



**In the Crown Court at Isleworth  
T20207376;20207399;20217126**

**The Queen  
V  
Jugoslav JOVANOVIC  
Alessandro MALTESE  
Alessandro DONATI**

**SENTENCE 15<sup>th</sup> November 2021**

**1. Preliminary Matters**

- 1.1 You may remain seated for the present.
- 1.2 Before I commence my sentencing there are some technical matters.
- 1.3 There are no reporting restrictions specific to this case that continue to apply.
- 1.4 I postpone consideration of confiscation under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 and therefore all financial orders. The surcharge provisions apply automatically. I have given directions for those matters to be resolved in due time.
- 1.5 Under s.327 Sentencing Act 2020 I direct that time spent by each of you in custody pending extradition count towards your sentences. If the figures should prove incorrect they can be amended administratively.
- 1.6 The figure for JOVANOVIC is 168 days;
- 1.7 When considering the position of MALTESE and DONATI I have confirmation that in Italian law an in-home curfew is treated for sentence purpose as the equivalent to custody and I am invited in each case to specify the days to include time spent on 24 hour in-home curfew as a form of custody. Had that not been the case I would have made a broad (but not day for day) allowance on terms of imprisonment.
- 1.8 MALTESE was in custody for 44 days and then subject to a 24 hour in-home curfew for a further 49 days and I therefore specify 93 days.
- 1.9 DONATI was in custody for 55 days and then subject to a 24 hour in-home curfew for 59 days and I therefore specify 114 days.
- 1.10 No pre-sentence reports have been obtained in this case. None has been sought and, given the inevitable custodial sentences, I determined that they were not required.

1.11 The sentences I pass must and do take account of the fact that you have been in custody at a time of Covid but given the length of sentences that is a modest factor.

## **2. Introduction**

2.1 I turn now to the sentencing.

2.2 Each of you, on your respective indictments, pleaded guilty to conspiracy to burgle, and in your case, JOVANOVIC, to two further offences of money laundering.

2.3 In November and December 2019 each of you flew into this country to take your parts in targeting the West London homes of well-known and wealthy people

2.4 The fact that each burglary was accomplished despite the precautions of the householders, that so much was stolen and then, it is to be inferred, removed from the country and not recovered, speaks to overall organisation, planning and criminal determination, together with a willingness to take chances.

2.5 You did so in the hope of substantial gain for yourselves, but regardless of the loss to those people, not only of objects of financial value, but of objects of deep personal significance, and of the sense of safety and security that everyone is entitled to feel in their own home.

2.6 You have been accused on these indictments alongside a man using the name Daniel Vukovic, believed to be aged 44. He is said to have been the fourth burglar and to have been the prime mover of events in the UK. He is not yet before the courts, and I make no findings as to the identity or role of the fourth man.

2.7 My task is to sentence you three on the bases that have been determined; namely that each of you played subsidiary roles and received only modest rewards compared to the scale of the losses that you caused.

## **3. The three burglaries**

3.1 The three burglaries covered by the single allegation of conspiracy were each immensely serious. In my summary I choose not to give the precise addresses.

3.2 On 30<sup>th</sup> November 2019 Vukovic and JOVANOVIC arrived at Stansted Airport from Italy, flying via Stockholm, and found accommodation in Orpington which was to serve as the base for the burglars until 16<sup>th</sup> December. In London contact was made with a number of people who were to provide some measure of assistance. For the purpose of this sentence I proceed on the basis that help was provided without knowledge of the conspiracy. Some of those contacts were made with the assistance of Ms Mester who was flown in from Italy on 7<sup>th</sup> December – apparently at a companion to Vukovic.

3.3 The first burglary occurred between 7.15pm and 8pm on the night of 1<sup>st</sup> December 2019 at the home of Frank and Christine Lampard, each well known in their respective professions. They were not at home that evening having gone out with family. A housekeeper, Ms Angel, had been in the house but had gone out to walk the dog. You, JOVANOVIC, rang the door bell and, getting no answer you and Vukovic entered through the rear garden and climbed, initially to the first-floor balcony where

you failed to gain entry and then to the second floor where you did. Inside the house, and despite the alarm sounding and the rapid arrival of the police, you smashed in the principal bedroom door, pulling curtains from their tracks, and leaving dirty footprints as you went. From the principal bedroom and adjoining dressing rooms you stole three valuable watches and other jewellery before making your escape. It was the distraught Ms Angel who informed Mr and Mrs Lampard of the break-in, having returned to find the police outside the property.

3.4 The stolen items had a financial value of some £60,000 but they were also wedding gifts, and gifts from family, the loss of which was deeply felt. The impact on the family is much greater even than their loss. Christine Lampard's words, in her statement of February 2020 reflect the thoughts and feelings expressed time and time again by those whose homes are burgled, whatever their circumstances and whatever is taken. She said:

*Since this break in at my house, I am much more fearful of being alone in my own home, I am less trusting of visitors to the house and feel unsafe in my home. I have a young daughter and feel vulnerable in a home which I had previously always felt safe and happy in.*

3.5 For the second burglary Vukovic and you, JOVANOVIC, sought additional assistance and arrangements were made for you MALTESE and DONATI to fly in from Italy, arriving at London Gatwick on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2019, and joining Vukovic and JOVANOVIC at their accommodation in Orpington.

3.6 That evening there was an expedition to the Chelsea area, no doubt to explore the area of what was to be the second burglary.

3.7 That second burglary occurred on the evening of 10<sup>th</sup> December 2019 at the home of Mr Vichai Srivaddhanaprabha. He was well known as having been the owner of Leicester City Football Club who had died in a helicopter crash in October 2018. The house, however had been kept in its original state by the family who would visit occasionally to pay their respects and use the prayer area.

3.8 There was no-one in the house that evening when you, JOVANOVIC, rang the bell to check that there was no answer and then moved away to act as look-out. You MALTESE and DONATI together with the other man broke in through rear patio door windows and ransacked the home. You found two safes but were only able to get into one of them taking from it a collection of seven valuable watches and some E400,000 in cash. The property stolen was worth some £1m.

3.9 You also took items of no monetary value but great sentimental value including, personal letters, pendants of religious significance, and clothes. The family have said:

*Our late father's residence was a place of reflection and to pray. We felt it was the strongest connection to him as he spent his last night there before his death. Since the burglary, our sacred and special connection has been damaged and violated beyond repair.*

3.10 I come to the third burglary. On 12<sup>th</sup> December, you, together with Vukovic carried out another expedition, this time to explore the access routes to the London home of Tamara Ecclestone, her husband Jay Rutland and their family. The family left to go abroad on 13<sup>th</sup> December and that evening the house was staffed by two security staff, although because of their movements only one was present in the house for most of the time when the house was burgled.

3.11 The burglary commenced at 9.30pm when Vukovic, MALTESE and DONATI entered via the rear garden and forced a rear door. You JOVANOVIC were then positioned in a café giving a view up the road onto which the house fronts, clearly once again acting as the lookout.

3.12 Inside the house many of the interior doors were locked and those doors were smashed. It appears you used large screwdrivers that you had brought to the house. The burglars moved up through the house and your principal target was Ms Ecclestone's dressing room from which you were to take jewellery, cash and other valuables with an estimated value of some £25m. Again, a mere statement of financial value does no justice to the sentimental value such personal possessions.

3.13 A security guard, Ian Eltringham, then on duty in the absence of his colleague, heard a noise upstairs and went to investigate. As he climbed the stairs, he encountered the burglars emerging from the dressing room. There was a confrontation in which he tried to detain at least one of the burglars as a result of which a fire extinguisher was thrown at him to break his hold and they made good their escape.

3.14 Once again the impact on the victims goes far beyond the loss of items of value. Mr Rutland's response again echoes that of victims of burglary in whatever circumstances. He writes:

*I feel a whole combination of emotions, anger that they have stolen from us, fear that they could come back and sadness that sentimental pieces of jewellery which were gifts at our wedding or at the birth of our daughter were stolen that cannot be replaced.*

3.15 He also speaks of the serious impact on his wife and daughter, of their fear that burglars may return and of the way in which their trust in those around them has been undermined. Tamara Ecclestone's own statement is also very powerful.

3.16 The stolen goods were, it appears, taken back to Orpington that night but in the following days moved to another property rented by the burglars and, it is inferred, removed abroad. Before you yourself left, JOVANOVIC, you went to Harrods where you attempted to purchase two Louis Vuitton jackets priced together at some £9,000 using stolen cash. You were unsuccessful only because of the money laundering safeguards at Harrods such that in the absence of proper identification they declined to accept the money.

3.17 Just a few items of comparatively modest value have ever been recovered.

3.18 Each of you was to make your escape abroad, but each were extradited back to London from Italy.

#### **4. Bases of Plea**

4.1 Each of you has pleaded guilty on a basis broadly accepted by the prosecution.

4.2 In the case of JOVANOVIC you accept a greater degree of criminality than MALTESE or DONATI but below that of Vukovic in terms of organisation or planning. Your basis is that you rang the door-bell and then entered the house on the first burglary, that you rang the doorbell and then acted as lookout for the second and were the lookout for the third. You entered the conspiracy for reward and received some E100,000 made up of some E40,000 from the burglary proceeds and the remission of a debt of E60,000. I proceed on the basis that you helped with the removal of the proceeds from Orpington but there is no clear evidence that you took a role in removing the proceeds from the jurisdiction. I bear in mind you had English language skills greater than the others that were of particular use.

4.3 In the cases of MALTESE and DONATI you each accept that you were recruited to help in the second and third burglaries. You maintain that occurred after you travelled to the UK and that you did not have prior knowledge of the intended targets, the owners of the homes or the possible extent of the gain. MALTESE says his reward was E30,000. DONATI does not specify a figure but says thousands of Euros. Whatever your respective skills or knowledge in advance it is clear that you each played a full part in those burglaries and continued from the second to the third burglary.

#### **5. Guidelines**

5.1 There are no sentencing guidelines specific to conspiracy but I must have regard to the guideline applicable to the underlying offences

5.2 The prosecution chose to charge a conspiracy to burgle rather than individual burglaries and therefore it is important for all, including all those outside this court, to have in mind that the maximum sentence for conspiracy to burgle is 14 years.

5.3 The conspirators carried out three high value burglaries of peoples' homes. The homes were targeted because of the celebrity of their occupiers and high level of gain hoped for. As the victim personal statements read out in court and my summary of the facts make all too clear the distress caused by the burglary of a home to householders who may be well known or wealthy, is no less than that caused to those in different circumstances. The acute distress caused to children, or the fear for the safety of children, is a particular feature. There have been life-changing effects on the victims' own sense of safety.

#### **5.4 There are multiple greater harm factors:**

5.5 The proceeds of the burglaries were very substantial. In goods and cash, very little of which has been recovered, the amounts concerned were respectively, £60,000; almost £1m and around £25m.

5.6 There was significant ransacking of each property, and particularly on the third burglary

5.7 The occupiers were not present in the properties at the time of the burglaries, but in the case of the third, two security guards were present, albeit only briefly at the

same time, and one of those guards confronted the burglars in the property and was assaulted so violence was used against a person in the property.

5.8 I have in mind that JOVANOVIC entered the property on the first burglary but acted as look-out in respect of the second two, and that MALTESE and DONATI were not involved in the first burglary.

**5.9 There are also multiple higher culpability factors:**

5.10 The respective premises were clearly deliberately targeted.

5.11 There was a significant degree of planning and organisation.

5.12 They were equipped with tools to effect entry.

5.13 This was the work of a group.

5.14 A single category 1 domestic burglary has a starting point of 3 years and a category range of 2-6 years.

5.15 I have considered the submissions of Mr Fisher that I should find that there are also lesser culpability factors applicable to JOVANOVIC. I have factored in the basis of plea – that is what actual role JOVANOVIC played. I do not accept that there is evidence that JOVANOVIC was subject to coercion, intimidation or exploitation by reason only of his comparative age to Vukovic or the debt that was owed. There are no specifics of intimidation beyond a broad assertion.

5.16 In this case we have a conspiracy to burgle that successfully achieved three high value domestic burglaries, with multiple harm and culpability factors and a level of loss said to be the greatest of any domestic burglary known in the UK. That requires me to move very substantially outside the category range and before considering aggravating or mitigating factors I consider the **starting point** for JOVANOVIC would be 12 years and for MALTESE and DONATI 11 years.

5.17 For each I must now go on to consider the individual aggravating and mitigating features, the extent of reduction to which they are entitled for their guilty pleas and, in the case of JOVANOVIC, the additional charges of money laundering.

**6. JOVANOVIC**

6.1 Yugoslav JOVANOVIC you are aged 24. You have set out a basis for sentence in the written materials to which the prosecution assent.

6.2 You are to be sentenced on Count 1 for conspiracy burgle to which you pleaded guilty on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2021; on Count 2 – Conspiracy to commit money laundering by concealing, converting, transferring or removing from England and Wales – to which you pleaded guilty at the beginning of the trial after I gave a formal indication of sentence and to which I shall be true, and finally on Count 3 – Attempting to convert criminal property relating to the attempted purchase of luxury goods priced at some £9,000 with stolen money – to which you pleaded guilty on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2021.

6.3 I have reviewed the aggravating and mitigating features in relation to the burglary.

6.4 You have a previous conviction dated 2020 in Italy for receiving stolen goods in 2017 resulting in a suspended sentence of 2 years 6 months. Therefore you are not of previous good character.

6.5 You are younger than the others, being 22 at the relevant time, but you were no child. You can have had no doubt as to what you were getting involved in and you accept your role was at a higher level than those alongside you in the dock.

6.6 I am told that you are married with a daughter currently aged 6. Your sentence in England will inevitably separate you from them.

6.7 I am unable to accept that these features amount to mitigation of substance compared to the overall scale of the crime and conclude that had there been a trial the sentence would have been 12 years.

6.8 I am required to give credit for your plea of guilty. I have given careful consideration to you advocate's submissions that a level higher than 25% should be applied on count 1. However you were extradited to this jurisdiction on 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2021 having contested the extradition and, doubtless having had considerable time to reflect on your position. You appeared before the magistrates on 3<sup>rd</sup> April and were sent to the Crown Court for PTPH on 13<sup>th</sup> April. On that day I preserved credit from his first appearance before me on 12<sup>th</sup> April until the pleas to counts 1 and 3 were entered on 14<sup>th</sup> May. Applying the credit guideline I do not find that credit above 25% is justified and therefore the reduction is to 9 years.

6.9 I turn to the second count against you. There seems no doubt that the main proceeds of the burglaries were removed abroad. This count covers that process from after the immediate getaway from the burglaries and includes the removal of the vast bulk of the proceeds from the jurisdiction and it is to be inferred that was always part of the overall plan.

6.10 I have in mind the relevant guideline.

6.11 I am satisfied that your role was of medium culpability – that is you played a significant role where offending was part of a group activity but one where the significant role is commensurate with the financial gain you received.

6.12 The harm category is Category 1 – for £10m or more with a starting point based on £30m, a figure marginally higher than the amount here.

6.13 The assessment of harm on this charge also requires consideration of the level of harm associated with the underlying offence to decide whether an upward adjustment is required. However, since I would here also be sentencing for the underlying offences that would be an element of double counting which I avoid.

6.14 That indicates a starting point of 7 years with a category range of 6-10 years before considering aggravating or mitigating factors and in the light of the role indicated I take a starting point of 6 years and, balancing aggravation and mitigation find that after a trial that would have been appropriate.

- 6.15 Given the stage of your plea the appropriate level of credit is 10%
- 6.16 The matter of principal concern is how to address the question of totality.
- 6.17 Given the magnitude of the sums concerned I do not consider that the overall criminality would be sufficiently reflected in a sentence concurrent with that for the conspiracy to burgle.
- 6.18 However merely to aggregate the sentences would not result in a sentence that was just and proportionate.
- 6.19 The lead offence is clearly the conspiracy to burgle. To achieve a sentence that was just and proportionate I must reduce the sentence on the money laundering to a level that I consider reflects the additional criminality of not only participating in the conspiracy to burgle but then, in addition, the removal of the proceeds.
- 6.20 That can be done by reducing the category range to Category 2 where the range commences at 3 years 6 months but that would not, in my judgement be sufficient and I limit the additional sentence to 2 years and make the sentence on Count 3 concurrent.
- 6.21 Therefore the sentence on Count 2 consecutive to the charge of conspiracy to burgle will be 2 years and the sentence on Count 3, concurrent, will be 1 year.
- 6.22 By making those adjustments I am satisfied that whatever individual arguments may be made on elements, the overall sentence is just and proportionate both to your criminality and your mitigation.
- 6.23 Yugoslav JOVANOVIĆ stand up. The total sentence upon you is 11 years.

## **7. Alessandro MALTESE**

- 7.1 You are aged 45.
- 7.2 The starting point is 11 years which, as for DONATI, reflects the role attributed to you and the way that you were drawn into serious offending.
- 7.3 You are of previous good character which is a mitigating feature. It is said that you were an unemployed painter and decorator lured into participation by the offer of €30,000.
- 7.4 I have taken into account the statement made by your partner. You have a young daughter with her born since these crimes and are important to the lives of her older children and have other family responsibilities.
- 7.5 But these features can count for little compared to the scale of your offending here and the persistence of your involvement. Considering aggravating and mitigating features I conclude that the sentence you would have received had there been a trial is 11 years.
- 7.6 You entered a plea of not guilty at the PTPH on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2021 and changed that to guilty on 23<sup>rd</sup> April having given an earlier indication to the prosecution. I take



into account the time for reflection that the extradition process must have given you and I conclude that credit of 20% is appropriate, a reduction of 2 years 3 months.

7.7 Alessandro MALTESE stand up. The sentence upon you is 8 years 9 months.

**8. Alessandro DONATI**

8.1 You are aged 44.

8.2 You have convictions for dishonesty in Italy dating far back to 1996 and 2008.

8.3 I have read the letter from your partner of many years. She is the mother of your young son and you have another son from another relationship. They will all suffer because of your imprisonment and your partner's letter describes the impact on your sons. The reference from a long term friend also speaks well of you.

8.4 I weigh those into the balance but again conclude that your relative good character and other mitigation can count for little compared to the scale of your offending and the persistence of your involvement. I am satisfied that the proper sentence had you pleaded not guilty would have been 11 years and there is no reason to distinguish your case from MALTESE.

8.5 You entered a plea of not guilty at the PTPH on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2021 and changed that to guilty on 13<sup>rd</sup> April, again having given an earlier indication to the prosecution. I also take into account the time for reflection that the extradition process must have given you and conclude that credit of 20% is appropriate, a reduction of 2 years 3 months.

8.6 Alessandro DONATI stand up. The sentence upon you is 8 years 9 months.

HHJ Edmunds QC

15<sup>th</sup> November 2021