



JUDICIARY OF
ENGLAND AND WALES

R -v- RICHARD JONES AKA BARRY BENNELL

SENTENCING REMARKS OF HHJ GOLDSTONE QC

LIVERPOOL CROWN COURT

19 FEBRUARY 2018

YOU ARE 64 YEARS OF AGE AND HAVE BEEN CONVICTED, FOLLOWING A TRIAL, OF A TOTAL OF 43 COUNTS OF OFFENCES OF SEXUAL ASSAULT COMMITTED BY YOU BETWEEN 1979 AND 1991 AGAINST 11 BOYS AGED BETWEEN 8 AND 14; THOSE OFFENCES COMPRISE 11 OF BUGGERY, 2 OF ATTEMPTED BUGGERY AND 30 OF INDECENT ASSAULT. IN ADDITION, YOU HAVE PLEADED GUILTY TO 7 COUNTS OF INDECENT ASSAULT, COMMITTED DURING THE SAME PERIOD, 3 OF WHICH INVOLVE 2 OF THE BOYS WHOSE MORE SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS LED TO CONVICTIONS FOR OFFENCES OUTLINED ABOVE, AND 4 RELATE TO ANOTHER BOY.

BETWEEN 1979 AND 1994 YOU WORKED AS A QUALIFIED YOUTH COACH AND SCOUT FOR VARIOUS FOOTBALL LEAGUE CLUBS, NOTABLY MANCHESTER CITY, CREWE ALEXANDRA AND STOKE CITY. THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT YOU WERE GOOD AT SPOTTING TALENT IN YOUNG FOOTBALLERS AND IN DEVELOPING THEIR SKILLS, BUT THERE IS EQUALLY NO DOUBT THAT BEHIND THE YOUTH COACH, THERE LAY A TOTALLY DIFFERENT PERSON – ONE WHO WAS HELL-BENT UPON ABUSING THOSE BOYS AND USING THE CONTROL AND POWER WHICH YOU WERE ABLE TO EXERT OVER THEM IN ORDER TO DO SO. IN ONE OF YOUR INTERVIEWS, YOU SAID THAT WHILST IT MIGHT BE FAIR TO DESCRIBE YOU AS MANIPULATIVE, CUNNING, AND EVEN PREDATORY, YOU WERE NOT EVIL. YOU COULD NOT HAVE BEEN MORE WRONG. YOUR BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS THESE BOYS IN GROOMING AND SEDUCING THEM BEFORE SUBJECTING THEM TO, IN SOME CASES, THE MOST SERIOUS, DEGRADING AND HUMILIATING ABUSE WAS SHEER EVIL. YOU KNEW THAT TO EACH OF THESE BOYS, FOOTBALL WAS THEIR LIFE; THAT WAS THE CAREER FOR WHICH THEY WOULD GIVE ANYTHING, AND IT WAS THE CAREER FOR WHICH YOU WOULD TAKE ANYTHING AND EVERYTHING THEY HAD TO OFFER. TO THOSE BOYS, YOU APPEARED AS A GOD WHO HAD IT IN HIS GIFT TO HELP FULFIL THEIR AMBITIONS AND REALISE THEIR DREAMS. IN REALITY, YOU WERE THE DEVIL INCARNATE; YOU STOLE THEIR CHILDHOODS AND THEIR INNOCENCE TO SATISFY YOUR OWN PERVERSION. THE EVIDENCE WHICH THE JURY AND I HEARD OVER A PERIOD OF FOUR WEEKS HAS REVEALED YEARS OF ABUSE, BOTH OF TRUST AND OF THE BODIES OF YOUNG BOYS, OF THE MAXIMUM GRAVITY, CAUSING THE MAXIMUM IMPACT UPON YOUR VICTIMS.

IN THE CASE OF EACH BOY, THE GROOMING PROCESS BEGAN IN EXACTLY THE SAME WAY – YOUR FIRST TARGET WOULD BE THE PARENTS, NOT THE BOYS THEMSELVES; YOU USED YOUR SO-CALLED

CHARISMA TO EARN THEIR TRUST AND CONFIDENCE THAT THEIR SONS WOULD BE SAFE AND PROPERLY LOOKED AFTER IN YOUR CARE AND IN YOUR HOME. ONCE THAT WAS ACHIEVED, YOU GROOMED THE BOYS. YOU FURNISHED YOUR HOME WITH VIDEO AND ARCADE GAMES AND A POOL TABLE, YOU SHOWERED THEM WITH SPORTS CLOTHING WHICH VERY OFTEN THEY OR THEIR PARENTS WOULD OTHERWISE HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO AFFORD, YOU TREATED THEM TO MEALS AND YOU TOOK THEM ON HOLIDAYS. YOUR HOMES WERE DESCRIBED VARIOUSLY AS AN ALADDIN'S CAVE AND A PARADISE; AND YOU KEPT EXOTIC ANIMALS, INCLUDING A PUMA AND A MONKEY. I AM SATISFIED THAT THEY, TOGETHER WITH YOUR LARGE DOGS SERVED TWO PURPOSES; ONE TO EXCITE THE BOYS, THE OTHER TO FRIGHTEN THEM. VERY OFTEN, YOU INTENTIONALLY FRIGHTENED THEM BY SHOWING HORROR FILMS SO THAT YOU COULD USE THEIR FEAR AS A PRETEXT FOR CUDDLING THEM – AND THAT WAS GENERALLY HOW THE ABUSE BEGAN.

ONCE THE BOYS WERE READY FOR YOU TO ABUSE, YOUR NORMAL APPROACH WAS TO INVITE THEM TO STAY OVERNIGHT IN YOUR HOUSE – ALTHOUGH SOMETIMES ABUSE, IN A RELATIVELY MINOR WAY, STARTED WHEN YOU WERE DRIVING THEM IN YOUR CAR. SOMETIMES, THE BOYS SLEPT IN BUNK BEDS; SOMETIMES, THEY WERE INVITED – AND WERE EXPECTED - TO SLEEP IN YOUR BED. THE ABUSE OFTEN BEGAN WITH A GAME WHICH YOU PLAYED, CALLED 'FOLLOW ME' WHEREBY YOU TOUCHED THEM IN A CERTAIN WAY AND THEY WERE EXPECTED TO DO THE SAME TO YOU; THIS WOULD END UP WITH YOU AND THEY TOUCHING EACH OTHERS' GENITALS. FROM THERE, YOU WOULD GRADUATE TO MUTUAL MASTURBATION – ALTHOUGH AS YOU YOURSELF SAID IN INTERVIEW, THERE WAS NOTHING MUTUAL ABOUT IT FROM THEIR POINT OF VIEW. MUTUAL MASTURBATION WOULD VERY OFTEN LEAD TO ORAL SEX, IN WHICH YOU WOULD SUCK THEIR PENISES; BUT MORE OFTEN, THEY WOULD BE REQUIRED TO SUCK YOURS, AND OFTEN TO THE POINT OF YOUR EJACULATION; WITH SOME OF THE BOYS, THIS WAS THE LIMIT OF YOUR PERVERSION, BUT OTHERS WERE LESS FORTUNATE; YOUR DESIRE FOR ANAL SEX WOULD LEAD SOMETIMES TO DIGITAL PENETRATION, OR PRESSURE BY THRUSTING YOUR ERECT PENIS AGAINST THEIR BACKSIDES. THRUSTING ESCALATED TO ATTEMPTED BUGGERY IN THE CASE OF 2 OF THE BOYS ON REGULAR OCCASIONS WHEN THEY WERE AGED BETWEEN 10 AND 14, AND TO REPEATED ACTS OF BUGGERY WITH 4 SEPARATE BOYS WHEN THEY WERE OF A SIMILAR AGE. WHILST YOU WERE EVER ANXIOUS TO POINT OUT IN INTERVIEW THAT YOU WOULD NEVER HAVE DONE ANYTHING TO HURT THESE BOYS, AS YOU WANTED THEM TO LIKE YOU, THE REALITY IS THAT YOU COULD NOT HAVE CARED LESS, AS LONG AS YOU OBTAINED SEXUAL GRATIFICATION FROM YOUR ABUSE OF THEM. THOSE BOYS CRIED OUT IN PAIN ON OCCASION, BUT RARELY IF AT ALL DID YOU STOP ON THEIR ACCOUNT.

THE ABUSE OCCURRED NOT ONLY IN YOUR HOMES, BUT WHEN YOU WERE AWAY IN HOTELS OR AT BUTLIN'S CAMP IN PWLLHELI; IT OCCURRED WHEN EITHER ONE OR TWO BOYS WERE IN BED WITH YOU, OR WHEN YOU WERE IN OR AT THE SIDE OF THEIR BEDS; IT HAPPENED WHEN YOU WERE ALONE WITH YOUR VICTIM AT THE TIME, OR IN THE PRESENCE OF OTHERS. ALTHOUGH YOU SAID IN INTERVIEW THAT YOU WOULD NOT ABUSE ONE IN THE PRESENCE OF ANOTHER BECAUSE OF THE RISK OF DETECTION, I AM QUITE SATISFIED THAT THE RISK OF DETECTION WAS ONE WHICH DID NOT CONCERN OR DETER YOU – IT GAVE AN ADDED DIMENSION TO YOUR PERVERSION. AS YOU SAID IN INTERVIEW, THE PARENTS OF THESE BOYS WOULD NEVER HAVE BELIEVED THEM IF THEY HAD COMPLAINED ABOUT YOU, WHO HAD DONE SO MUCH TO EARN THEIR MISGUIDED TRUST AND RESPECT. AND IF THE BOYS DID NOT SUCCUMB TO YOUR ADVANCES OR SOUGHT PHYSICALLY TO RESIST YOU, YOU CONVINCED THEM THAT THEIR FOOTBALLING PROSPECTS WOULD SUFFER, AND THAT THEIR BUDDING CAREERS WOULD WITHER ON THE VINE.

THESE ARE OFFENCES FOR WHICH YOU HAVE SHOWN, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SOME RELATIVELY MINOR ABUSE WHICH YOU ADMITTED AT VARYING STAGES IN THE PROCEEDINGS, NO REMORSE

WHATSOEVER. FOLLOWING THE IMPOSITION OF THE SENTENCE OF 9 YEARS IN 1998, YOU WERE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY OF WIPING THE SLATE CLEAN; AT THAT STAGE, YOU ADMITTED SOME, AGAIN, RELATIVELY MINOR ABUSE OF A NUMBER OF VICTIMS, BUT VOLUNTEERED NO ADMISSIONS WHATSOEVER IN RELATION TO ANY OF THE MORE SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS OF INDECENT ASSAULT, ATTEMPTED BUGGERY OR BUGGERY.

I NOW PROPOSE TO SUMMARISE THE OFFENCES OF WHICH YOU HAVE BEEN CONVICTED. IN SO DOING I WILL DESCRIBE THE EVIDENCE OF ABUSE WHICH WAS GIVEN BY EACH OF YOUR VICTIMS, BUT I BEAR IN MIND THE SUBMISSIONS OF MISS LAWS QC AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF SENTENCING YOU ONLY FOR THE OFFENCES OF WHICH YOU HAVE BEEN CONVICTED. IN MY JUDGMENT, THERE ARE SUFFICIENT COUNTS IN THE INDICTMENT TO REFLECT THE REPEATED CONDUCT OF WHICH COMPLAINT WAS MADE BY NO FEWER THAN 11 VICTIMS AND TO ENABLE AN APPROPRIATE OVERALL SENTENCE TO BE PASSED.

COUNTS 1 AND 2 REFLECTED ACTS OF MUTUAL MASTURBATION COMMITTED BY YOU AGAINST HH OVER A PERIOD OF 2 YEARS WHEN HE WAS AGED BETWEEN 11 AND 13

COUNTS 3-7 DEAL WITH YOUR ABUSE OF CHRISTOPHER UNSWORTH; COUNT 3 – REPEATED ACTS OF MUTUAL MASTURBATION OVER A 4 YEAR PERIOD STARTING FROM WHEN HE WAS JUST 8; COUNTS 4 AND 6 – YOU GRADUATED FROM MUTUAL MASTURBATION AND CAUSED HIM TO SUCK YOUR PENIS FROM WHEN HE WAS 10 UNTIL YOU LOST INTEREST IN HIM WHEN HE REACHED PUBERTY – BUT NOT BEFORE YOU HAD BUGGERED HIM IN TOTAL ABOUT 6 TIMES WHEN HE WAS AGED BETWEEN 11 AND 13 [COUNTS 5 AND 7].

COUNTS 8-11 DEAL WITH YOUR ABUSE OF EV; HE WAS 11 OR 12 WHEN YOU FIRST BUGGERED HIM; THESE COUNTS REFLECT THE MOST SERIOUS ABUSE PERPETRATED ON ANY OF YOUR VICTIMS; REPEATED ACTS OF BUGGERY OVER A 2-3 YEAR PERIOD, WHICH HE THOUGHT TOOK PLACE ON MORE THAN 100 OCCASIONS; WHETHER OR NOT THAT WAS A FIGURE OF SPEECH, SIMILAR TO ONE YOU USED DURING THE COURSE OF YOUR INTERVIEWS, IT WAS RELENTLESS ABUSE THROUGHOUT WHICH YOU WERE TOTALLY UNCONCERNED FOR HIS WELLBEING. ON THE MORNING FOLLOWING THE LAST OCCASION ON WHICH YOU BUGGERED HIM, HE WAS BRAVE ENOUGH TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU WOULD DO, IF HE TOLD ON YOU. YOU TOLD HIM THAT NO ONE WOULD BELIEVE HIM; THAT YOU HAD BEHAVED SIMILARLY TO PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALLERS, AND THAT HE WAS NOTHING. YOU WERE HEAVING HUMILIATION ON HUMILIATION. IN 2009, SOME TIME AFTER YOU HAD BEEN RELEASED FROM YOUR 1998 SENTENCE, YOU HAD THE GALL TO SEND HIM A FACEBOOK MESSAGE FROM THE ACCOUNT OF RICHARD BARRY, YOUR LATER ADOPTED AND BIRTH CHRISTIAN NAMES, IN WHICH YOU WROTE 'GOOD TO SEE YOU HAVE A FAMILY AND ENJOYING LIFE' AND ASKED HIM TO DROP YOU A LINE SAYING HOW LIFE WAS GOING. YOU CARED NOT ONE JOT ABOUT THE PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM YOU HAD DONE TO HIM OR INDEED TO ANY OF YOUR VICTIMS – FOR THAT IS, ONCE THE JURY'S VERDICTS WERE RETURNED, WHAT THEY ARE. YOU TOLD HIM YOU HAD CANCER AND WITH A TOUCH OF IRONY ADDED 'PAYBACK, I HEAR YOU SAY'. THAT IS FOR OTHERS TO JUDGE.

COUNTS 12-15 DEAL WITH YOUR ABUSE OF HR, THE ONLY ONE OF YOUR VICTIMS, WHO DESPITE HIS SURNAME, YOU CLAIMED NOT TO RECALL. HE WAS SUBJECTED TO MUTUAL MASTURBATION AND REQUIRED TO SUCK YOUR PENIS BETWEEN THE AGES OF 11 AND 12, AND ON ONE OCCASION, WHEN YOU AND HE WERE AT BUTLINS, YOU PULLED HIS PANTS DOWN AND THRUST YOUR ERECT PENIS AGAINST HIS BOTTOM. YOU TOLD HIM THAT AS YOU WERE GOOD TO HIM, HE HAD TO BE GOOD TO YOU.

COUNTS 16-21 INVOLVE GARY CLIFFE; IN ADDITION TO THE COUNTS OF WHICH YOU WERE CONVICTED, YOU PLEADED GUILTY BEFORE TRIAL TO A COUNT OF INDECENT ASSAULT [COUNT 16A] BASED UPON REPEATED ACTS OF MUTUAL MASTURBATION, WHEN HE WAS 11 OR 12. AS WITH OTHERS, YOUR ABUSE GRADUATED TO ORAL SEX, BOTH WAYS, OVER A 3-4 YEAR PERIOD AND INCLUDED UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS TO BUGGER HIM ON 2-3 OCCASIONS WHEN HE WAS 12 OR 13. SUCH WAS YOUR CONFIDENCE THAT HE WOULD NOT TALK ABOUT HIS ABUSE OR THAT IF HE DID, HE WOULD NOT BE BELIEVED, THAT, AT A TIME WHEN YOU KNEW THAT YOU HAD ABUSED A BOY IN AMERICA, YOU TRIED TO PERSUADE HIS MOTHER, WHOM YOU HAD EMPLOYED IN YOUR VIDEO-SHOP TO GIVE YOU A CHARACTER REFERENCE. SHE WAS ONLY DISSUADED FROM DOING SO WHEN HER SON TOLD HER SHE COULDN'T BECAUSE THE ALLEGATIONS WERE TRUE. YOU WERE ALSO BRAZEN ENOUGH TO COMMIT ONE OFFENCE AGAINST HIM WHILST YOU WERE STAYING IN HB'S BEDROOM AS A GUEST OF HIS PARENTS.

COUNTS 23-26 RELATE TO YOUR ABUSE OF BI; TOUCHING OF HIS GENITALS, MUTUAL MASTURBATION WHEN HE WAS 12, AND SINGLE ATTEMPTS TO GET HIM SUCK YOUR PENIS AND TO DIGITALLY PENETRATE HIS ANUS.

COUNTS 27-29 RELATE TO YOUR ABUSE OF TV; HE WAS PARTICULARLY VULNERABLE IN YOUR HOME, BECAUSE HE, TOGETHER WITH ANOTHER OF YOUR VICTIMS, NE, WAS FROM PLYMOUTH; HE WAS MILES AND HOURS AWAY FROM HOME AND HIS FAMILY AND YOU ALLOWED HIS PARENTS TO BE CONFIDENT THAT HE WOULD BE SAFE IN YOUR CARE. WHEN YOU INITIALLY TRIED IT ON WITH HIM AND HE REFUSED, YOU USED A PLOY WHICH YOU EMPLOYED WITH OTHERS – YOU TOLD HIM HE WOULDN'T BE A SUCCESS, YOU PLAYED HIM OUT OF POSITION SO HE COULDN'T GIVE OF HIS BEST AND YOU THEN DROPPED HIM. THE FIRST FOUR OR FIVE TIMES HE STAYED WITH YOU, NOTHING MORE OCCURRED THAN YOUR UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS TO TRY IT ON, BUT THEN YOU BUGGERED HIM FOR THE FIRST TIME, AND REPEATED THE ACT ON ANYTHING BETWEEN 12 AND 20 TIMES OVER AN 18 MONTH PERIOD WHEN HE WAS AGED BETWEEN 12 AND 13 ½. SUCH WAS THE MESS YOU'D MADE OF HIS MIND THAT HE'D FEEL HE'D LET THE OTHER BOYS DOWN WHEN YOU MOVED ON FROM HIM TO ANOTHER; AND THAT, EVEN THEN, HE WASN'T YOUR FIRST CHOICE; THAT HONOUR FELL TO ANDREW WOODWARD, WHO YOU ADMITTED BUGGERING WHEN YOU APPEARED AT CHESTER CROWN COURT IN 1998, ALTHOUGH WHEN INTERVIEWED FOR THESE OFFENCES, YOU SOUGHT TO RESILE FROM THAT ADMISSION.

COUNTS 30-36 RELATE TO YOUR ABUSE OF FU; HE WAS PARTICULARLY VULNERABLE BECAUSE HE LACKED SUPPORT AT HOME; YOU SPOILT HIM BY KITTING HIM OUT IN SMART SPORTSGEAR; THE ABUSE STARTED WHEN HE WAS 10 AND FINISHED WHEN HE WAS 12 1/2. IT BEGAN WITH MUTUAL MASTURBATION, AND PROCEEDED TO YOU GIVING HIM ORAL SEX, VERY OFTEN IN THE COURSE OF THE SAME SESSION OF ABUSE. AFTER YOU HAD BEEN ABUSING HIM IN THAT WAY FOR ABOUT 12 MONTHS, YOU GRADUATED TO ATTEMPTED BUGGERY ON ABOUT 6 OCCASIONS.

COUNTS 37-40 RELATE TO YOUR ABUSE OF NF; HE WAS THE OTHER BOY FROM PLYMOUTH, SHY AND YOUNG FOR HIS AGE WHEN HE CAME UNDER YOUR WING. YOU USED THE HORROR FILMS TO GET HIM CLOSE TO YOU AS A PRETEXT FOR HUGGING HIM; THE FIRST OCCASION WAS OVER CHRISTMAS AND HE WAS FAR FROM HOME AND HOMESICK – HE HAD ALSO JUST BEEN BITTEN BY ONE OF YOUR DOGS WHICH DID NOT CONCERN YOU AND YOU WERE RELUCTANT TO TAKE HIM FOR TREATMENT. SEXUAL TOUCHING FOLLOWED, IN THIS CASE, OF HIS PENIS UNDER HIS CLOTHING. YOU THEN GRADUATED TO MASTURBATING HIM, UNDETERRED BY THE PRESENCE OF WHOEVER WAS IN THE BUNK ABOVE WHERE HE WAS SLEEPING AT THE TIME; HIS FINAL INDIGNITY, OVER THE FOLLOWING EASTER HOLIDAYS, WAS TO HAVE YOU PENETRATE HIS ANUS WITH YOUR FINGER.

COUNTS 41-43 RELATE TO YOUR ABUSE OF NL WHEN HE WAS BETWEEN 12 AND 14; HE ENJOYED EXALTED STATUS AS A FAVOURITE FOR A WHILE, WHICH OF COURSE MEANT THAT HE WAS ONE OF THOSE SUBJECTED TO THE WORST ABUSE. ON ONE OCCASION YOU FORCED HIM TO SUCK YOUR PENIS AND EJACULATED IN HIS MOUTH; THEREAFTER, YOU PROGRESSED, AS YOU HAD WITH OTHERS, TO ACTS OF BUGGERY; NL WAS BUGGERED BY YOU, 7 TO 10 TIMES, FROM THE AGE OF 12 ½, AND YOU PERSISTED DESPITE HIS PLEAS TO YOU TO STOP AND THE EXCRUCIATING PAIN TO WHICH YOU WERE SUBJECTING HIM; IT MADE YOU ANGRY THAT YOU COULDN'T PENETRATE HIM FULLY, BUT IT DIDN'T STOP YOU TRYING AND GRADUALLY ACHIEVING GREATER PENETRATION.

COUNTS 45-47 RELATE TO YOUR ABUSE OF LB WHO WAS AGED 12 AND 13 WHEN YOU COMPELLED HIM TO GIVE YOU ORAL SEX TO THE POINT OF EJACULATION, FIRST AT A HOTEL IN CRICCIETH AND THEN MOST WEEKENDS WHEN HE WAS STAYING AT YOUR HOME; IN ADDITION, YOU HAVE PLEADED GUILTY TO TWO COUNTS OF INDECENT ASSAULT [COUNT 47A AND B] REPRESENTING MUTUAL MASTURBATION OVER A THREE YEAR PERIOD WHEN HE WAS AGED BETWEEN 11 AND 14. FOR THE SAKE OF COMPLETENESS, I SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT I PUT OUT OF MY MIND THE CLEAR AND DETAILED EVIDENCE OF YOUR ALLEGED ABUSE OF HIM IN THE USA, WHICH DISCLOSES A NUMBER OF SERIOUS OFFENCES WHICH CANNOT BE TRIED OUTSIDE THE USA.

FINALLY, COUNTS 49-52, TO WHICH YOU PLEADED GUILTY, RELATE TO YOUR ABUSE BY MASTURBATION OF KO AT YOUR HOMES IN DERBYSHIRE AND CREWE, AND AT BUTLINS, PWLLHELI.

I TURN NOW TO THE IMPACT WHICH YOUR CONDUCT HAS HAD ON YOUR VICTIMS - TO THE TRAIL OF PSYCHOLOGICAL DEVASTATION WHICH YOU LEFT IN YOUR WAKE. NO ONE LISTENING TO THE STATEMENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN READ TO THE COURT TODAY EITHER BY YOUR VICTIMS, WITH GREAT COURAGE AND DIGNITY, OR ON THEIR BEHALF, OR WHICH WERE TAKEN BY THEIR AUTHORS AS READ, COULD FAIL TO BE MOVED BY THEIR CONTENTS. IT IS QUITE IMPOSSIBLE FOR ME TO SAY WHETHER ALL OR ANY OF YOUR VICTIMS WOULD HAVE MADE IT TO THE TOP, OR EVEN ENJOYED ANY SUCCESS AT ALL AS PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALLERS, BUT THE EFFECT OF YOUR ABUSE UPON THEM WAS TO DESTROY THEIR ENTHUSIASM FOR TRAINING AND PLAYING, TO BREED INSECURITY AND A LACK OF CONFIDENCE WITHIN THEM - WHICH IN TURN ENSURED THAT THEIR PROSPECTS OF A SUCCESSFUL CAREER IN FOOTBALL WERE ZERO. AND OF COURSE, IT DIDN'T STOP THERE OR THEN; THEY HAVE CARRIED THROUGHOUT THEIR ADULT LIVES THE SAME HEAVY BURDEN WHICH THEY WILL ALWAYS BELIEVE HAS BLIGHTED THEIR LIVES AND THEIR ABILITY TO FORM RELATIONSHIPS. DELINQUENCY, SUICIDAL THOUGHTS, ALCOHOLISM, ISSUES WITH ANGER MANAGEMENT, DEPRESSION – EACH HAS SUFFERED AND NOW, MORE THAN 30-35 YEARS AFTER YOU RUINED THESE BOYS' - NOW MEN'S – LIVES, CONTINUES TO SUFFER FROM ONE OR MORE OF THESE CONSEQUENCES OF YOUR ABUSE. AND, HOWEVER MUCH THEIR FAMILY AND FRIENDS MAY TELL THEM THEY SHOULD NOT DO SO, THEY BEAR HUGE FEELINGS OF GUILT – FOR BEING VICTIMS, FOR FAILING TO STAND UP TO PROTECT OTHERS, AND FOR PROTECTING FROM THEIR SHAME AND EMBARRASSMENT THEIR FAMILIES WHO HAD OFTEN MADE GREAT SACRIFICES TO SUPPORT THEIR SONS. THE IMPACT UPON YOUR VICTIMS, INDIVIDUALLY AND COLLECTIVELY, MUST BE REFLECTED IN THE SENTENCE WHICH YOU WILL SERVE FOR THESE OFFENCES.

I TURN NOW TO THE SENTENCING GUIDELINES. HAVING REGARD TO THE SHEER VOLUME OF OFFENDING IN THIS CASE, THEY CAN, AS FAR AS THE GUIDELINES FOR INDIVIDUAL OFFENCES ARE CONCERNED, BE OF ONLY LIMITED ASSISTANCE IN THE EXERCISE I HAVE TO PERFORM. THEY REMAIN OF RELEVANCE, OF COURSE, AS FAR AS THE PRINCIPLES OF TOTALITY AND, WHERE APPROPRIATE, CREDIT FOR GUILTY PLEAS IS CONCERNED. I ACCEPT THAT THE AGE OF THE OFFENCES IS SUCH THAT I AM NOT IN ANY EVENT UNDER A STATUTORY DUTY TO FOLLOW THEM, ALTHOUGH I SHOULD AND DO HAVE REGARD TO THEM.

THE GUIDELINES FOR RAPE, UNDER THE SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT 2003, APPLY TO OFFENCES OF BUGGERY, AN OFFENCE UNDER THE SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT 1956. SIMILAR GUIDELINES, WITH AN ALLOWANCE FOR THE ABSENCE OF A COMPLETED OFFENCE, APPLY TO ATTEMPTS TO COMMIT SUCH OFFENCES, UNDER THE CRIMINAL ATTEMPTS ACT 1981.

IT IS CONCEDED BY THE DEFENCE THAT FOR EACH OFFENCE FOR WHICH YOU ARE TO BE SENTENCED, THERE ARE PRESENT ELEMENTS OF CATEGORY 2 HARM AND 'LEVEL A' CULPABILITY; THAT IS THE BASIS UPON WHICH I AM INVITED BY MISS LAWS TO SENTENCE YOU. HOWEVER, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE COMBINATION OF THE NUMBER OF OFFENCES BY REFERENCE TO THE NUMBER OF VICTIMS AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE CONDUCT WAS IN MANY CASES REPEATED OVER A NUMBER OF YEARS, HAS CAUSED TO YOUR VICTIMS A LEVEL OF HARM BOTH IN THE PAST AND ONGOING, MORE THAN 30 YEARS AFTER THE EVENT, WHICH ENTITLES ME TO TREAT THE OVERALL IMPACT AS EXTREME, AND ALL OFFENCES, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE RELATIVELY ISOLATED OFFENCES INVOLVING DIGITAL PENETRATION AS FALLING WITHIN CATEGORY 1 [HARM] LEVEL A [CULPABILITY]. IF I AM WRONG IN MY ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF THE HARM CAUSED TO THE VICTIMS, THEN THE AGGRAVATING FACTORS WHICH I HAVE SET OUT BELOW, AND WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN MY CATEGORISATION OF THE OFFENCES, ARE SUCH AS TO ENTITLE ME TO MOVE OUTSIDE THE CATEGORY 2A RANGE.

ACCORDINGLY, IF I APPLY THE CATEGORY 1A GUIDELINES, THE STARTING POINT FOR A SINGLE OFFENCE OF RAPE, WHERE THE VICTIM WAS UNDER 13, IS 16 YEARS, WITH A RANGE OF 13-19 YEARS.

THE STARTING POINT FOR A SINGLE OFFENCE OF RAPE, WHERE THE VICTIM WAS 13 YEARS OR OVER, IS 15 YEARS, WITH A RANGE OF 13-19 YEARS.

I NOTE THAT THE RAPE GUIDELINES STATE IN TERMS THAT 'OFFENCES MAY BE OF SUCH SEVERITY, INVOLVING FOR EXAMPLE A CAMPAIGN OF RAPE, THAT SENTENCES OF 20 YEARS AND ABOVE MAY BE APPROPRIATE'. AS THE SAME WORDS ARE USED IN RELATION TO RAPE INVOLVING UNDER 13 AS WELL AS OVER 13 VICTIMS, IT MUST FOLLOW, IN MY JUDGMENT, THAT, AS THE STARTING POINT AND THE RANGES IN SUCH CASES ARE HIGHER THAN IN THE CASE OF AN OLDER VICTIM, A SENTENCE SIGNIFICANTLY IN EXCESS OF 20 YEARS MAY BE APPROPRIATE FOR A CAMPAIGN OF RAPE INVOLVING VICTIMS UNDER 13.

THE GUIDELINES FOR RAPE APPLY TO THOSE OFFENCES OF INDECENT ASSAULT INVOLVING ORAL RAPE BY THE DEFENDANT, ALBEIT THAT THE MAXIMUM SENTENCE FOR AN OFFENCE OF INDECENT ASSAULT IS 10 YEARS, FOR WHICH AN APPROPRIATE ADJUSTMENT MUST BE MADE.

THE CATEGORY 2A GUIDELINES FOR ASSAULT BY PENETRATION, WHERE THE MAXIMUM SENTENCE [AS WITH RAPE] IS LIFE IMPRISONMENT, APPLY TO THOSE OFFENCES OF INDECENT ASSAULT INVOLVING DIGITAL OR ATTEMPTED DIGITAL PENETRATION, SUBJECT TO THE SAME APPROACH .

ACCORDINGLY, THE STARTING POINT FOR A SINGLE OFFENCE OF ASSAULT BY PENETRATION, WHERE THE VICTIM WAS UNDER 13 YEARS IS 11 YEARS, WITH A RANGE OF 7-15 YEARS.

THE STARTING POINT FOR A SINGLE OFFENCE OF ASSAULT BY PENETRATION, WHERE THE VICTIM WAS OVER 13 YEARS IS 8 YEARS, WITH A RANGE OF 5-13 YEARS.

THE CATEGORY 1A GUIDELINES FOR SEXUAL ASSAULT, WHERE THE MAXIMUM SENTENCE IS 14 YEARS [WHERE THE VICTIM IS UNDER 13 YEARS] AND 10 YEARS [WHERE THE VICTIM IS 13 YEARS OR OVER] APPLY TO THE REMAINING OFFENCES OF INDECENT ASSAULT, SUBJECT TO THE ADJUSTMENT TO REFLECT THE DIFFERENCE IN MAXIMUM SENTENCES.

THE STARTING POINT FOR A SINGLE OFFENCE OF SEXUAL ASSAULT, INVOLVING THE TOUCHING OF NAKED GENITALIA, WHERE THE VICTIM WAS UNDER 13 YEARS IS 6 YEARS, WITH A RANGE OF 4-9 YEARS

THE STARTING POINT FOR A SINGLE SUCH OFFENCE WHERE THE VICTIM WAS OVER 13 YEARS IS 4 YEARS, WITH A RANGE OF 3-7 YEARS.

I TURN NOW TO AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING FEATURES. AS FAR AS AGGRAVATING FEATURES ARE CONCERNED, MOST HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DETERMINING THE CATEGORIES OF HARM AND CULPABILITY, AND I MUST GUARD AGAINST DOUBLE COUNTING – THAT IS BY TREATING AS AGGRAVATING FACTORS THOSE FACTORS WHICH ASSIST IN DETERMINING THE CATEGORY INTO WHICH THE OFFENCE FALLS WITHIN THE SENTENCING GUIDELINES; HOWEVER, THE FACT THAT YOU DELIBERATELY INCREASED THE FEAR AND VULNERABILITY OF YOUR VICTIMS BY MAKING THEM WATCH HORROR FILMS BEFORE ABUSING THEM, THE STEPS WHICH YOU TOOK TO PREVENT THE REPORTING OF SOME OF THE OFFENCES, BY SAYING THAT THE VICTIM IN QUESTION WOULD NOT BE BELIEVED, THE FREQUENCY WITH WHICH EJACULATION OCCURRED DURING THE OFFENCES OF INDECENT ASSAULT INVOLVING ORAL RAPE, THE FACT THAT MANY OFFENCES, INCLUDING SOME OF THE MOST SERIOUS, WERE COMMITTED BY YOU IN THE PRESENCE OF OTHER VICTIMS, AND THE LOCATION OF ONE OF THE OFFENCES, COMMITTED AGAINST HB, NAMELY HIS PARENTS' HOME, WHILST THEY WERE THERE, ARE FURTHER AGGRAVATING FACTORS, IF ANY WERE NEEDED.

YOUR PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS ARE OF COURSE STATUTORY AGGRAVATING FEATURES, BUT I BEAR IN MIND THAT YOU HAVE NOT REOFFENDED SINCE THE TIME OF YOUR FIRST ARREST IN THE UNITED STATES IN 1994.

MITIGATING FACTORS ARE STRICTLY LIMITED. I NOTE THAT YOU PLEADED GUILTY AT VARIOUS STAGES TO SOME OF THE LEAST SERIOUS TYPES OF INDECENT ASSAULT ALLEGED AGAINST YOU. HOWEVER, IN SO FAR AS THOSE PLEAS WERE ENTERED ON A BASIS WHICH DIFFERED FROM THE EVIDENCE WHICH I HEARD DURING THE TRIAL, I REJECT IN EACH CASE THAT BASIS. YOU DID NOT PLEAD GUILTY TO ANY COUNT INVOLVING AN ALLEGATION OF ORAL SEX, DIGITAL OR PENILE PENETRATION OF MOUTH OR ANUS. I NOTE THAT YOU ARE IN POOR HEALTH AND NOW HAVE TO ENDURE A SPECIAL FEEDING REGIME, ALTHOUGH YOU ARE CURRENTLY FREE FROM THE CANCER FROM WHICH YOU HAVE PREVIOUSLY SUFFERED AND WHICH HAS NECESSITATED THE REMOVAL OF MOST OF YOUR TONGUE. THIS WILL NOT MAKE YOUR LIFE IN PRISON ANY EASIER, BUT I DO NOT CONSIDER IT APPROPRIATE FOR ME TO ADJUST OTHER THAN MINIMALLY THE LENGTH OF YOUR SENTENCE TO REFLECT YOUR STATE OF HEALTH; I AM SURE THAT WHEN YOU WERE SENTENCED IN 2015, AT A TIME WHEN YOUR HEALTH WAS WORSE, THE LEARNED JUDGE TOOK IT INTO ACCOUNT. IF YOUR CONDITION RETURNS WHIST YOU ARE SERVING YOUR SENTENCE AND YOUR LIFE IS IN IMMINENT DANGER, THAT WILL BE A MATTER FOR THE HOME SECRETARY TO CONSIDER.

I MUST NOW ADDRESS THE FACT THAT SINCE YOU COMMITTED THESE OFFENCES YOU HAVE SERVED NO FEWER THAN THREE CUSTODIAL SENTENCES, TWO IN THE UK AND ONE IN THE UNITED STATES. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT IS REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT WHEN YOU WERE SENTENCED TO A TERM OF 9 YEARS IMPRISONMENT IN 1998 FOR A CATALOGUE OF OFFENCES, FOR WHICH HAD YOU BEEN APPEARING FOR SENTENCE TODAY, EVEN FOLLOWING A LATE GUILTY PLEA, YOUR SENTENCE WOULD HAVE BEEN VERY MUCH LONGER, THE SENTENCING JUDGE WOULD HAVE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT THE FACT THAT YOU HAD RECENTLY BEEN RELEASED FROM THE SENTENCE YOU HAD SERVED IN THE U.S. SIMILARLY, IT IS REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT THE SENTENCE OF 2 YEARS WHICH YOU RECEIVED FOLLOWING YOUR LATE PLEAS OF GUILTY IN 2015 WAS ONE WHICH HAVING REGARD TO THE GUIDELINES BY THEN IN FORCE WOULD HAVE BEEN LONGER HAD IT NOT BEEN FOR

THE FACT THAT THESE WERE OFFENCES COMMITTED AT THE SAME TIME AS THOSE FOR WHICH A SENTENCE OF 9 YEARS WAS IMPOSED IN 1998.

IN MY JUDGMENT, THE EXTENT TO WHICH THOSE EARLIER SENTENCES FALL TO BE CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING THE PRINCIPLES OF TOTALITY FOR THE OFFENDING FOR WHICH YOU NOW FACE SENTENCE IS LIMITED TO ONE PARTICULAR ASPECT TO WHICH I WILL REFER SHORTLY. THE SITUATION WOULD NO DOUBT HAVE BEEN VERY DIFFERENT IF YOU HAD BEEN CANDID ABOUT THE EXTENT OF YOUR THEN UNDETECTED OFFENDING WHEN YOU WERE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY OF WIPING THE SLATE CLEAN IN 1998, AND MADE CERTAIN LIMITED ADMISSIONS IN RELATION TO SOME VICTIMS WHO HAD NOT BY THEN COME FORWARD, IN RESPECT OF WHICH YOU HAVE, QUITE PROPERLY, NOT BEEN PROSECUTED, OR EVEN IF YOU HAD PLEADED GUILTY TO THE OFFENCES ON THIS INDICTMENT. WHILST THE OVERALL SENTENCE MUST REFLECT THE PRINCIPLES OF TOTALITY, AS FAR AS THE OFFENCES NOW BEFORE THE COURT ARE CONCERNED, NOTHING MUST DETRACT FROM THE OBLIGATION OF THE COURT TO IMPOSE AN OVERALL SENTENCE WHICH BOTH PUNISHES YOU AND DETERS OTHERS, AND ALSO GIVES NO SUCCOUR WHATSOEVER TO THOSE WHO PERPETRATE SEXUAL ABUSE AGAINST THE YOUNG OR THE VULNERABLE, AND WHO THINK THAT WITH THE PASSAGE OF TIME, THEIR CRIMINALITY BECOMES ANY THE LESS SERIOUS. IT DOES NOT, AND INDEED THE LENGTH OF TIME FOR WHICH A SERIOUSLY ABUSED VICTIM FEELS IT NECESSARY TO KEEP HIS ABUSE TO HIMSELF, OR WITHIN THE FAMILY, MAY ITSELF BE EVIDENCE OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH HE HAS BEEN PSYCHOLOGICALLY DAMAGED AS A RESULT. THERE IS CLEAR EVIDENCE OF THAT IN THIS CASE. THE FACT IS THAT THE OFFENCES FOR WHICH YOU NOW FALL TO BE SENTENCED DISCLOSE CRIMINALITY ON SUCH A GRAND SCALE THAT ANY EARLIER SENTENCES PALE INTO INSIGNIFICANCE AND DO NOT, IN MY JUDGMENT, ENABLE IT TO BE ARGUED SUCCESSFULLY THAT THE LENGTH OF YOUR SENTENCE SHOULD BE REDUCED TO TAKE THEM INTO ACCOUNT.

I NOW TURN TO THE SENTENCING EXERCISE IN THIS CASE. THERE ARE 3 OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE COURT; LIFE IMPRISONMENT, AN EXTENDED SENTENCE PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT 2003, S226A AND A DETERMINATE SENTENCE, TO WHICH THE PROVISIONS OF S236A WOULD APPLY AS YOU WOULD BE AN OFFENDER OF PARTICULAR CONCERN. I AM ALL TOO WELL AWARE THAT NO SENTENCE WHICH I PASS CAN BEGIN TO REDRESS THE HARM AND DAMAGE WHICH YOU CAUSED TO YOUR VICTIMS, NOT LEAST BECAUSE THE PRINCIPLES OF TOTALITY ARTICULATED BY THE SENTENCING COUNCIL, AND WHICH REFLECT A LONG-STANDING APPROACH TO SENTENCING WHERE THERE ARE MULTIPLE VICTIMS AND MULTIPLE OFFENCES, AS THERE ARE IN THIS CASE, DO NOT PERMIT OF AN APPROACH TO SENTENCE ON A VICTIM BY VICTIM OR OFFENCE BY OFFENCE BASIS.

I ACCEPT THAT THERE MAY BE CASES IN WHICH EVEN WHERE A DEFENDANT NO LONGER REPRESENTS A DANGER TO SOCIETY IN GENERAL, OR A SECTION THEREOF, THE NATURE, FREQUENCY AND SEVERITY OF HIS OFFENDING, AND ITS IMPACT UPON ITS VICTIMS IS SUCH THAT, IN ORDER TO MARK THE PUBLIC DENUNCIATION AND ABHORRENCE OF HIS CONDUCT, A DISCRETIONARY LIFE SENTENCE MAY BE APPROPRIATE; BUT SUCH A SENTENCE MUST TRULY BE A SENTENCE OF LAST RESORT. IN THIS RESPECT, I CONSIDER THAT THE EARLIER SENTENCES IMPOSED UPON YOU FOR SIMILAR ALBEIT LESS EXTENSIVE OFFENDING ARE RELEVANT. HAD YOU BEEN FACING SENTENCE TODAY FOR ALL THE OFFENCES COMMITTED BY YOU DURING THE PERIOD BETWEEN 1979 AND 1994, THEN I MAY WELL HAVE BEEN PERSUADED THAT A LIFE SENTENCE WAS THE CORRECT SENTENCE TO IMPOSE WITH AN APPROPRIATE MINIMUM TERM, EQUIVALENT TO ONE-HALF OF THE NOTIONAL DETERMINATE TERM, FOR YOU TO SERVE BEFORE YOU COULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE. AS IT IS, I AM NOT PERSUADED THAT I SHOULD IMPOSE UPON YOU THAT

SENTENCE OF LAST RESORT. BUT AS YOU WILL SOON APPRECIATE, IN TERMS OF THE LENGTH OF SENTENCE WHICH YOU WILL SERVE, IT IS LIKELY TO BE A DISTINCTION WITHOUT A DIFFERENCE.

I TURN TO THE OPTION OF AN EXTENDED SENTENCE. BEFORE I CAN IMPOSE SUCH A SENTENCE, I MUST BE SATISFIED THAT YOU POSE NOW, AT THE AGE OF 64 AND IN POOR HEALTH, A SIGNIFICANT RISK TO YOUNG BOYS OF SERIOUS HARM CAUSED BY THE COMMISSION OF FURTHER SIMILAR OFFENCES. IN THIS REGARD, I NOTE THAT YOU COMMITTED NO OFFENCES WHILST YOU WERE AT LIBERTY BETWEEN 2005 AND 2015, WHEN YOU RECEIVED YOUR MOST RECENT SENTENCE. IT IS SAID THAT WHILST YOU WERE IN PRISON YOU UNDERTOOK TREATMENT PROGRAMMES FROM WHICH YOU LEARNT A LOT AND DEVELOPED AN INSIGHT INTO YOUR OFFENDING; SADLY, YOU DID NOT LEARN THE IMPORTANCE OF REMORSE. THERE IS, HOWEVER, NO EVIDENCE THAT YOU REMAIN A DANGER TO YOUNG BOYS; ALTERNATIVELY, IF THERE IS, I AM QUITE SATISFIED THAT SUCH A RISK CAN BE MANAGED WITHIN THE CONFINES OF THE VERY LONG SENTENCE WHICH I AM ABOUT TO IMPOSE UPON YOU, COUPLED WITH THE EXTENDED LICENCE WHICH I AM BOUND TO ATTACH BY VIRTUE OF YOU BEING AN OFFENDER OF PARTICULAR CONCERN.

THE TOTAL SENTENCE FOR THE 50 OFFENCES FOR WHICH YOU APPEAR IS ONE OF 31 YEARS, COMPRISING A CUSTODIAL TERM OF 30 YEARS AND A LICENCE PERIOD OF 1 YEAR. THAT IS A SENTENCE FROM THE CUSTODIAL TERM OF WHICH YOU WILL BE RELEASED AFTER YOU HAVE SERVED ONE-HALF, LESS TIME ON REMAND, PROVIDED THAT THE PAROLE BOARD IS SATISFIED THAT YOUR CONTINUED IMPRISONMENT IS NOT NECESSARY FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC. TO THAT EXTENT, THE PERIOD OF TIME FOR WHICH YOU WILL REMAIN IN PRISON IS UNLIKELY TO BE AFFECTED BY THE FACT THAT I HAVE CHOSEN TO IMPOSE UPON YOU, AS AN OFFENDER OF PARTICULAR CONCERN, A DETERMINATE RATHER THAN A DISCRETIONARY LIFE SENTENCE.

I WILL NOW EXPLAIN HOW THE TOTAL SENTENCE IS MADE UP. THE SENTENCES OF IMPRISONMENT WILL ALL BE CONCURRENT; CONSECUTIVE SENTENCES, WHILST RICHLY MERITED, AND NOT AN AFFRONT TO SENTENCING PRACTICE, WOULD INEVITABLY HAVE RESULTED IN FAR SHORTER SENTENCES FOR INDIVIDUAL OFFENCES; IN MY JUDGMENT, IT IS APPROPRIATE TO MARK THE MOST SERIOUS OFFENDING WITH THE LONGEST CONCURRENT SENTENCES AND SCALE DOWN OTHER CONCURRENT SENTENCES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SERIOUSNESS OF THOSE OFFENCES.

I WILL FIRST PASS SENTENCE ON THE COUNTS OF BUGGERY AND ATTEMPTED BUGGERY; AS WITH ALL COUNTS, THE SENTENCES REFLECT THE AGES OF YOUR VICTIMS AND THE PERIOD OVER WHICH YOU OFFENDED AGAINST THEM. THE CUSTODIAL TERMS ON EACH COUNT IS AS FOLLOWS:

COUNT 5, 22 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 7, 20 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 8, 30 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 9, 25 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 10, 25 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 11, 17 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 21, 14 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 27, 17 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 28, 25 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 29, 20 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 35, 17 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 42, 20 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 43, 20 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

I WILL NOW PASS SENTENCE ON THE MORE SERIOUS OF THE OFFENCES OF INDECENT ASSAULT, INVOLVING ORAL RAPE, CAUSING YOUR VICTIMS TO GIVE YOU ORAL SEX, DIGITAL OR ATTEMPTED DIGITAL PENETRATION;

COUNT 4, 8 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 6, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 12, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 13, 8 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 16, 8 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 17, 8 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 18, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 19, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 20, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 25, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 26, 5 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 31, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 32, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 34, 8 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 40, 4 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 41, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 45, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 46, 8 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 47, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

I NOW TURN TO THE REMAINING COUNTS OF INDECENT ASSAULT, TO SOME OF WHICH YOU PLEADED GUILTY AT VARIOUS STAGES IN THE PROCEEDINGS

COUNT 1, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 2, 4 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 3, 6 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 14, 4 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 15, 5 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 16A, 3 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 23, 3 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 24, 4 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 30, 4 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 37, 2 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 38, 4 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 39, 4 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 47A, 3 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNT 47B, 2 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNTS 49-50, 3 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

COUNTS 51-52, 2 YEARS IMPRISONMENT

I HAVE ALREADY INDICATED THAT ALL THESE CUSTODIAL TERMS WILL RUN CONCURRENTLY, AS WILL THE ADDITIONAL PERIOD OF LICENCE IMPOSED ON EACH COUNT, AS THE COUNTS ON WHICH YOU HAVE BEEN SENTENCED RENDER YOU A DEFENDANT OF PARTICULAR CONCERN UNDER S236A OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT 2003. THE TOTAL SENTENCE, THEREFORE, IS EXPRESSED AS ONE OF 31 YEARS COMPRISING A CUSTODIAL TERM OF 30 YEARS AND AN ADDITIONAL LICENCE PERIOD OF 1 YEAR.

HAVING REGARD TO THE LENGTH OF SENTENCE, AND MY EARLIER OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE RISK OF FURTHER OFFENDING, I DO NOT CONSIDER IT NECESSARY TO IMPOSE A SEXUAL HARM PREVENTION ORDER, FOR THE FURTHER PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC IN GENERAL OR YOUNG BOYS IN PARTICULAR.

THE SEX OFFENDERS' REGISTRATION PROVISIONS APPLY, FOR LIFE.

-ENDS-