

IN THE CROWN COURT SITTING AT INNER LONDON

B E T W E E N:

THE KING

-and-

PAMELA BELLINGER

AMY PRITCHARD

STEPHANIE AYLETT

ADELHEID RUSSENBERGER

ROSEMARY WEBSTER

SENTENCING REMARKS

1. Pamela Bellinger, Amy Pritchard, Stephanie Aylett, Adelheid Russenberger and Rosemary Webster, you may all remain seated for the moment.
2. Each of you believe passionately in the need to, as you would put it, raise the alarm about the existence of a climate emergency. Each of you has broken the law on multiple occasions seeking to spread your views to other people. None of you has any remorse for your actions in this case and indeed some if not all of you are proud of committing the offence you did. Those attitudes do not aggravate the case at all but help put it into its proper context and impact on the mitigation available to you.
3. In the current case you were part of a larger group of people who had decided to plan and execute what can properly be described as an attack on the premises of JPMorgan Chase Bank (“the bank”) just off the Embankment. This was done under the name of Extinction Rebellion. Each of you, I have no doubt, were of the view the bank bear significant responsibility for their part in funding projects involving the extraction or utilisation of fossil fuels.

4. Some of you had large amounts of documentation with you when you committed the offence which supported your views about the bank. A number of you gave evidence in a disparaging way about your views as to the bank's business affairs. You, Ms Aylett, as an example, said that the bank were fiddling the numbers, lying about their figures and that their dishonesty, as you put it, was causing deaths. Part of a document you had with you entitled "The Bad Guys" described JPMorgan Chase as the worst bank in the world.
5. Despite this view of the bank, which each of you held in similar ways, each of you claimed in your evidence that you thought people deeply involved with that very same bank would consent to you damaging the building. Those claims were utterly illogical and deluded, if indeed they were honestly made.
6. What in fact motivated each of you to undertake this action was a desire to cause negative impact to the bank whilst creating publicity for your cause. I accept that you may have additionally hoped it might have some impact on some people working for the bank.
7. The operation you undertook was well planned. Each of you were recruited to the scheme over the days and weeks before hand. There were meetings over Zoom in respect of the planning. Each of you secured tools to break windows and decorated those tools to advertise your cause. I do accept from you, Ms Webster, that you may have not just been of the view that the tool you had would not break the type of glass used on the bank's premises but also been accurate in that view. That does not impact the way in which I am going to deal with you. You were fully supportive of those whose tools could and did break the glass.
8. You organised as a group of 8 preparing literature which in my view you had with you in order to seek to try and utilise it at the inevitable criminal proceedings which were to follow. None of you pleaded guilty despite your obvious guilt. That in itself does not aggravate the case as everyone, however guilty, is entitled to have a trial. It does however have impact when considering your general approach to your offending behaviour.
9. This is not a case where each of you have acted out of conscientious reasons and then accepted responsibility for your actions saying "yes I broke the law but I did it as I felt I had to". Rather each of you broke the law and then seeking to continue your cause pleaded not guilty and took up weeks of court time and sought to utilise what opportunities you could to use the court proceedings for your own ends. This continued during mitigation in a stark way in at least some of your cases, as anyone listening to your statements will readily understand.
10. On the day of the incident you arrived as a well marshalled squad of 8 people. The 5 of you were the ones personally involved in striking at the window. Due to choice of

tools, and in your case Ms Bellinger the mistake in not removing the safety guard from your chisel, some of you were more effective than others.

11. Each of you expressed shock at the value of the damage you caused. Ms Russenberger you confirmed in your evidence that the plan was to break a total of 3 windows. Each of you thought the damage might be in the region of £10,000.
12. In fact it was vastly in excess of that. That is, not least, because the final panel which was cracked was a structural piece of glass measuring around 8m by 2m. Thankfully, despite it being structural, the damage was just financial. Although it had to be replaced it did not entirely shatter, with what could have been catastrophic effect.
13. In total the net costs of repairing the damage you all did ran to well over ¼ million pounds excluding VAT.
14. Before the incident there had been a number of meetings via Zoom and in person to discuss the plans. Each of you knew beforehand that arrest was likely and prison possible having been briefed on each consequence. That puts your stated surprise at the concept of joint enterprise into its proper context in your case, Ms Webster.
15. Each of you filmed video pieces prior to the action to be put out as publicity after you had conducted the action. People came and filmed the action. Social media was used during and after the action to seek to publicise your crime. These are further indications of the sophisticated and detailed planning that went on for this operation.
16. Prior to the incident the bank had set up railings so as to prevent access to most of the windows at the front of the bank. There were security guards as well. It was obvious to each of you that people were not permitted behind the railings despite evidence which some of you gave about that. The security guards tried to stop you but you acted quickly in numbers to ensure your plan would be carried out.
17. You all waited for the police to arrive and were arrested.
18. Criminal damage is a serious offence. The sentencing council have set down guidelines for such offences. Your case is a category A1 case.
19. You each have high culpability primarily because of the detailed planning and extensive premeditation of this crime.
20. I raised with Ms Osasami, for you Ms Bellinger, whether this case can be described as a revenge attack. Looking at your motivation for choosing the bank as your target, together with each of your views that the bank is the biggest contributor to fossil fuel project funding in the world with the impact each of you believe that has, it is clear each of you thought the bank was acting badly and had decided to damage the windows because of that. Most people would think of that as revenge. Ms Osasami, however, submitted that your collective actions were not to get back at the bank or to

punish it but rather to raise awareness both within the bank and in the wider world about the bank's activities. I accept that what Ms Osasami says may be the correct way on the evidence to look at things but it is still the case that the bank was specifically targeted because of each of your negative views about its activities.

21. I do accept it is at least possible that none of you were aware that damaging a pane of glass which is 8m by 2m would be as expensive as it was. That possibility, that each of you were reckless as to the value of the damage caused, is a factor I take into account but is not sufficient to take this case away from being a high culpability case.
22. You Ms Russenberger submitted that the matter should not be dealt with as a high culpability case because the planning was to break the glass safely. As you accepted, you had not investigated whether the glass which ultimately was broken was structural or not. In any event, such considerations as to undertaking your actions with an eye to safety and reducing the risk to others, is in fact another indication of the very high degree of planning and premeditation. There was evidence at the trial of you engaging in run throughs of your action prior to undertaking it as part of the preparation.
23. Each of you state your criminal actions were in fact an act of protest. Protest against the bank and protest to seek to raise what each of you perceive to be a current climate emergency. This is a matter which impacts on your culpability generally albeit in the sentencing council guideline it is not a factor to be taken into account of the assessment of culpability. Whether as a factor reducing culpability or a mitigating feature I have taken due account of this feature of the case so as to reduce significantly the sentence I would otherwise have passed.
24. There is a long history of people committing offences to effect protest both in this country and elsewhere in the world.
25. Many years ago now, Lord Hoffman explained in the case of R v Jones [2006] UKHL 16 that history and the impact of the interface between protest and criminal offending.
26. He said "People who break the law to affirm their belief in the injustice of a law or government action are sometimes vindicated by history. The suffragettes are an example which comes immediately to mind. It is the mark of a civilised community that it can accommodate protests and demonstrations of this kind. But there are conventions which are generally accepted by the law-breakers on one side and the law-enforcers on the other. The protesters behave with a sense of proportion and do not cause excessive damage or inconvenience. And they vouch the sincerity of their beliefs by accepting the penalties imposed by the law. The police and prosecutors, on the other hand, behave with restraint and the magistrates impose sentences which take the conscientious motives of the protesters into account."

27. Effectively he was speaking of a social compact between the courts and protestors where criminal offences are committed for reasons as might be described of conscience.
28. In this case there was excessive damage. There was no need to target the largest pane of glass. At the time that was broken two other panels had already been cracked. There was no real thought given as to what level of damage would be caused as I am quite sure none of you would in fact have cared. I do accept, however, that the largest pane was not deliberately targeted for its size.
29. You were all quite obviously guilty. Your planning involved the consideration of being arrested and imprisoned; that would hardly be necessary if you were not knowingly planning to break the law in a serious way. Despite this you all contested the allegation, as, of course, anyone is entitled to. The consequence therefore is not an aggravation of the sentence but it does provide the clearest indication none of you were prepared to accept the full consequences of your action and each utilised the court process, albeit to differing degrees, to further your protest by way of your evidence. Indeed 4 of you did so at the sentencing hearing by representing yourselves and using that opportunity to speak as you wished. You Ms Pritchard and you Ms Webster dispensed with the services of counsel specifically for the sentencing hearing and clearly so you could say exactly what you wanted to whether relevant to sentencing or not.
30. Articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights allow for freedom of expression and association. These are the rights which underpin the right to protest. They are not designed to excuse criminal behaviour by way of causing damage. The criminal damage was not some side effect of your protest but the prime part of it. You could have perfectly lawfully demonstrated outside the building. You could have sought to plaster the building with posters or caused some other minor damage. I have no doubt you were each of the view that those types of protest would not achieve the publicity you wanted and therefore decided to commit this serious criminal offence.
31. Drawing those threads together, despite this being an act which each of you would describe as one of conscience to effect protest each of you still bears a high culpability. I do take into account the recklessness, or more accurately the effective indifference, to the cost of repairing the damage you planned but this is far outweighed by the high culpability factors in this case. I also take full account that this was an act of protest. This is a matter reducing culpability, or alternatively is a mitigating feature, but again not so as remotely to take it out of the category of high culpability when all aspects of the case are taken into account. I have reduced the sentences I would otherwise have passed taking it into account.
32. If the damage here were in fact a side effect to your action rather than the entirety of it or if you had not sought to misuse the court process to continue your protest then the mitigating impact of you acting for conscientious reasons would have been greater.

Where excessive damage or serious impact on the public is the pure manifestation of an act of protest rather than a side effect or secondary part of it then people can not rely to the same extent on their conscientious motives to soften the sentence the courts must pass. In such cases prison sentences can be appropriate.

33. In respect of harm it is obvious with only a moment's thought that more than ¼ million pounds is a high value of damage. Whilst it may be insignificant set against the value of the bank this only means that there is no additional financial impact of your actions over and above the replacement costs for the glass.
34. Category A1 cases have a starting point of 18 months imprisonment and a range of 6 months to 4 years imprisonment.
35. Even if I am wrong in respect of your culpability and it should fall somewhere between high and medium I note that the category range for B1 cases goes up to 18 months imprisonment.
36. Each of you have other convictions. All of those relate to protest matters. They are a statutory aggravating feature and a serious one.
37. Ms Bellinger you have just one conviction for failing to comply with the conditions on public assembly but you were subject to a conditional discharge for that at the time of this offence for which I have to resentence you. It is of note as set out by Ms Osasami that this incident is the last time you involved yourself with criminal acts of protest.
38. Ms Pritchard you have many convictions although most of them occurred after this offence. You also have a matter of contempt of court which I committed you to prison for last year. Your offences in particular show that whether under the banner of Extinction Rebellion, Insulate Britain, Just Stop Oil or whether in a court room flouting a court order you have been dedicated to committing criminal offences to forward your cause.
39. Ms Aylett at the time of this offence you had no convictions but you too have engaged under all the banners and now have many convictions for criminal offending to further your cause. You too broke my directions last year at another trial although, after apologising, no further action was taken.
40. Ms Russenberger as with Ms Bellinger you too were subject to a conditional discharge at the time, yours for obstructing the highway, and like the other two you have a number of postdating convictions showing your dedication to breaking the law to further your cause. In mitigation you told me of a 6 week period on remand in prison for another protest case you still await trial for and the impact that time had on you is clear to see. In your case the probation officer was of the view you would be likely to continue to offend in the future and become more sophisticated in doing so. I am not of the same view as the probation officer for reasons I will come to.

41. Ms Webster you too were subject to a conditional discharge at the time, have a number of other convictions and indeed were being investigated at the time of this offence for an earlier offence of criminal damage committed in almost identical terms, albeit it was a different bank. Again you have shown your dedication to breaking the law to further your cause. You do accurately point out that you have not committed any protest related offence since the suspended sentence of imprisonment was imposed for that other offence of criminal damage.
42. All of these convictions are a significant aggravating feature to each of your cases, especially where subject to conditional discharges or under investigation.
43. On the mitigating side away from your offending each of you have many positive things to be said about you as indeed you set out powerfully to the jury at trial and which were confirmed by character witnesses.
44. You Ms Bellinger have long been involved in living your life in a cooperative way, having been brought up with the ideas of duty and honour instilled in you. You have been heavily influenced by your child's embracing of climate protest and were responsible for setting up XR Leicester.
45. You Ms Pritchard are an empathetic person who is spoken highly of by others for being genuine and honest. You have a long work history with a lot of your jobs involving caring responsibilities.
46. You Ms Aylett have a successful background in biomedical science. You gave up your career to involve yourself in climate protest. You have a number of caring responsibilities and are described by others as being a kind person with honesty and integrity.
47. You Ms Russenberger are studying for a PHD and volunteer for a charity as well as working part time. Your religious upbringing taught you honesty, compassion and social justice.
48. You Ms Webster are described by others as honest, reliable and compassionate and are proud of your daughters and have a good work history as a professional cook. You also engage in numerous voluntary activities for the community. You have some health difficulties which I take account of.
49. I have no doubt that taking into account all that I have read and heard about each of you that this offence is so serious that only a custodial sentence can be justified for it.
50. This is not least because one of the purposes of sentencing is deterrence. Not just to you but to the wider public. If people think that, because they honestly believe in their cause, they can go and effect significant damage on other people's property and not receive significant punishment then they will feel emboldened to do so.

51. You may all think that your protest is different to others as yours is geared towards ensuring the future of the planet and the human race. The court's job is not to decide if your cause or any particular cause is right or wrong. Judges are not permitted to allow any personal views about the causes of defendants before them to impact their decisions. What the court must do is have due regard to the conscientious attitudes of defendants without any consideration of the merits of their views. If I were to take a particular course due to your protest being about climate and then a different course if a protest was about some other different but important subject then justice would ebb away from the courts to be replaced by the personal whims and beliefs of whichever judge happened to be dealing with a case.
52. Taking everything into account my view is the appropriate sentence in each of your cases is one of 12 months imprisonment save for you Ms Bellinger as you have only committed a total of 2 offences and have not offended since the commission of this offence. In your case a sentence of 9 months is appropriate.
53. The next question for the court is whether that inevitable sentence of imprisonment needs to be imposed now. To answer that question I must have regard to the imposition guideline.
54. Features which point towards imposing the sentence immediately include whether an offender presents a risk or danger to the public, whether appropriate punishment can only be achieved by immediate custody and whether there is a history of poor compliance with court orders. All of you in different ways have a history of poor compliance with court orders.
55. Factors which indicate it may be appropriate to suspend a custodial sentence include whether there is a realistic prospect of rehabilitation, whether there is strong personal mitigation and whether immediate custody will result in significant harmful impact upon others.
56. In respect of risk or danger to the public it is quite clear to me that in the ordinary sense of the word none of you are remotely dangerous. The prime feature of Extinction Rebellion and all of its descendant organisations is a commitment to non-violence against human beings. Each of you believe strongly in the importance of that commitment.
57. The only risk from any of you in any way to the public is whether you are likely to engage in further criminal action which would negatively impact the public.
58. I note the current well-publicised intentions of Just Stop Oil to target airports in groups of people willing to risk arrest and they are looking for hundreds of people to do so in the coming summer months. If their plan succeeds it will cause massive disruption to large numbers of members of the public. One only needs to look at the case of R v James Brown [2022] EWCA Crim 6 to understand the type of disruption

which 1 person can cause at an airport and the impact they can have on members of the public.

59. I have also born in mind another principle which runs through the sentencing of protestors and that is the concept of dialogue. This is the concept expressed in the case of Cuadrilla v Others [2020] EWCA Civ 9 by Lord Justice Leggatt. Courts engage in restraint in sentencing in protest cases in anticipation that a defendant will respond by desisting from further breaches. In other words if the court comes to the view that a defendant will be encouraged to desist from further criminal offending by suspending an inevitable custodial sentence then that is often the course which should follow.
60. In the case of R v Trowland and Decker [2023] EWCA Crim 919 Lady Justice Carr as she then was pointed out that the courts need to consider not just the “dialogue” but also all the facts of the case including previous convictions and the nature of defendants’ actions, which ordinarily will take precedence as may the need to deter the wider public.
61. Ms Bellinger in your case you were subject of a conditional discharge at the time of this incident. There has been no offending since this incident and you were clear with the probation officer you have no intention to break the law again in the future to effect protest. You have caring responsibilities for one of your adult children who needs support from you. Weighing everything up it seems to me in your case there is a significant prospect of rehabilitation and, in fact, to all intents and purposes you seem to be rehabilitated. True it is you still believe you acted for good reason and in my view have no remorse, not least evidenced by your not guilty plea, but I accept your claim that you will not offend in the future, coming as it does from someone who is generally pro-social. I do not think there is any need for the Rehabilitation Activity Requirement but there must be punishment by way of unpaid work.
62. Ms Pritchard you now have a long history of offending through which you have shown your disregard for the justice system by way of frequently offending on bail and by committing a serious contempt of court in your trial before me last year. You spoke to the probation officer about the way you have found the judicial system a brutalising process. You gave a long address to me during the sentence hearing having dispensed with the services of counsel for this latter part of the case. You told me of the blind rage you feel.
63. You did not take your time to set out personal matters of mitigation but rather used the opportunity you had to seek to speak not just to me but primarily to the wider world. That is an abuse of the court’s process. You set out your views as to the conduct of JPMorgan Chase. You spoke of people being insane if they did not do things which work. By this you meant what you referred to as civil disobedience but, as in this case, really means breaking the law to effect protest. By talking of things which work you meant things which will change policy of companies and governments in the way you would wish them to be changed.

64. You think of actions such as the current one as being reasonable and necessary peaceful steps. They are not. They are criminal offences.
65. You made reference to various matters you complain about during this and an earlier trial. You also said your commitment is not to the law and you will do what you can to change the path the world is taking. You finished by saying you would continue to do what you feel is necessary to maintain your integrity.
66. I am quite satisfied that you will have no real regard to whether actions in the future are lawful protest or not and will feel almost compelled to engage in further criminal action at a time when such actions are being publicly planned and advertised by Just Stop Oil. There is no foreseeable prospect of rehabilitation in your case and even if I were to impose a suspended sentence I have no doubt this would not deter you from breaking the law. Prison, hard as it is which you know from personal experience, has had no deterrent effect on you but it can on others seeing the consequences where people continually and/or seriously break the law.
67. Ms Aylett you also have a long history of offending including committing many offences on bail. As well as criminal offences you have involved yourself in protest action which has brought you before the civil courts to face contempt proceedings and you faced contempt proceedings before me last year when you repeatedly broke the directions I had made in your closing address to the jury in that case.
68. You too used your opportunity in mitigation to make comments to support your views about climate change, despite having already done so in some detail at the trial. That being said your position is clear. You do not intend to commit crime in the future to effect protest. You have caring responsibilities and it seems to me there is a good prospect of rehabilitation by way of you not committing criminal offences in the future.
69. You have recently had 140 hours of unpaid work imposed for another protest offence which I take into account when deciding how to deal with you.
70. Ms Russenberger you told me you don't feel remorse or regret. You also to a degree used your mitigation statement to seek to justify your criminal behaviour. As was necessary I asked you about the pre-sentence report and the opinion of the probation officer. You told me effectively that there was some misunderstanding of the officer with what you had said about the likelihood of future criminal offending. In your statement to me you were clear that you do not intend in the future to engage in behaviour which is currently criminal. You frankly said that that position might change if the law was changed in the future to restrict what is currently lawful protest, but otherwise you valued your freedom and 6 weeks you spent on remand in prison had had a large impact on you especially given the difficult circumstances to be found in the prison estate.

71. Overall I accept that you have been frank, honest and open with me about your future behaviour and I think that currently the risk of you engaging in further criminal behaviour to effect protest is low.
72. Ms Webster you also utilised your mitigation statement to complain about the bank and me amongst others. You set out some of the health difficulties you had and also set out the numerous voluntary works you already carry out for your local community. You made submissions about joint enterprise and the tool you used as I have set out above.
73. As well as all of that you confirmed your statement to the probation officer that you have no intention in engaging in criminal acts of protest in the future.
74. I have considered what requirements would be appropriate if I am able to suspend the inevitable sentences of imprisonment. In a number of pre-sentence reports the suggestion is made that Rehabilitation Activity Requirement would potentially assist you to avoid offending again in the future. Having heard each of you give evidence and considered all the material about each of you carefully I am not of the view that it would assist.
75. None of you have remorse and I do not see that any of you have any real regrets. Your views about the Climate are not something which need to be or should be changed – each of you is absolutely entitled to those views. Input from the probation service is not likely to be something to impact whether or not you commit further offences. That will be a personal decision that each of you will make and indeed has made as best I can tell.
76. Generally to ensure some punitive aspect of the sentence there should be unpaid work requirements.
77. I also raised, and consulted with the probation officer in court, the making of a prohibited activity requirement to keep you away from commercial airports. The purpose of such a condition is to provide extra support in any of your cases in not committing further criminal offences by way of protest given the clear warning by Just Stop Oil of the next phase of their planned actions. It seems to me it is appropriate to make such an order, where relevant, but it should only be used to prevent offending and not to unnecessarily negatively impact any of your lives.
78. Could each of you now stand up.
79. Ms Bellinger in your case the sentence is one of 9 months imprisonment. That will be suspended for 18 months. You will undertake 120 hours of unpaid work for the community in the next 12 months. There will be a prohibited activity requirement for the next 18 months that you are not to enter any part of any commercial airport whether landside or airside in England or Wales except if attending to travel to Japan

or to return from Japan, whether directly or indirectly. This is to ensure as far as I can with this aspect of the sentence that you are able to attend your son's wedding.

80. You have limited means but can afford £50 a month so will pay £600 towards the prosecution's costs. There is also a surcharge of £156. I make a collection order and you can pay those sums at £50 a month from 1st August 2024.
81. In the circumstances of this case I have treated the breach of the conditional discharge as an aggravating feature but impose no separate penalty for that offence.
82. Ms Pritchard in your case there is not a good prospect of rehabilitation and it seems to me inevitable that you will commit further offences and likely this year if you are able. That is the only conclusion I can draw having heard and paid close attention to what you said to me last week about your future intentions and your prevailing attitude.
83. I do not feel able to suspend the inevitable sentence of imprisonment. Given I have come to that conclusion I also have to have regard to the case of R v Ali EWCA Crim 232 dealing with the impact on sentencing of the current condition of the prison estate. You know all too well the conditions in prison having been there last year but as I said earlier it seems to have had no deterrent effect on you at all. I am going to reduce the inevitable sentence of imprisonment to one of 10 months imprisonment.
84. Given you are going to prison I make no order for costs but the surcharge does apply in the sum of £156 and I make a collection order in respect of that.
85. Ms Aylett in your case I take you at your word you will not offend in the future and take account all other aspects of your case. The sentence in your case is 12 months imprisonment which will be suspended for 18 months. You will undertake 60 hours of unpaid work in the next 12 months which will be consecutive to the hours you already have. There will be a prohibited activity requirement for the next 18 months which will prohibit you from entering any part of any commercial airport whether landside or airside in England and Wales save the landside part and then only when having attended by motor vehicle for the purpose of dropping off a family member who is catching a flight or picking up a family member who is arriving on a flight.
86. Your means are very limited and you are already paying thousands of pounds of costs both for criminal and civil cases. Therefore although you should pay towards the prosecution costs I make no order for costs. I have to impose the surcharge and I do in the sum of £156. I make a collection order.
87. Ms Russenberger in your case the balance tips on today's date in favour of suspending the inevitable sentence of imprisonment. The sentence in your case is 12 months imprisonment which will be suspended for 18 months. You will undertake 150 hours of unpaid work in the next 12 months. There will be a prohibited activity requirement

for the next 18 months which will prohibit you from entering any part of any commercial airport whether landside or airside in England and Wales.

88. Your means are limited but it seems to me you can afford £30 a month so I order you pay £360 towards the prosecution costs. I also order the surcharge in the sum of £156 and make a collection order. You can pay at £30 a month from 1st August 2024 onwards.
89. In the circumstances of this case I have treated the breach of the conditional discharge as an aggravating feature but impose no separate penalty for that offence.
90. Ms Webster I am also going to suspend your sentence of imprisonment. The sentence in your case is one of 12 months imprisonment suspended for 18 months. I am not going to order unpaid work in your case because of the significant level of unpaid work you already do and will no doubt continue to do for the community. There will be a prohibited activity requirement for the next 18 months which will prohibit you from entering any part of any commercial airport whether landside or airside in England and Wales.
91. Although you should pay costs as with Ms Aylett you have large amounts of costs outstanding from other matters so I make no order for costs in this case. The surcharge applies in the sum of £156 and I make a collection order.
92. In the circumstances of this case I have treated the breach of the conditional discharge as an aggravating feature but impose no separate penalty for that offence.
93. Let me explain the sentences to you now. Ms Pritchard you have received a sentence of 10 months imprisonment. You will serve up to half that sentence in custody and then be released subject to post sentence supervision for a year after your release liable to being taken to the Magistrates Court and returned to prison if you commit further offences or do not comply with the terms of your post sentence supervision.
94. With regards to the rest of you if commit any offence in the next 18 months then as well as being dealt with for that offence you will go to prison for the length of time I have imposed on you. If you do not comply with the requirements I have imposed on each of you then you will be breached, back before me and, if the breach is proved, sent to prison for the length of time I have imposed.