



# Judiciary of England and Wales

**In the Central Criminal Court**

**R v JOSHUA BOWLES**

## **Sentencing Remarks**

1. Joshua Bowles, on 30 August this year you pleaded guilty to attempting to murder a woman who has anonymity by court order because of a potential threat arising from the nature of her work. She is identified on the indictment impersonally as 99230. I will call her Miss B. You also pleaded guilty to the second charge, of assault occasioning actual bodily harm to a man called Alex Fuentes.
2. I adjourned sentence so the court could have the fullest information about you and you could have an opportunity to give or call evidence on a disputed fact.
3. I have seen a pre-sentence report from an experienced Probation Officer, Tracey Coggins dated 25 October 2023, an assessment of you dated 5 August 2023 by Dr M E C Alcock a Consultant Forensic Psychiatrist recognised for the purposes of s.12 Mental Health Act and a psychological report dated 23 August 2023 prepared by Dr Robert Halsey a Chartered Consultant Psychologist. Your legal team has prepared a substantial bundle of records taken from the prosecution investigation including the digital records of your internet and other activities, and I also have their detailed written submissions on sentence. The prosecution has provided an Opening Note and their submissions on sentence. I have read all this material and a number of the witness statements, in addition. I have watched the CCTV compilation. I have also read in full the impact statement written by Miss B dated 9 October 2023.
4. On 9 March this year you went to a leisure centre in Cheltenham in your car and waited in the car park. You had with you two knives in a rucksack. At about 9.15pm Miss B and her friend came out of the centre and walked to their car. You ran after them through the dark and attacked Miss B without warning. She thought she was being mugged and dropped her bag but you continued to hit her. She saw the knife you were using to stab at her and she fought you bravely, kicking, punching and screaming loudly. You pushed her to the ground, banging her head. She got up but you kept going for her. Her friend was hitting you with her bag and shouting. You dropped your knife which broke.
5. Alex Fuentes, who had just arrived in the car park intervened and asked you what was going on, you began punching him in the face. This distraction enabled Miss B and her friend to run away into the leisure centre. Miss B was bleeding from the mouth.
6. However, once Mr Fuentes pushed you off him, you pursued the women, taking hold of your second knife. You got into the foyer seconds after them. You attacked Miss B again,

lunging at her with your knife, grabbing her and stabbing her again. She was distraught, fighting for her life and bleeding heavily. Another man, Mr Steve Bunn saw and intervened. You were flailing around with the knife and he thought he was going to be stabbed but he separated you from Miss B with three or four blows and your blood-stained knife dropped to the floor. Miss B and her friend ran into another part of the centre and what Mr Bunn described as your “*frenzied aggression*”, immediately dissipated. You remained in the foyer until the police arrived and you were arrested.

7. Miss B suffered a 6cm long, deep stab wound to her lower left abdomen for which she had emergency surgery, including to repair a 1cm laceration to the liver. You inflicted other stab wounds to her chest and her right thigh, as well as cuts to her finger, a black eye and other bruising to her ankle and a lump to the back of her head. Mr Fuentes sustained bruising and marks on his face, nose and forehead.
8. This was not a random act of serious violence. You were not a mugger attacking a stranger.
9. You had been employed at Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) the United Kingdom’s intelligence, security and cyber agency which gains intelligence from communications, for three years until November 2022 when you resigned from your job as a computer software coding developer. You were unhappy about your limited career progression. Miss B is an American citizen who works for the United States government’s National Security Agency, based at GCHQ. The job she was doing was done by another American woman before her and you knew both women, albeit at a distance. The first had rejected an advance from you in the past. You had targeted Miss B deliberately knowing her occupation and nationality.
10. Your attempt to kill her has completely changed Miss B’s life. She underwent surgery for the first time and although you had fortuitously missed any major organs, she spent weeks in severe pain, unable to do anything for herself. She is plainly a high achieving, strong and capable woman who was able to make a home in a new continent in service of her country. I will only summarise the result of your action on her. She has suffered physically and mentally. It will take at least a year for her body to be back to normal. She has significant physical scarring which is a permanent reminder. The psychological impact is profound. She has flashbacks and is receiving treatment. She no longer feels safe. She is not able to do many of the activities she enjoyed such as competitive sports. Your actions have affected her family and her partner and his family. She has not been able to return to work yet. She says, “*I have been robbed of my independence. This has shaken up my sense of self and my sense of the world. I think, regardless of what happens, he has got a time limit for when he will be done with this, but I dont. I know that Im at the end stages of this case but it will never be finished for me. I will never not live with this and it will affect me for the rest of my life.*”

**Basis for sentence**

11. There is an important dispute between you and the prosecution as to whether your attack on Miss B was an act of terrorism or connected to terrorism. Where such a connection is proved s.69 Sentencing Act 2020 requires the court to treat it as an aggravating factor. I have to determine that issue on the evidence provided, against the criminal burden and standard of proof which is borne by the prosecution.
12. In this case there are three necessary elements which I draw from s.1 Terrorism Act 2000. All have to be proved by the prosecution.
  - i. The attack involves an act of serious violence against a person,

- ii. The attack is designed to influence the government or an international governmental organisation or intimidate a section of the public, and
  - iii. The attack is done for the purpose of advancing a political or ideological cause.
- 13. The first is obviously proved. In respect of the rest, the evidence I have considered falls into two categories. First, the accounts you gave to explain your own behaviour. These were to Steve Bunn at the scene, in a prepared statement for a police interview and to a prison officer. The prosecution rely on this material as the clearest evidence of your mind-set, intent and purpose at the relevant time.
- 14. Second, the context of the attack. In particular the detail of your preparation for it, the evidence of your disaffection with your ex-employer GCHQ, distress at your failure to gain romantic interest from women, records of your digital life and thought processes, medical evidence of depression and your developmental disorder Autism Spectrum Disorder/Aspergers Syndrome.
- 15. You do not dispute the evidence of the witness Steve Bunn, who had previously worked in security and having stopped you waited in what he described as a ‘stand off’ with you until the police arrived. He asked if you were ok. You said, *“No, I have just tried to kill her.”* He asked you what had happened and you said that you and Miss B worked at GCHQ and that if he knew what ‘they’ do there then he would understand. You were making out that you were disgusted by the way GCHQ gathers information and *“uses things against people.”* You told him that you had had time off recently for mental health reasons, you were appalled by the agency Miss B worked for and you had picked her to try and kill her. You told him that what you had done was justified because she worked at GCHQ, you hated the morals behind what they did and what she had done was wrong. Another witness shouted at you, in response you said, *“all government institutions are corrupt.”*
- 16. You also told Steve Bunn that you could no longer, *“handle the murky waters of ethics and whether theyre doing the right thing and the power that the American NSA have and the things they do.”* You repeated that you didnt know Miss B well, just from around the office but you had selected her because, *“She works for them.”* Mr Bunn also recalled that you said a number of times, *“It’s the unethical things they do”*, that you couldn’t stand by and you had to do something about it. You mentioned the American NSA again and the fact that Miss B was an American. You said to him, words to the effect of, *“It’s a good job I didn’t have a gun isnt it?”* as well as expressing incredulity that you had tried to kill her. You said, *“what have I done? Ive tried to kill her. I cant believe this... they pay me all this money, I just couldnt face the ethics of it... I make a pretty shit terrorist, dont I?”* You said that the deeper you got into your work at GCHQ, with greater security clearance, you were authorised to see what you said was *“the worst”* and you were privy to things you didn’t agree with. You said that you thought the man you had punched in the car park was also something to do with the NSA. In fact Mr Fuentes is not an American. It was obvious to Mr Bunn that you were suffering mental ill-health. You were compliant when the police arrived.
- 17. When interviewed your response to all questions was ‘no comment’ but your lawyer provided a prepared statement in the first interview which you accepted causing injury to the victim with a knife. You also said you had been suffering from depression. You gave no further information. In the seventh interview you provided another prepared statement which you said was the justification for your attack. It reads *“The system is*

*rigged. I believe the intelligence community helps ensure this rigging. This view has been reinforced by my time working at GCHQ. The target was selected for her employment at the NSA. Due to the size and resourcing, American intelligence represents the largest contributor within the intelligence community so made sense as the symbolic target. I consider GCHQ just as guilty. Any mental health issues I may have, have been induced by the weight of the truth and the bleakness of the situation. Due to fear of retribution from the intelligence community I do not wish to divulge any details of the advanced capabilities I had exposure to whilst working in intelligence.”*

18. You were charged with the two offences. On 19 March, as part of your induction at HMP Belmarsh you spoke to a Prison Officer David Gott who is the Prevent lead there. You told him that you monitored Miss B on-line, that you knew her from working with her in the past and that you did not agree with the practices of the American intelligence services. You also said that you had another target who was male but that person did not fit your criteria.
19. I have regard to the degree of preparation you carried out in the months and weeks before you tried to murder Miss B which demonstrates a pre-occupation with your former place of work and Americans who worked there contemporaneously with you. You visited the site of GCHQ on numerous occasions at various times of day, sometimes many times in a day. You carried out research on Miss B and two other US citizens, one female who had been Miss B’s predecessor in her role, and one male. Through your on-line research you were able to establish that Miss B played netball competitively. You contacted the leisure centre at the end of 2022 asking if you could look around it. You were told you could visit to view the facilities even if you were not a member. You had obtained the team’s fixture schedule. On 9 February, a month before your attack, you went there when her team was due to be playing. In the event she was not present that evening but you hung around that evening, going in and out of the centre including watching netball being played. This may have been a frustrated first attempt at an attack or a reconnaissance. You also found the details of the friend who was with Miss B on 9 March and searched for her on Facebook.
20. Furthermore, on 26 & 27 February, less than 2 weeks before the attack, you searched the internet using terms such as, “Ted K letters” this is a reference to Ted Kaczynski, a terrorist also known as the Unabomber. He ran a mail bombing campaign in the USA from 1970s to 1990s, murdering several people. He had been a maths prodigy but turned his back on society. He sent letters to several media organisations in 1995 asking for his manifesto to be published, in return for which he would desist from his action. He was anti-authoritarian. One of the themes of the Unabomber’s complaints was that technological developments destabilised society and had to be resisted. Anti-tech ideas were the subject matter of other searches you made around this time, and in the early hours of 1 March you searched under ‘Anti-tech revolution pdf’ and found two books, one by Ted Kaczynski and the other by an American political philosopher Robert Nozick called, ‘Anarchy, State and Utopia’.
21. I turn to summarise the medical evidence. You told Dr Alcock you were academically able but lost focus in secondary school. Engrossed in online gaming you dropped out of A levels. Aged 20 you determined to address your antisocial habits and successfully completed an access course which led to university. You gained a degree in computer science and started work at GCHQ in November 2019. By 2021 you were becoming unhappy with the limitations of your job and a lack of social connections. You had tried

to make a romantic approach to an American woman who worked with you but nothing came of it. Afterwards you felt she was ‘ghosting’ you. You took a placement within the organisation to try to gain more satisfaction from your work but this did not satisfy you and you resigned in November 2022. You told the psychiatrist that on reflection you realised this was a mistake. You had suffered from depression over many years but had not taken medication prescribed. By the beginning of 2023 you had reached a low point with no social or personal relationships and no job. You struggled to forget about the woman who had rejected you and searched for information about her online, obsessively.

22. You prepared to commit suicide, writing a final note, but didn’t go through with it. You described yourself as depressed, failing to care for yourself, suicidal, preoccupied with the rejection from the American co-worker and overall, “*very angry*”.
23. Although you told Dr Alcock you could not be sure what your motive on 9 March was you thought that Miss B symbolised the woman you had been obsessed by. You denied to him that you had any ‘issues’ with the work of GCHQ or the NSA *per se* but you did feel resentment towards GCHQ as your ex-employer.
24. Dr Alcock’s opinion is that by March you had developed “*a clinical depressive disorder of a moderate to severe fluctuating severity.*” Relevant cognitive symptoms can include negative or distorted thinking, impaired consequential thinking, poor judgment and impulsivity. You display a significant degree of autistic traits arising from Autism Spectrum Disorder, a life-long disability that affects how a person makes sense of the world, processes information and relates to other individuals. Because you have not experienced retardation of language or overall cognitive development your condition is more accurately described as Asperger’s Syndrome. Dr Alcock reports that individuals with such disorders will tend to have abnormal social interactions together with a restricted repertoire of interests and activities. The psychiatrist did not attempt to suggest what your intention was at the time of the attack but his opinion is that you were unable to process the anger you had described to him and this was an integral reason for your behaviour. In addition the depressive disorder combined with your particular limitations arising from the ASD/Asperger’s Syndrome meant you were likely to be exercising poor judgment and consequential thinking and your ability to process information in relation to social imagination and interactions was affected.
25. Dr Halsey, the psychologist was asked to conduct an assessment and confirm the ASD/Aspergers diagnosis. You told him that although you did not understand why you attacked Miss B you regretted what you had done. You said that she had replaced a person you had asked out in the past and you added, “*Another possible reason is that she was from the US and it could hurt my employers if I damaged their relationship with the US.*”
26. Dr Halsey’s testing confirmed Dr Alcock’s view of your pervasive developmental disorder ASD and given your obvious strong intellectual abilities, he concluded that you fit the criteria for high functioning Autism or Asperger’s Syndrome. He confirmed that you are likely to have a restricted ability to understand the causal effect of your own behaviour and to face problems anticipating the likely consequences of your actions.
27. Against the Crown’s proposition that you committed an offence with a terrorist connection, Mr Forte relies on your age, 29, and previous good character. He argues that your only motivations were a festering discontent with your ex-employer leading to an antipathy towards it (which could have been the same for any employer), and rejection

by the predecessor of Miss B. He suggests that because these, the real reasons behind what you had done, were petty and humiliating you misrepresented them when asked for an explanation. He invites me to ignore what you said to Steve Bunn and others subsequently as 'mere bravado'.

28. Mr Forte grounds this submission on an survey of digital material harvested from your devices. I have read all of it. You made copious notes in preparation for writing a series of books. These were intended to discuss the relative lives of an alpha male type called a CHAD and someone not in education, employment or training, abbreviated to a NEET. Those writings and other content such as plans for the future, betray an unhappy and unfulfilled personality. They show you were familiar with such terms as Oneitis, an obsession with an idealised individual, Incels (involuntarily celibate men) and Doomers, a name for young males who have become dispirited, depressed and lonely through life experiences and spend their time ruminating and active on-line at night.
29. Mr Forte suggests that there is an absence of extremist, political or ideological elements in your internet history. He relies on the absence of more typical overt terrorist behaviour such as attention seeking by the publication of a manifesto to attract like-minded individuals. He submits that the records are of a politically and ideologically apathetic individual. He does not seek to extrapolate any innocuous meaning from your extensive pattern of visits to GCHQ's location between the start of this year and 9 March.
30. In the digital material I see a more mixed picture, especially at the time approaching the attempted murder. In addition to the significant research I have already referred to concerning the Unabomber and associated material, there is content suggesting a deep disaffection with society and a desire to challenge authority. You write as part of your thoughts about life, that you should '*Take control. Break free. Wage war....Remember they are poisoning you. Replacing you. Demoralising you. Do not be complicit. Fuck their system.*' On 7 March amongst the searches you made, you looked at tweets about people charged with domestic terrorism. On 8<sup>th</sup> March you searched death penalty rates in the US and murderers. On 9 March itself, including hours before the attack, your internet search history included numerous searches relating to murderers and serial killers, how to achieve permanent deletion of computer files and Russian massacres of German civilians during WWII.
31. You were given the opportunity to give evidence to explain the material the prosecution relies on. The court is able to direct the use of measures to enable you to give your best evidence and to ensure that you can say all you wish to without fear, but you have chosen not to offer any evidence yourself. You are a highly intelligent, competent man. Your depression is being treated in custody. It has not be suggested that you are unable to give evidence. I have no doubt you have been properly and fully advised. You would have been cross-examined. You would have had the opportunity to explain the inconsistencies and the explanation put forward on your behalf would have been tested. This was your chance and this is your choice. You are not to be punished for that decision. However, here remains no unambiguous refutation of the explanations at the scene and afterwards, which I have listed, and which support the Crown's case that this was an offence with a terrorist connection.

## **Conclusion on the Disputed Issue**

32. I have reflected on this issue of a terrorist connection very carefully. It is striking that even months after the event you could not, or would not, explain fully to the experts examining you why you attacked Miss B and why you had said it was aimed at the intelligence gathering at GCHQ. I have found no support for the interpretation Mr Forte suggests, in essence that you lied on the spur of the moment in what you said immediately after the attack.
33. I accept the psychiatric evidence that by the start of this year you were moderately or severely depressed, obsessed, full of resentment and you felt disempowered. I allow that the totality of the evidence demonstrates that your motivation, at least at the start of your planning, was mixed and your ultimate action may well have grown out of increasing frustration at how futile you thought your life was, disillusionment at how you felt your employer had failed you and the fact that women had rejected you. The experience of the courts is that it is not unusual for those who commit offences of terrorism or linked to terrorism, to have had some similar negative life experiences, suffer mental health issues and exhibit mixed motives. Furthermore, I accept that your life-long pervasive developmental limitations and depression may well have acted on the sense of resentful disempowerment and contributed to your decision to commit a terrorist act. In particular ASD/Aspergers may have made it somewhat harder for you to explore and grasp other solutions to your predicament.
34. However, on consideration of the cogent evidence I have set out in some detail, the court cannot avoid the conclusion that a significant part of your motivation in planning and carrying out the attack on Miss B was that your action would have an adverse impact on the intelligence communities of the United Kingdom and the United States. In my judgment it is notable that you carried out research on a male NSA employee and once you had targeting Miss B your designed action went as far as trying your best to kill her.
35. Accordingly, I find that by the time you launched your attack your feelings of anger and resentment against GCHQ and women, had evolved sufficiently to lead you to mount a lethal assault through which you wanted, however unrealistically, to disrupt the work of the UK intelligence community with an important ally, the United States of America and you hoped to achieve this by killing one of the American citizens you knew was engaged in that work. You made unsolicited admissions to exactly that in the immediate aftermath and also, notably, in a prepared statement after you had received legal advice. This was therefore a politically motivated attack. I cannot know for certain how committed you were to disrupting the intelligence work of GCHQ and the NSA but the law covers transient states of conviction as well as deeper, more fully reasoned ones.

#### **Sentencing framework**

36. Amongst the sentencing reference material I have read and considered are the Sentencing Council guideline for offences with a terrorist connection, the guideline for sentencing offenders with mental and developmental disorders, the guideline for offences of attempted murder, the assault guideline and the reduction in sentence for a guilty plea guideline.
37. The statutory purposes of sentencing are set out in section 57 of the Sentencing Act 2020. They include the reduction of crime, including its reduction by deterrence, the reform and rehabilitation of offenders and the protection of the public.
38. I start with the guideline for attempted murder. The maximum sentence is life imprisonment. Because of my finding on the contested issue this is a very high

culpability offence, category A. The harm caused is serious and falls just outside category 1. I place harm in category 2.

39. The relevant guideline observes that impairments such as your life long developmental disorder Asperger's Syndrome and your clinical depression should always be considered by the court but will not necessarily have an impact on sentence. I have to assess your culpability absent these features and then consider the degree of connection between them and the offending behaviour. I have reflected on the questions included in the guideline and I summarise: it is clear that your ASD/Asperger's Syndrome did not prevent you holding a high level job in a specialist field despite a history of depression, albeit at a lesser level than by the time of your offences. During a period of moderate to severe depression you were able to plan carefully, avoid detection until you carried out your attack and articulate your reasons clearly afterwards. The evidence of Dr Alcock supports some potential limitation of your ability to understand the consequences of your actions. In my judgment these features were linked to the commission of the offence but they do not diminish your culpability to any significant degree, indeed Mr Forte does not suggest that it does. Applying this guideline, before considering features that make the offence more or less serious than the standard, I reduce the guideline starting point of 30 years by 2 years to reflect the impact on your culpability.
40. The features that aggravate the offence are that you took two knives to the scene, the degree of planning involved and the persistence of the assault on Miss B. Although I accept the submission that your target was someone who was working in the public interest I do not treat that as an aggravating feature to avoid double counting given the reasons why I have found it to be a category A culpability offence. This is not a breach of trust case.
41. You have mitigation. You are of previous good character and have no antecedent history. You made some admissions in interview. You conveyed regret and remorse for your actions and I have no reason not to treat these expressions as genuine, as far as they go, given your failure to confront the full motivation for your action.
42. Allowing for the aggravating and mitigating features I reduce the notional custodial term before discount for a guilty plea to 26 years.
43. The guilty plea guideline requires the court to allow a maximum of one third discount if an offender admits his guilt and enters a plea of guilty the first time he is asked to do so. You pleaded guilty at the adjourned PTPH after the psychiatric report had been obtained but you challenged the terrorism connection. You did not give evidence but I have found against you after hearing submissions. Taking into account all these matters I allow less than the usual maximum. The sentence will be reduced by one quarter.
44. Accordingly, a determinate custodial sentence on count 1 would be 19 years and 6 months imprisonment. The case does not fall into the category of a serious terrorism sentence for which there are particular requirements and a statutory scheme.
45. The assault against Mr Fuentes falls into category C3. Aggravating features present are that he was intervening in an assault with a terrorist connection. The sentence would have been one of nine months imprisonment after trial and requires six months imprisonment which, allowing for totality, will be served concurrent to the sentence on count 1.
46. Attempted murder is a Schedule 19 Sentencing Act 2020 offence. I have to consider, pursuant to s.285 whether there is a significant risk to members of the public of serious harm occasioned by the commission by you of further specified offences. If so, and the



offence together with any offence associated with it is such as to justify the imposition of imprisonment for life then the court must impose such a sentence.

47. I have considered s.308(2) Sentencing Act 2020. The test is one of future risk.

48. I turn to the pre-sentence report which was commissioned to assess dangerousness. When you were rejected by Miss B's predecessor you pursued her and declared your feelings for her on-line but you were rebuffed again and your anger turned towards Miss B. Miss Coggins discerned an emerging pattern of predatory and stalking type behaviour. Furthermore you could not elaborate to Miss Coggins, as recently as this month, why Miss B became your focus and you suggested that her nationality had no bearing. This is not credible. I summarise the conclusions as follows, you are now taking medication for depression, but factors in your thinking and behaviour remain unaddressed and you will require appropriate interventions to fully understand your motivations and actions and to reduce the risk of future harm. Until then, the potential for you to react with similar level of violence cannot be ruled out. In-depth exploration of your motivation for the attack is required before the real risk of causing serious harm to the public by your committing specified serious offences can be understood.

49. If you re-offend and commit a specified offence you are currently assessed as posing a high risk of causing serious harm to known adults, and given your unpredictability and level of grievance thinking you pose a high risk of causing serious harm to any member of the public who became the object of your fixation.

50. I have regard to the details of the build up to and attack itself, and all the material, including the medical evidence I have read about you and your deteriorating mental health, distorted thinking and obsessive rumination. You carefully planned an unpredictable outburst of very serious violence, connected to terrorism, using two knives against someone you had targeted and the victim escaping fatal injury by mere chance.

51. Those involved in terrorism present particular difficulties in assessment. The resentment and anti-authoritarian attitudes that gave rise to your offending have not been tackled because they remain largely unfaced and whilst I recognise that the events of 9 March were out of character, I am not able to be confident that there is any firm indication of positive change. Despite your remorse you have not, in my judgment, faced up to the key motivation the court has identified and taking all the matters described in s.308(2) Sentencing Act 2020 into account, I cannot escape a conclusion that there is a significant risk that you will cause serious physical and psychological harm by committing specified offences in the future.

52. Having made that finding the court must decide whether the offence (together with any offence associated with it) is actually such as to justify the imposition of a sentence of imprisonment for life. If so the court must impose a life sentence which is a sentence of last resort. The gravity of the offence of attempted murder in the circumstances I have described is amongst the highest and it plainly justifies such a sentence. If you had succeeded it would have been classified as an exceptionally serious murder resulting in a whole life order pursuant to Schedule 21 Sentencing Act 2020.

### **Sentence**

53. Accordingly, for the terrorist offence of attempted murder of 99230 there will be a sentence of life imprisonment. This sentence is served in two stages. First by a minimum term of imprisonment. The minimum term to be served is fixed by law at two-thirds of the sentence reached by application of the guidelines: that is 13 years, less the time you

have spent in custody until today which is 227 days. If that number needs correction the court must be notified and the case will be relisted for the calculation to be amended. On count 2 the sentence is 6 months imprisonment concurrent.

54. It is important that you, and everyone else concerned with this case, understand the effect of a minimum term. I emphasise that it is not a term after which you will be released automatically; it is, as its description indicates, the minimum period which you must serve before the Parole Board can undertake its first review of your case. There is no guarantee that you will be released after you have served that minimum term, or at any time thereafter. It is up to you to work towards achieving eventual release by demonstrating that the public no longer need protection from you. If the Parole Board determines at some point after the minimum term has been served, that you are fit to be released, you will be released. Then the second stage of the sentence begins. If that happens, you will remain supervised by the probation services, subject to licence conditions and you will be on licence for the rest of your life, meaning that you may be recalled, to continue your life sentence, if you re-offend or otherwise breach the conditions of your licence.
55. You will be subject to notification requirements as described in Part 4 Counter Terrorism Act 2008 for 30 years.
56. If the statutory surcharge applies in your case then the appropriate orders must be drawn up.
57. I grant the application under s.23A Terrorism Act 2000 for forfeiture of your car (IO/10), the unbroken and broken knives (MBE/1, MBE/3 and KLV/2), your iPhone (DDM/1), your HP laptop and power lead (DDM/2) and your custom tower (DDM/3)
58. I grant a judge's commendation to Alex Fuentes and Steve Bunn for their bravery which I am sure saved Miss B's life.

**MRS JUSTICE CHEEMA-GRUBB DBE**

**30 OCTOBER 2023**