R v LEWIS EDWARDS

WARNING: *Reporting restrictions apply to these proceedings because the case concerns sexual offences and involves children. Reporting restrictions prohibit the publication of the applicable information to the public or any section of the public, in writing, in a broadcast or by means of the internet, including social media. A person who breaches a reporting restriction is liable to a fine and/or imprisonment. For guidance on whether reporting restrictions apply, and to what information, ask at the court office or take legal advice.*

The Defendant's refusal to attend Court for sentence.

The defendant has refused to attend court. He cannot be compelled to attend either by the use of force or the threat of force. The only remedy is punishment for contempt and to continue in his absence. [*R v O'Boyle (1991) 92 Cr. App. R. 202, CA.*]

The offences.

The defendant has pleaded guilty to 160 counts on 2 indictments comprising: 19 counts contrary to s8 Sexual Offences Act 2003, 13 of which involve penetration; 27 counts contrary to s10 Sexual Offences Act 2003, 13 which involve penetration and 1 attempt; 11 counts contrary to s12 Sexual Offences Act 2003; 4 counts contrary to s15A Sexual Offences Act 2003; 1 count contrary to s48 Sexual

Offences Act 2003; 1 count of distribution of Category C indecent images of children contrary to s1 Protection of Children Act 1978; 14 counts of making Category A indecent images of children contrary to s1 Protection of Children Act 1978; 13 counts of making Category B indecent images of children contrary to s1 Protection of Children Act 1978; 15 counts of making Category C indecent images contrary to s1 Protection of Children Act 1978; 10 counts of possession of Category A indecent images of children contrary to s160 Criminal Justice Act 1988; 11 counts of possession of Category B indecent images of children contrary to s160 Criminal Justice Act 1988; 12 counts of possession of Category C indecent images of children contrary to s160 Criminal Justice Act 1988; 22 counts of blackmail contrary to s21 Theft Act 1968; and 1 offence of failing to comply with a s49 notice to disclose the key to protected information contrary to s53 Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 which was committed for sentence.

Count 50 on indictment 2 has been pleaded incorrectly. That has been adjourned to a later date to be corrected and sentenced. There is no need to adjourn sentence on the remaining counts.

Summary of the offences.

Although the defendant is to be sentenced for many offences, the circumstances can be dealt with succinctly. The offences have been opened in detail by Prosecuting counsel and I don't intend to deal with each offence in detail again.

At about 7:15 in the morning of Wednesday, 8 February this year, police officers from the South Wales Police Online Investigation Team executed a search warrant at the address in Bridgend where the defendant lived with his parents. Officers found the defendant asleep in bed with two mobile phones next to him. He was arrested on suspicion of possession of indecent images of children, cautioned, and made no reply. The property was searched and a number of mobile phones and other electronic devices belonging to the defendant were recovered. The defendant said that he did not want to give the passwords or PIN numbers at that time. When he was later interviewed, he made no comment and refused to provide passwords or PIN numbers to enable the police to examine his devices.

Nevertheless, the police were able to examine all but two of the devices seized. The defendant was served with a notice under s49 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 requiring him to provide the information needed to access those two devices. He failed to comply.

The police examination of the devices seized revealed the defendant's very significant offending against a large number of young girls. He had been in online contact with 210 girls ranging in age from 10 to 16 years.

The defendant had a pattern of behaviour. He made online contact with a girl, sometimes pretending to be someone that she knew, sometimes making contact through friends of friends. The defendant pretended to be a boy of a similar age. He groomed his victims,

psychologically manipulating them until he had gained control over them. He would often be friendly and complimentary, pretending an interest in his victims and their lives, gaining their trust and building relationships with them, continuing to pretend to be a teenage boy. Often, he gained the victim's sympathy by claiming that contact with her helped his well-being. Once he had groomed his victims sufficiently to gain control over them, he pressured them to send him indecent images and to engage in sexual behaviour for him to view remotely. He threatened serious violence against some of the victims and their families. Under his control, groomed and subject to psychological pressure, and often fearful for their own safety and that of their families, his victims would comply, usually in the hope that the defendant would then leave them alone. However, as he intended all along, the defendant then had the victims trapped. He had recorded and retained images of the sexual acts that his victims had been forced to perform. He threatened to disclose the images via social media to force the victims to do what he wanted, although the only images that he in fact distributed were two Class C images of one victim that he sent to her friend. He threatened and forced his victims to perform more, and more extreme, sexual acts. He directed them in detail on what they had to do for his sexual gratification. He made them perform sexually for him. He made many of them penetrate themselves with their fingers and with objects. One victim caused herself physical harm penetrating herself when she was ordered to do so by the defendant. The digital forensic examination also revealed that the defendant had purchased child sexual abuse

material via an organisation called 'Snapgod'. This is a global network of offenders who have obtained child sexual abuse material by blackmail or various other means and which is then sold via the Telegram application. The defendant made some of his victims write the word 'Snapgod' across their breasts for him. When his victims did not comply with his orders, he would threaten them until they did as they were told. Even when his victims were crying, distressed, begging him to stop, even when told that the victim was self-harming or suicidal, the defendant did not stop, although he could have been in no doubt about the immense harm that he was causing to his victims.

Apart from the offences against the first victim, throughout the time when the defendant was committing these offences, he was a serving officer with South Wales Police. On 30 dates he had incoming contact from his victims during working hours and he also committed some of these offences when he had protected work time to study for his degree. He even had direct contact with the victim of Count 25 on indictment 2 in the course of his official duties shortly before he first made contact with her. However, the defendant did not use his position as a police officer in order to commit these offences.

The victim personal statements.

Victim personal statements have been read to the court. There is no need to repeat them but they have all been taken into account. It is clear from the statements that the defendant caused his victims very

significant harm. That harm extends to the victims' parents, siblings, and wider families. It is important that everyone, particularly the victims and their families, understands that they have done nothing wrong. They bear no blame and no responsibility. The blame and responsibility for this offending is the defendant's and the defendant's alone.

The defendant's character.

The defendant is now 23 years old and he has no convictions, cautions, or reprimands.

The Sentencing Guidelines.

I take into account the Sentencing Guideline on the Imposition of Community and Custodial Sentences. Obviously this offending is so serious that only an immediate custodial sentence is appropriate.

Applying the Sentencing Guideline on Reduction in Sentence for a Guilty Plea, the defendant is entitled to the full one third discount on all offences as he indicated at the earliest opportunity that he would plead guilty to all offences.

Given the contents of the Pre-Sentence Report, I have considered the Sentencing Guideline on sentencing offenders with mental disorders, developmental disorders or neurological impairments. I am satisfied that the defendant's culpability is not affected by the mental health problems from which the defendant says that he suffers.

I take into account the Sentencing Guideline on Totality. On all of the offences contrary to section 8 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 involving penetration, I will pass concurrent sentences which will reflect the defendant's overall offending. I will pass concurrent determinate sentences for all other offences. This is not an indication that the sentences on the other offences are any less important. It is simply a matter of how the sentences are structured.

Sentencing Guidelines for the offences.

For all offences in any sentencing guideline, the recommended starting point is for a single offence before allowing for any aggravating or mitigating features and before applying the reduction in sentence for the guilty pleas. However, as both prosecution and defence counsel recognise, the scale of the offending is such that sentence moves outside the guidelines.

Causing or inciting a child under 13y to engage in sexual activity, contrary to s8 Sexual Offences Act 2003:

[Maximum penalty life imprisonment if penetration involved, if not 14 years imprisonment].

I will categorise the offences involving penetration first. There are a number of category 2 factors present – severe psychological harm was caused, there was penetration of the vagina with a body part or objects by the victim, in Counts 33 and 34 the defendant made

threats of serious violence to the victim and her family. The sentencing guideline provides that the extreme nature of one or more category 2 factors or the extreme impact caused by a combination of category 2 factors may elevate the offence to category 1 harm. Taking into account all the circumstances and the contents of the victim personal statements, I am satisfied that the harm is elevated into category 1. The defendant's culpability falls in category A as grooming behaviour was used against the victims and sexual images of victims were recorded, retained, or solicited. The recommended starting point for a single category 1A offence is 13 years custody with a range from 11 to 17 years custody.

For the offences not involving penetration, the harm falls into category 3 because there are no category 1 or category 2 factors. Culpability remains in category A. The starting point for a single category 3A offence is 5 years custody with a range from 3 to 8 years custody.

Causing or inciting a child to engage in sexual activity, contrary to s10 Sexual Offences Act 2003:

[Maximum penalty 14 years imprisonment.]

The offences involving penetration are Category 1 harm. The defendant's culpability is category A because grooming behaviour was used against the victims, sexual images of the victims were recorded, retained and solicited, and the defendant lied about his

age. The recommended starting point in the guideline for a single category 1A offence is 5 years custody with a range of 4 to 10 years.

For offences not involving penetration, the harm falls in category 2 because the offences involve touching and/or exposure of naked genitalia or naked breasts by the victim. The recommended starting point for a single 2A offence is 3 years custody with a range of 2 to 6 years custody.

The harm involved in Counts 43 and 58 on indictment 1 and Count 35 on indictment 2 falls into category 3 because there are no category 1 or 2 factors. Culpability is category A as before. The recommended starting point for a single 3A offence is 26 weeks custody with a range from a high level community order up to 3 years custody. A small reduction will be made on Count 35 on indictment 2 to reflect the fact that it is an attempt.

Causing a child to watch a sexual act, contrary to s12 Sexual Offences Act 2003:

[Maximum penalty 10 years].

The harm falls in the category 1 because the images involved penetration of the vagina or masturbation. Culpability is category A because grooming behaviour was used against the victims. The recommended starting point for a single 1A offence after trial is 4 years custody with a range of 3 to 6 years custody.

Sexual communication with a child, contrary to s15A Sexual Offences Act 2003:

[Maximum penalty 2 years].

The harm is category 2 because there are no category 1 factors present. Culpability falls in category B because there are no category A factors. The recommended starting point for a single 2B offence is 6 months custody with a range from a medium level community order to 1 year custody.

Causing or inciting child sexual exploitation, contrary to s48 Sexual Offences Act 2003:

[Maximum penalty 14 years].

This is category 1 harm as the victim was involved in penetrative sexual activity. The culpability is category B as the defendant had close involvement with inciting, controlling, arranging or facilitating the sexual exploitation of a child. The starting point sentence for a single 1B offence when the child was aged 16 years is 4 years custody with a range of 3 to 7 years custody.

Distributing indecent images of children, contrary to s1 Protection of Children Act 1978:

[Maximum penalty 10 years].

Count 46.

The starting point sentence for distribution of a single category C image is 13 weeks custody with a sentence range from a high level community order up to 26 weeks custody.

Making indecent images of children, contrary to s1 Protection of Children Act 1978:

[Maximum penalty 10 years].

The sentencing guideline states that *'Production includes the taking or making of any image at source, for instance the original image. Making an image by simple downloading should be treated as possession for the purposes of sentencing.'*

These are images that were made by the defendant when he recorded what his victims were doing. He made the image at source and so these offences fall into the category of production. For a single category A offence, the starting point is 6 years custody with a range of 4 to 9 years custody. For production of category B images, the starting point is 2 years custody with a range of 1 to 4 years custody. For production of category C images, the starting point is 18 months custody with a range of 1 to 3 years custody.

Possessing indecent images of children, contrary to s160 Criminal Justice Act 1988:

[Maximum penalty 5 years].

The starting point sentence for a single category A image is 1 year custody with a range of 26 weeks to 3 years custody. For a category B image, the starting point is 26 weeks custody with a range from a high level community order to 18 months custody. For a category C image, the starting point is a high level community order with a range from a medium level community order to 26 weeks custody.

Blackmail, contrary to s21 Theft Act 1968:

[Maximum penalty 14 years imprisonment.]

There are no sentencing guidelines for the offence of blackmail. There are few authorities on this type of blackmail and they are of very little assistance in this case as each case is fact specific and the range of factual circumstances is vast. There are no authorities on sentence for this type of blackmail against child victims and on this scale. I have considered the General Sentencing Guideline on Overarching Principles. I take account of the type of material demanded, the nature of the menaces, the age and vulnerability of the victims, the time over which the unlawful conduct persisted, and the harm caused to the victims. I am satisfied that this is a case of high culpability because the defendant's conduct was deliberate, persistent, for his sexual gratification, and against child victims. A high level of harm was caused.

Failure to comply with RIPA notice, contrary to s53 Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

There is no sentencing guideline for this offence. I have considered the General Sentencing Guideline on Overarching Principles. The defendant's culpability is high as this was a deliberate refusal intended to prevent further investigation. The harm or potential harm is high as the defendant has succeeded in preventing the police from investigating those two devices.

Overall, the offending is aggravated by the period of time over which these offences were committed, the number of victims, the number of images, almost all of which were moving images, and the fact that the defendant was a serving police officer. In mitigation, the defendant is said to have some mental health problems but I am satisfied that they are not sufficient to reduce his culpability. He is still only 23 years old and he lacks maturity for his age but the scale and nature of the offending means that there is no reduction to be made because of his age. He has no previous convictions although in context of this case that is not a factor that carries any great weight. I have considered carefully the submission that the defendant is remorseful. Remorse is different from pleading guilty. The defendant has said to the probation officer that he is extremely sorry for his actions but he continues to minimise his offending behaviour which limits the mitigating effect.

I take into account all the contents of the presentence report, all the information that I have about the defendant, and Ms Ferrier's realistic submissions in mitigation which have been eloquent, and succinct, and yet said everything that could be said on the defendant's behalf.

Sentence.

These are extremely serious offences and the defendant was a prolific offender. He has caused significant harm to the victims, to their parents, their siblings, and their wider families. It is clear that he not only gained sexual gratification from his offending but that he also enjoyed the power and control that he had over these young girls. His reaction to their distress can properly be described as cruel and sadistic. His offending is significantly aggravated by the fact that he was a serving police officer. Many of his victims and their families have said that his actions have caused them to lose trust in the police. There is no doubt that he has caused significant harm to the reputation of South Wales Police and to policing generally but it should also be borne in mind that it was officers from South Wales Police who investigated this case and brought this defendant to justice and who continue to work hard to identify and help further victims.

The offences contrary to sections 8, 10, 12, 15A, and 48 Sexual Offences Act 2003 are specified offences for the purposes of sections 266 and 279 of the Sentencing Code and so I must consider the issue of dangerousness.

I am satisfied that there is a significant risk that the defendant will commit further specified offences and that by so doing he will cause serious physical or psychological harm to another. I have come to that decision because of (i) the nature, circumstances, and scale of his offending which included sadistic enjoyment of his victims' distress as well as the sexual enjoyment that he gained from his offending (ii) the fact that he suggested meeting some of victims in order to have sex (iii) the contents of the Pre-Sentence Report and in particular the fact that the probation officer has assessed the defendant as presenting a very high risk of serious harm towards children, an assessment with which I agree.

Having found the defendant dangerous, I must then go on to consider whether the seriousness of these offences justifies a discretionary life sentence pursuant to s285 of the Sentencing Act 2020 for the s8 offences involving penetration. I have considered what was said by the Court of Appeal Criminal Division in A-G Reference (No 27 of 2013) (R v Burinskas) [2014] EWCA Crim 334:

"Discretionary" life imprisonment under s.225

H10. Taking into account the law prior to the coming into force of the 2003 Act, and the whole of the new statutory provisions, the question in s.225(2)(b) (ibid., § 5-496) as to whether or not the seriousness of the offence, or of the offence and one or more offences associated with it, was such as to justify a life sentence required consideration of:

(i) the seriousness of the offence itself, on its own or with other offences associated with it in accordance with the provisions of s.143(1) (ibid., §5-67), which was always a matter for the judgment of the court;
(ii) the defendant's previous convictions in accordance with s.143(2) ;
(iii) the level of danger to the public posed by the defendant and whether or not there was a reliable estimate of the length of time he would remain a danger; and *362
(iv) the available alternative sentences.

It was inevitable that the application of s.225 in its current form would lead to the imposition of life sentences in circumstances where previously the sentence would have been one of imprisonment for public protection. It was what Parliament had intended and also ensured, as Parliament had also intended, so far as was possible, the effective protection of the public.

I bear in mind that a life sentence is a sentence of last resort.

I am satisfied that a life sentence is appropriate because of the seriousness of these offences and the other offences associated with them. The level of danger posed to children by the defendant is very high. I am satisfied that that risk will continue long into the future and that it is not possible to say when that risk will cease. I have considered the available alternative sentences, which would be a determinate sentence or an extended sentence, but I am satisfied that neither would be appropriate because of the defendant's continuing very high risk and the impossibility of assessing when that risk will or might cease.

Therefore, on Counts 33, 34, and 85 on indictment 1 and on Counts 6, 15, 17, 21, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 43 on indictment 2, I impose sentences of life imprisonment pursuant to s285 Sentencing Act 2020. As to the minimum which must be served, if I had been sentencing the defendant to a determinate sentence, and taking account of all the aggravating and mitigating factors and reflecting

the overall offending, I would have sentenced the defendant on each of those counts to concurrent terms of 27 years imprisonment. Allowing the defendant the full one third credit to which he is entitled for his guilty pleas reduces that sentence to 18 years concurrent on each of those counts. As the defendant would have served up to two thirds of that sentence in custody, I fix the minimum term on each of those counts which he must serve concurrently at two thirds of 18 years, that is 12 years imprisonment. The time that the defendant has spent in custody on remand is not automatically deducted from this sentence by the prison authorities. Any time that would have been automatically deducted had this not been a life sentence should be deducted now and so I reduce those minimum terms by the 197 days that the defendant has spent on remand in custody. Any error in the calculation of the number of days on remand can be corrected administratively. This means that the minimum term that the defendant must serve before the parole board may consider his possible release is one of 12 years.

It is very important that the defendant and everyone concerned with this case should understand what this sentence means. It is a life sentence. The minimum term is not a fixed term after which the defendant will automatically be released. It is the term that must be served before the parole board can undertake the first review of the case. The Parole Board will review the risk that the defendant then presents and will consider whether the defendant can properly be

released from custody subject to licence at that stage and if so on what terms. If and when the defendant is released, he will be subject to licence and that will remain the case for the rest of his life. If for any reason his licence is revoked, he will be recalled to prison to continue to serve his life sentence in custody. It follows that unless and until the Parole Board considers that his release is appropriate, the defendant will remain in custody.

For the remaining counts, the sentences are as follows:

Section 8 SOA 2003 (no penetration):

Indictment 1 – counts 11, 12, 32, 84, 92.

Indictment 2 – count 45.

After trial, the sentence would have been 14 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence on each count is 9 years 4 months concurrent.

Section 10 SOA 2003 (penetration):

Indictment 1 – counts 2, 22, 60, 67, 77, 100.

Indictment 2 – counts 9, 19, 23, 28, 38, 39, 41.

After trial, the sentence would have been 14 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty

pleas, the sentence on each count is 9 years 4 months imprisonment concurrent.

Section 10 SOA 2003 (no penetration):

Indictment 1 – counts 6, 20, 21, 42, 50, 76.

Indictment 2 – counts 1, 5, 25, 34, 36.

After trial, the sentence would have been 14 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence on each count is 9 years 4 months concurrent.

Indictment 1 – counts 43 and 58.

After trial, the sentence would have been 4 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence on each count is 2 years 8 months.

Indictment 2 – count 35

After trial, the sentence would have been 3 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence is 2 years imprisonment concurrent.

Section 12 SOA 2003:

Indictment 1 – counts 13, 23, 59, 68, 93.

Indictment 2 – counts 2, 3, 7, 12, 13, 20.

After trial, the sentence would have been 9 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence on each count is 6 years imprisonment concurrent.

Section 15A SOA 2003:

Indictment 1 – counts 10, 19, 31, 86.

After trial, the sentence would have been 1 year 9 months imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence on each count is 1 year 2 months imprisonment concurrent.

Section 48 SOA 2003:

Indictment 2 – count 11.

After trial, the sentence would have been 4 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence on each count is 2 years 8 months imprisonment concurrent.

Distributing category C photos:

Indictment 1 – count 46.

After trial, the sentence would have been 1 year imprisonment concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence is 8 months imprisonment concurrent.

Making category A photos:

Indictment 1 – counts 3, 24, 35, 51, 61, 69, 78, 87, 94, 101.

Indictment 2 - counts 46, 49, 52.

After trial, the sentence would have been 9 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence on each count is 6 years imprisonment concurrent.

Making category B photos:

Indictment 1 – counts 4, 14, 25, 36, 44, 52, 62, 70, 79, 95, 102.

Indictment 2 – counts 47, 53.

After trial, the sentence would have been 5 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty

pleas, the sentence on each count is 3 years 4 months imprisonment concurrent.

Making category C photos:

Indictment 1 – counts 5, 15, 26, 37, 45, 53, 63, 71, 80, 88, 96, 103.

Indictment 2 – counts 48, 51, 54.

After trial, the sentence would have been 3 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence on each count is 2 years imprisonment concurrent.

Possession category A photos:

Indictment 1 – counts 7, 28, 38, 54, 64, 72, 81, 89, 97, 104.

After trial, the sentence would have been 5 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence on each count is 3 years 4 months imprisonment concurrent.

Possession category B photos:

Indictment 1 – counts 8, 16, 27, 39, 47, 55, 65, 73, 82, 98, 105.

After trial, the sentence would have been 4 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence on each count is 2 years 8 months imprisonment concurrent.

Possession category C photos:

Indictment 1 – counts 9, 17, 29, 40, 48, 56, 66, 74, 83, 90, 99, 106.

After trial, the sentence would have been 3 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence on each count is 2 years imprisonment concurrent.

Blackmail:

Indictment 1 – counts 1, 18, 30, 41, 49, 57, 75, 91.

Indictment 2 – counts 4, 8, 10, 14, 16, 18, 22, 24, 27, 29, 37, 40, 42, 44.

After trial, the sentence would have been 14 years imprisonment on each count concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty

pleas, the sentence on each count is 9 years 4 months imprisonment concurrent.

S53 Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000:

Committed for sentence.

After trial, the sentence would have been 3 years imprisonment concurrent. Allowing a discount of one third for the guilty pleas, the sentence is 2 years imprisonment concurrent.

Ancillary orders.

Pursuant to s152 Sentencing Act 2020, I make an order for forfeiture of the items set out in the application on DCS at Q21.

I certify that the defendant has been convicted of a sexual offence so that he must, for the rest of his life, keep the police informed at all times of his personal particulars, the address at which he is living, and any alteration in the name that he is using. The defendant will be provided with full details of these requirements on a form after this hearing.

The offences of which the defendant has been convicted are ones which will make him subject to barring from working with children or other vulnerable persons. He will be told of the restrictions under the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006 by the Disclosure and Barring Service.

The prosecution application for a sexual harm prevention order is on the digital case system at document Q8. I am satisfied the making of such an order is necessary to protect others from sexual harm caused by the commission of further schedule offences by the defendant. I have considered the terms of the proposed order. They are not oppressive, they are proportionate, and they are in clear terms and capable of being understood by the defendant without recourse to legal advice. I make the order in the terms set out in the draft uploaded by the prosecution at Q8. I am satisfied that this is one of the rare occasions where such an order should continue indefinitely.

Breach of the registration requirements or the sexual harm prevention order is a separate offence for which the defendant can be sent to prison. The maximum penalty is 5 years.

If the statutory surcharge applies in this case, the order can be drawn up in the appropriate amount and is to be paid within 6 months. Any error in that order can be corrected administratively as can any error in the collection order that I also make.

Given the sentence that has been passed, it is not necessary to deal with the defendant's contempt.

I direct that copies of my sentencing remarks are to go to the Probation Service and to the Prison Service to be placed on his file for any future parole hearing.

Finally, many of the victims and their families have been present today and at earlier hearings. I thank them all for their patience and the dignity and forbearance that they have shown as they have had to listen to the awful details of these offences.