUCTION

1. John Kenneth Collins (JKC) Daniel Jones (DJ) Terence Perkins (TP) all pleaded guilty to Count 1, Conspiracy to commit Burglary on arraignment at the Plea and Case Management Hearing on 4 September 2015. Carl Wood (CW) and William Lincoln (WL) were convicted by the jury on Count 1 and on Count 2 Conspiracy to Conceal, Convert or Transfer Criminal Property. Hugh Doyle (HD) was convicted by the jury of Count 3 Concealing, Converting or Transferring Criminal Property.

2. The burglary of the Hatton Garden Safe Deposit vault (“HGSD”) in April 2015 has been labelled by many (including some defendants and advocates) as the biggest burglary in English legal history. Whether that assertion is capable of proof I do not know. However, it is clear that the burglary at the heart of this case stands in a class of its own in the scale of the ambition, the detail of the planning, the level of preparation, the organising of the team to carry it out and in terms of the value of property stolen. Collins, Jones, Perkins along with Brian Reader were the ringleaders at the heart of the planning and driving through the preparation for the burglary. Wood and Lincoln were recruited to carry out more limited and specific roles. Hugh Doyle was involved long after the burglary when the conspirators needed assistance in finding a safe place to transfer stolen property.
3. The attraction of a safety deposit vault obviously lies in its security. HGSD certainly appeared secure. Its premises lay in a basement area of an office building with its main entrance on Hatton Garden itself. Access to HGSD was gained via a staircase and was protected at night by a series of locked doors and an electronic intruder alarm, linked to a monitoring company. The vault area was controlled by an “airlock” with sliding metal gates at each end, with the vault itself being guarded by a formidable door that could only be unlocked with the correct combinations. Inside the vault there were secure cabinets bolted to floor and ceiling housing 996 safety deposit boxes. In 2015 about 500 of those were being rented, mainly by jewellers working in the Hatton Garden area. These were mainly independent jewellers and sole traders, not large multiples. The evidence was that they used the vault as convenient, local, secure storage both for long term items of jewellery and in some cases for pieces that were being worked on.
4. Neither the building, nor the vault premises were staffed at night. Each evening the security staff would leave around 6 p.m. securing the vault premises before they left and leaving the outer doors to the building locked. There was extensive CCTV for the building owners. The system was linked to a hard drive in a caretaker’s office in the basement. The HGSD premises had its own CCTV system with the recorder located in a small office within the airlock area. Even without the presence of night time staff, the outward appearance was of a formidable barrier to anyone tempted to try and break the security of the vault.

PLANNING AND EXECUTION

5. The burglary required careful, detailed and intense planning. In the months before the burglary, the ringleaders JKC, DJ, TP and BR had met regularly at the Castle PH and kept in contact by phone. Once he had been recruited to help, CW was kept informed by DJ. There were reconnaissance trips and at least one dry run to the area of Hatton Garden. A man who resembled Perkins was seen working in the lift around a week before the burglary. There were meetings with a metalworks business presumably investigating how some material might be disposed of. Collins who lived with Lincoln’s sister, recruited Lincoln to assist with transport after the burglary and with housing some of the stolen property.
6. The successful penetration of the vault required first of all a detailed knowledge of the building, its security systems and weak points and the means of gaining access to the inside of the building. It has been suggested in the course of mitigation that the man “Basil” who remains at large was the source who

possessed or secured the necessary information. Whatever means was used, the conspirators appear to have obtained keys to the outer doors used by all the occupants of the building and a very detailed knowledge of the internal layout and security systems in the building and the HGSD vault itself. It appears they discovered door codes and security PIN numbers where they needed them. On the nights when the burglary was effected, Thursday 3 April and Saturday 5 April, Basil probably used a key to get into the building. He then worked his way through the ground floor and the common parts to the outdoor fire escape. Near there, a small door led on to the quiet Greville Street and he was able to let in the rest of the team that way.

7. Once inside, a key element in breaching the security at HGSD was the identification of the lift shaft as a means of securing entry to the basement. The lift had not been used to access the basement of the building since the 1970s and the lift doors in the basement were behind a locked metal shutter that separated the lift from the airlock area of the HGSD premises. The conspirators' plan was to disable the lift at one of the upper floors and then to clamber down the shaft from the ground floor to the basement. Once there, the doors and the metal shutter would be forced open to give access to the airlock and putting the burglars right in the heart of the HGSD premises. Provided they could disable the alarm swiftly, the advantage of this plan was that those who had climbed down would be on the inside and could work backwards through the locked doors to the ground floor to allow the rest of the team in with the heavy drilling equipment.
8. The CCTV systems for the building and for the vault were broken into and the recorders and hard drives were removed. The conspirators had brought with them equipment to cut alarm wires, to cut through and hold open metal grilles and gates as well as a specialist drill to make holes in the thick wall of the main vault. Three holes had to be drilled side by side and overlapping to create a space large enough for some members of the team to squeeze through. On the first night (3 April 2015) another piece of equipment, a Clark pump and hose, failed to force over the heavy cabinets inside the vault that housed the deposit boxes. The attempt was abandoned and the conspirators left but there was barely any trace of their visit visible outside the vault and it wasn't immediately detected. Brian Reader had had enough after this failure and he was taken to London Bridge station by William Lincoln, who, I am satisfied, was standing by that morning, waiting to provide whatever transport was required.
9. Undaunted, the remaining conspirators returned on the Saturday night (5 April 2015). Before approaching in the white van, they made a preliminary check of the area to see if the coast was clear. This was where they made a major mistake of using Collins' distinctive Mercedes which was captured on CCTV in nearby Leather Lane, where Jones and Wood got out. This was to provide the police investigators with an important clue. Jones had been to Twickenham with Collins earlier that day to buy a replacement unit that enabled the team to complete the task of breaking into the vault. They had to do so without Carl Wood who was referred to during the trial as "man F." The discovery that someone had locked the fire escape door after the conspirators had left it unlocked on their previous visit plainly worried Carl Wood and he decided to walk away.

10. Once inside the vault, the burglars worked quickly to ransack 73 safety deposit boxes. The evidence was that 44 boxes were in active use and had goods stolen. The current estimate of the total value of the stolen property is just short of £14 million. The valuation exercise is however a work in progress and I have to treat the figures of loss and recovery with some caution. On any view, the sums involved are very large indeed. Gold and jewellery filled up a number of bags and two wheelie bins that had been used to bring equipment to the vault. Not without difficulty, the haul was dragged upstairs to the street and a waiting white van before 7 a.m. to ensure departure before any early arrivals disturbed them.
11. Part of that process could be observed on CCTV images from a camera which was inside the corridor from the fire exit passageway to Greville Street. The camera was on a separate system owned by a neighbouring jewellery business. Their system was triggered by movement and it captured the arrival and departure and some of the other movements of the burglars. All the men observed were well covered, in overalls and different forms of headgear so their identity was obscured.
12. Far from stumbling into 21st century crime as relics of a past era, the conspirators were clearly highly aware of the dangers of leaving traces that could lead to their identification. They ensured there was no electronic footprint left by ditching their mobile phones for the period and relying on walkie-talkie radios for communications. The van that picked them all up took them all to a rendezvous at Collins' house in Bletsoe Walk in Islington. It was never seen again. The conspirators would have had confidence that if there was any sighting of them on any cctv outside the building it would be next to impossible to identify any of them. They could safely go back to their own phones and routines.

AFTERMATH

13. There must have been a preliminary sort through of the stolen property at Bletsoe Walk after the burglary. Then on 6 April 2015 (Easter Monday) Lincoln collected three sports bags filled with stolen jewellery and arranged for them to be stored in his nephew's garage until they were needed again. By the time the burglary was discovered by the returning security guards on Tuesday 7 April, the conspirators must have believed they had covered their tracks.
14. After the burglary, the ringleaders kept in touch by phone and in a series of meetings in April and the first half of May. Brian Reader was included in some meetings despite having failed to return to HGSD on the second night. Carl Wood was cut out and was referred to in disparaging terms by Jones and Perkins in conversations in their cars that were covertly recorded. Plans were made for a meeting at the Sterling Road home of Perkins daughter in Enfield while she was away on holiday from 16 May. An electric crucible and smelter had been procured and it was obvious that a major sort out was being planned. The call went out for the return of the jewels held under Lincoln's control. It is an irresistible inference that the value of that consignment was substantial given that Collins, Jones and Lincoln were all involved in the handover that took place outside Hugh Doyle's office at the back of the Wheatsheaf pub in Enfield.

15. So far as Hugh Doyle is concerned and bearing in mind his acquittal on Count 2 of the indictment, it is likely that he was only approached for assistance in the transferring of the jewellery filled sports bags at a very late stage. He was, as the jury found prepared to assist his old drinking partners at least suspecting they were engaged in a dishonest enterprise. By then, the police had been observing and listening for some time and once the bags had been taken back to Sterling Road for the sort out, the police began to make arrests.
16. The police have recovered some of the property. I am satisfied that the jewellery that was contained in the sports bags that ended up at Sterling Road must represent a significant part of the recovered property. The process of identifying what has been recovered will be a long one and will continue for some time. I have been told that higher value items and many loose precious stones are not among the property recovered. A quantity of bullion was stolen, which is also missing. Furthermore, a large amount of cash was also taken from the safe deposit boxes. Some cash has been recovered from some of the defendants, but it cannot be said whether a particular recovered note was taken in this raid. Based upon estimates of the losers themselves the prosecution informed me that at best, approximately one third (approx £4.5m) of the value of property taken may have been recovered so far.

ASSESSMENT

17. Prosecution and defence have made submissions to me in writing concerning the approach to the Sentencing Council's Burglary Guideline. They have developed their submissions in oral argument. The prosecution argue this is a case where I am required to sentence outside the guideline and indeed to use the maximum sentence for non domestic burglary of 10 years imprisonment as a starting point on Count 1. The defence, broadly have argued that even if the case merits a departure from the guidelines, the maximum term should be reserved for even worse cases.
18. First of all, I identify this case as one involving greater harm in the terms of the guideline. The theft and damage inevitably caused significant financial and economic loss on an unprecedented scale. The consequences for the company and for some of the individual jewellers were serious indeed. The safety deposit company went into administration, its reputation in ruins and it no longer operates as it did. The jury heard in person or from statements from individual jewellers whose boxes had been broken into. Many of the losers were small independent jewellers. Some of them, like Mr Hopper whose statement was included in the sentencing bundle were keeping stock for their retirement. Some of them may have had insurance and others may have viewed the safety deposit vault as adequate insurance. Mr Jeffrey who gave evidence was typical. He had been a jeweller for over 30 years and he kept much of his stock in the vault. He suffered losses of cash (£30,000) gold bars and jewellery. He has had a series of meetings with the police seeking to identify items – a painstaking and laborious process where it was often not possible for him to say with certainty whether a piece was his. He and many others suffered greatly and continue to suffer the after effects of the burglary.

19. As for culpability there was a very high level of planning and organisation that extended to the recruitment of a sizeable group needed to carry out the crime and the selection and provision of a wide range of equipment to cater for the tasks involved in breaking into the vault. In my judgement it must rank among the worst offences of its type. Further, it was a conspiracy to commit burglary that comprehended a plan as to how the stolen property would be disposed of. That is the basis upon which the Crown chose not to proceed on Count 2, the money laundering conspiracy in the cases of those defendants who pleaded guilty.
20. I am satisfied that in assessing the appropriate starting point for sentencing the conspirators on count 1 that it would be contrary to the interests of justice to follow the definitive guideline, which was simply not designed with a case of this scale in mind. Further I am satisfied that nothing other than the maximum sentence permitted by law would be appropriate as a starting point for anyone convicted of conspiring to take part in this exceptional case.

GUILTY PLEAS

21. The prosecution have submitted that, when determining the level of discount for pleas of guilty, in the cases of Collins, Jones and Perkins that I should consider withholding the full discount of one third, and substituting instead a deduction of 20%, on the basis that they faced an overwhelming case. They submit the relevant factors are their arrest inside a house containing a very large quantity of the stolen material in the middle of being divided up, and the recordings of them confessing to participating in this offence. The defence have argued that there should be no deduction of credit on this basis. I have been referred to the SGC Guideline on Reduction in Sentence for a Guilty Plea and to the leading case of ***R v Caley [2012] EWCA Crim 2821*** as well as other cases included in the sentencing bundle.
22. It is right that these defendants would have known that they would be facing a formidable case. That is a factor that needs to be kept in mind but so does the reality that everyone has a choice whether or not to plead guilty, however strong the case against them and there are powerful pragmatic reasons why pleas of guilty at an early stage should result in discounts of one third or close to it, depending on how early the indication comes. Each defendant's case needs to be considered individually but I decline the invitation to interfere to any significant extent with the extent of credit for plea. In each case the sentence I pass will result in one half of the term being served in custody and the remainder on licence in the community subject to any conditions that may be imposed and at risk of recall until the end of the terms.

ANCILLARY ORDERS

23. **Deprivation of Property:** The prosecution have applied for an order under s 143 of Powers of Criminal Courts Sentencing) Act 2000 depriving the defendants of items seized from them that were used for the purposes of crime. The targeted

items, phones, walkie talkies etc are listed in a schedule provided to the court. In principle there is no objection to the making of the order and I will make the order in the terms sought with the exception of Items 155 to 161 which will be further considered when the court deals with Brian Reader.

24. **Confiscation:** The prosecution has initiated confiscation proceedings against all the defendants. Notices requiring information from the defendants and relevant third parties have been served. I make the following directions:

- i. Defendants and third parties to serve a response to the s18 and s18A POCA requests by 8 April 2016
- ii. Prosecution to serve a s16 POCA statement of information by 9 September 2016.
- iii. Defence to serve a s17 POCA response by 4 November 2016 and third parties to make any representations pursuant to s10A(2) POCA
- iv. Prosecution to serve a supplementary s16 statement by 6 January 2017.
- v. Matter to be listed for mention and directions on the first available date after 13 January 2017.

25. The court will give notice to the third parties of the timetable.

26. **Criminal Behaviour Orders:** The prosecution have applied for CBOs to be made in the case of each defendant before me. The power to make such orders (which replaced Anti-Social Behaviour Orders) is contained in the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 s22. Under s22 I may make such an order

(3)... the court is satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the offender has engaged in behaviour that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to any person.

(4)... the court considers that making the order will help in preventing the offender from engaging in such behaviour.

27. I am grateful to all counsel and to Mr Evans QC and Mr Keleher QC in particular for attempting to guide me through the legislation and principles involved. There are some indicators in the wording of the Act that do not sit comfortably with designating a highly organised burglary as anti-social behaviour with its usual connotations. That said, there is nothing in the legislation that excludes burglary as a base offence for consideration of such an order.

28. I have concluded I am not sure that the behaviour of Doyle was likely to cause distress and the application fails in relation to him. On the other hand, I am sure that the behaviour of Collins, Jones, Perkins, Wood and Lincoln caused distress at the very least to the victims of the burglary. However, bearing in mind the relatively mature ages, the likely length of prison sentences to be imposed and the pending confiscation proceedings I find it difficult to conclude that the orders sought will necessarily help in preventing further anti-social behaviour. In any

event the section says I “may” make an order and in the circumstances of this case I would decline to do so.

29. The court will adjourn consideration of matters such as costs and compensation to the final confiscation hearing.

JOHN KENNETH COLLINS

30. John Kenneth “Kenny” Collins you were born on 5.9.1940, and were already 74 years old at the time of the burglary. You were a ringleader and part of the central planning team, present at numerous meetings before and after the burglary. You visited Hatton Garden a number of times in the build up to check out the premises and surrounding areas. You were the look out during the burglary at 25 Hatton Gardens during both nights, and drove the van to and from the scene. Your home address was where the goods were first taken, prior to their division and concealment.
31. You recruited Lincoln to whom you have a family connection, and Doyle who he knew well. In your home address at 14 Bletsoe Walk, Islington, a large amount of cash, wrist watches, coins, jewellery and a money counter were found.
32. You have a long list of previous convictions going back to the 1950 and 1960s when you served sentences for robbery and warehouse breaking. In 1989 you were sentenced to 9 years imprisonment for a conspiracy to rob involving jewellery worth £300,000. Until now, this century had been uneventful in terms of your criminal offending.
33. You are now 75 years old and like most of your co defendants you are suffering from a number of health issues including diabetes, high blood pressure and arthritis. You have had some family sadness to cope with. I bear these matters in mind to the limited extent that I can in a case where you nonetheless undertook a leading role in a very serious offence.
34. You pleaded guilty at the PCMH and I accept that there had been discussions about a possible plea to count 1 at the time of the Preliminary Hearing although you did not seek arraignment at that point. I take the starting point of 10 years imprisonment on Count 1 and deduct 30% as credit for your plea. The sentence in your case is 7 years imprisonment. Count 2 will be ordered to lie on the file not to be proceeded with, without leave of this court or the Court of Appeal Criminal Division.

DANIEL JONES

35. Daniel Jones: you were 60 years of age at the time of the burglary and have just turned 61. You were also a ringleader, at the heart of the extensive planning and

regular meetings both before and after the Easter weekend. You recruited Carl Wood and kept him updated on the preparations. You were at the burglary throughout and were instrumental in gaining access to the vault. After the first night failure, it was you with Collins, who obtained the further equipment to complete the job. Based on the transcripts I heard you appear to have taken the lead in operating the drill and pump to gain access through the vault wall. Also based on the transcripts, and on your build, you appear to have been, along with 'Basil', one of the two who actually entered the vault area on the second night and broke open boxes.

36. When his property in Park Avenue, Enfield was searched the police found items including facemasks; a drill and cash, and a book entitled 'Forensics For Dummies'. You clearly embraced the need for careful preparation and the mechanics required to avoid detection.
37. You also have a long list of previous convictions including a sentence of 6 years imprisonment imposed in 1982 for burglary of Ratners Jewellers. That matter was followed by two offences of Attempted Robbery and possession of a firearm in 1987 and 1989 for which you received 4 years and 7 years respectively. You have no convictions in this century.
38. Your plea of guilty was indicated at the Magistrates court I was told although it was not entered formally until the PCMH. You made an offer to take the police to the place where he had buried some of the proceeds from this crime and which were part of his share and indeed you did so in October 2015, shortly before the trial. You claimed that the jewellery hidden under the headstone was all that was left to you. In the light of the fact that other jewellery was found hidden under another stone in the cemetery. It would be unrealistic to sustain a plea for any enhanced credit and Mr Godfrey has not asked for it. The episode tends to suggest you have adopted a pragmatic approach to your position.
39. In your case I adopt the same starting point and apply a 30% reduction for plea. The sentence is one of 7 years imprisonment. Count 2 will be ordered to lie on the file.

TERENCE PERKINS

40. Terence Perkins born on 4 April 1948. You therefore turned 67 on the Saturday of the burglary. You were a ringleader and a party to meetings both before and after the offence. He also met in the pub and he visited Hatton Garden in preparation. He was present throughout the offence, and was inside HGSD on both nights. Based on the transcripts you assisted in the drilling/pump operation, and were apparently in the corridor immediately outside the vault as Jones and 'Basil' were inside opening the boxes. When your home address in Enfield was searched the police found jewellery, cash, blue overalls, five pairs of white fabric gloves and a quantity of euros.
41. You were convicted of a Robbery in 1985. The offence concerned the armed robbery of the vaults of Security Express and nearly £6m was stolen. TP was sentenced to 22 years imprisonment.

42. You pleaded guilty at the PCMH and I accept that there had been discussions about a possible plea to Count 1 at the time of the Preliminary Hearing although you did not seek arraignment at that point. I take the starting point of 10 years imprisonment on Count 1 and deduct 30% as credit for your plea. The sentence in your case is 7 years imprisonment. Count 2 will be ordered to lie on the file

BRIAN READER

43. It is worth observing that those who appear today were in league with Brian Reader 76 years old at the time of the burglary, a man who also had some criminal history. That principally concerned a conspiracy to handle stolen goods, namely the £66m proceeds of the Brinks Mat robbery.

CARL WOOD

44. Carl Wood. You are now 59 years old. You have a number of previous convictions for offences of dishonesty in the 1980s and 1990s. In 2002 you were convicted of False Imprisonment and conspiracy to assault and were sentenced to 4 years imprisonment. You were a friend of Daniel Jones and I am satisfied he recruited you as someone who would be a useful additional pair of hands. You had a background in running and keeping fit although I am aware that you have been suffering from Crohn's disease. Mr Corsellis has reminded me of the condition of your parents' health.
45. You had significant money problems and agreed to join in but you were not a ringleader. Indeed when it came to the return to Hatton Garden on the night of 4 April you decided not to go through with the operation and left. You were motivated not by any change of heart about stealing jewellery but by self preservation because it became apparent someone had locked the fire escape door and danger might lie within the building. In the result, you did not share in the successful completion of the burglary and indeed you became the subject of scornful comment from the others in the recorded conversations. I suspect that aspect of matters may lie behind the fact that you would not acknowledge what was a powerful circumstantial case against you and stood trial before the jury. Your withdrawal cannot in any sense lessen your guilt but I consider it is a matter that entitles me to make some modest adjustment in sentence in your case.
46. The appropriate starting point in my judgement taking all these matters into account is one of 6 years imprisonment. That will be the sentence on Count 1 with a concurrent sentence of 6 years imprisonment on Count 2.

WILLIAM LINCOLN

47. William 'Bill' Lincoln you were 59 years old at the time of the burglary and 60 years old now. You were recruited by Collins and obviously in regular contact with him as a family member. I accept of course that you were not at the burglary and I accept you are not a ringleader. However, I am satisfied that you were

standing by on the morning of 3 April to assist with transport as soon as the burglars got back to Bletsoe Walk. In the event, following the failed attempt you gave Brian Reader a lift to London Bridge, an indication of how close you were to the principal players in this operation. Thereafter you held yourself ready to assist with the transfer of jewellery at the request of Collins. You supervised the removal and retention of the three sports bags full of jewellery and were closely involved in the handover at Doyle's workplace. The fact that the stolen property was physically at your nephew's garage and not in your possession is not a point that impresses me in terms of mitigation.

48. Cash and jewellery were found at your address. It was a formidable case against you. You decided not to give any indication of what your defence was and tried to weave a narrative around the evidence to explain it all away. You are not entitled to any discount for plea.
49. William Lincoln has a number of previous convictions, mainly for offences of burglary and mainly in the 1970s and 1980s. While not as grave as some of the matters for which others have been convicted, these matters were serious enough to merit terms of 3 and 4 years' imprisonment.
50. Although not a ringleader, in my judgement you were very close to one of the principal organisers, Collins and you were heavily involved in both conspiracies. In my judgement the appropriate starting point for Count 1 is 7 years imprisonment and on Count 2 there will be a sentence of 7 years concurrent.

HUGH DOYLE

51. Hugh Doyle born on 28 February 1967, and is now 49 years old. As you acknowledged when pressed in the witness box, you had a long, social association with Collins and others. I conclude you may have been somewhat in awe of these old school villains. It is quite apparent that you were only too ready to provide Collins and the others with any assistance that they might need. Perhaps you were flattered to be asked. It may be fortunate for you that the arrests happened when they did and there was no opportunity for you to be called on to do anything more than provide a venue for the sensitive handover of a large quantity of stolen jewellery. Whether you knew exactly what the bags contained and that they represented proceeds from the HGSD burglary doesn't matter. The jury concluded from the circumstances that you must have known or suspected they were moving the proceeds of crime.
52. Having been convicted by the jury, you are to be sentenced for a money laundering offence contrary to s.327 of the Proceeds of Crime Act. The prosecution concede that it may be difficult to apply the sentencing guidelines rigorously as, unlike other types of money laundering (for example money transferred into bank accounts), you may not have understood the actual value involved, although I am satisfied you will have understood that Collins and the others would not be concerned with anything other than property of substantial value. Your case has some features indicating lesser culpability to the extent that the guideline can assist me. It is plainly a case where only a custodial sentence

can meet the nature of the offence. I do need to bear in mind that having demonstrated weakness by agreeing to help, you at no stage exercised any control over the property that they wanted to move from one vehicle to another. Yours was a limited role and the jury acquitted you of involvement in the wider conspiracy.

53. You were convicted of dangerous driving and possession of class A drugs in 2007 and sentenced to 3 years imprisonment. To your credit, you applied yourself and got a gas safe engineering qualification. Since your release you have built up your own heating and plumbing business in Enfield. I am satisfied from what I have heard and read that the business relies heavily on you as the front man and driving force. I have been impressed by the personal and business references that have been written in your support. Family, employees, friends and business colleagues will all feel let down by you and they all suffered during the time you spent on remand in custody before being granted bail shortly before the trial.
54. You were on remand in custody for 177 days, just short of 6 months. You have since spent 118 days on a qualifying curfew which would entitle you to a deduction of 59 days from any prison sentence I impose today.
55. Because of the limited role you performed and the fact that you have already spent a period in custody and under a curfew. I have concluded I can suspend the sentence of imprisonment that I must impose. I am not satisfied that the level of criminality here demands that I send you back into prison. The sentence is one of 21 months imprisonment suspended for 2 years. That means if you do not commit any further offences during the next two years you will not need to serve any part of that term. Any further offending would trigger the activation of all or part of that sentence. Consideration of costs is adjourned to the confiscation proceedings when your financial circumstances can be more closely examined.

HHJ Christopher Kinch QC

9 March 2016