



Judiciary of England and Wales

**In Westminster Magistrates Court
Between-**

Rex

v

Huw Edwards

Sentencing remarks

Mr Ian Hope appears for the Crown

Mr Philip Evans KC appears for the defendant

Introduction

1. Mr Edwards , you face sentence in respect of 3 offences , you pleaded guilty on 31st July 2024 , the first opportunity to do so, in due course and in accordance with the Sentencing Councils guideline you will receive full credit by way of reduction in your sentence.
2. You are 63 now, the offences span a period when you were 59 – 60 years of age. Perhaps it does not need saying but you are of previous good character, I accept positive exemplary character, having enjoyed a very successful career in the media, it is obvious that until now you were very highly regarded by the public for your dedication and professionalism, you were perhaps the most recognised news reader / journalist in the UK. It is not an overstatement to say your long-earned reputation is in “tatters.”
3. The 3 offences you pleaded guilty to are-

- Count 1 – Making 7 indecent images of children of Cat A, Contrary to S1 (1) (a) and 6 of Protection of Children Act 1978 a
 - Count 2 - Making 12 indecent images of children of Cat B ,Contrary to S1 (1) (a) and 6 of Protection of Children Act 1978
 - Count 3 - making 22 indecent images of children of Cat C, Contrary to S1 (1) (a) and 6 of Protection of Children Act 1978
4. The maximum sentence for these offences 10 years imprisonment.

Facts

5. The facts have been extensively opened both orally in open court and in written submissions by both parties, they do not require full recital here, it suffices to summarise them as follows:-

6. The offences were committed between 16th December 2020 and 14th August 2021 and specifically relate to images of children categorised within Category A (7 images) Category B (12 images) and Category C (22 images).

7. The children depicted were both in still and moving images across all categories and all were male, aged between 12 and 15 years with one moving image depicting a child aged approximately 7 -9 years within Category A.

8. Whilst most of the children appeared to be alone when recorded, I cannot rule out the potential presence of others and in some of the images, others were clearly seen to be present and the ages of these individuals are not easily determined.

9. You received the images during your online contact with Alex Williams, a then 19 -year -old male who had contacted you via his Instagram account in 2018. This individual has since been convicted and sentenced for offences of Distribution and Possession of Indecent Images of Children. It was during the investigation into those offences, the involvement of Mr Edwards was revealed.

10. A statement has been provided to Police by Mr Williams and forms part of the prosecution case against you . For your part, you told probation that whilst you can accept some elements of Alex Williams's. statement as true, there are significant comments made by him which you strenuously deny.

11. Although you have pleaded guilty you have advanced the following matters as context behind your offending and / or issues you take with the prosecution case, they are not subject to challenge by the Crown, but rather proper comment, the parties agree, as do I, that where a difference is advanced and it makes no material difference to sentence no trial of those issues is necessary (

known as a Newton hearing) thus I will sentence you on the basis advanced , qualified by my findings, as set out below.

1. Although you accept ‘making’ images as described in law, you do not accept that you in any way physically made or created any of the images in question. At most, what you accept you did is to ‘make’ any image was open the WhatsApp which contained the images. You say you did nothing more with them. I accept that submission, there is no evidence of you doing anything further with those images, and I proceed on that basis.
2. I accept you did not make payments in order to pay for images to be sent, in particular indecent images.
3. The Prosecution accept that you were not directly asking for and then paying directly for images, but rather that there is a clear inference from the nature of the relationship coupled with reading the direct messaging that exists that demonstrates Alex Williams to be requesting gifts and presents after he has sent images, and you then responds by sending him money, I agree with the prosecution analysis, this appears to be by way of an apparent ‘thank you’, but not “purchasing“ images in a way more often seen in such cases.
4. I accept you told the individual who sent the images not to send images of people who were underage, but only at a later stage , which is not from the beginning, this is not a case where despite protestation not to nonetheless the images were still sent, to that extent this mitigation is qualified.
5. I accept you did not see or read any descriptive material attached to or accompanying any of the images.
6. Although you accept the categorisation of the images and the number of images you nonetheless urge that most of those images contain post pubescent individuals and a number that have been classified as an individual image represent a still which is similar or virtually identical to other still images included in the totals. You submit this should be reflected when I consider the total numbers of images, I agree but do not consider it to materially affect my sentencing.
7. I accept the medical evidence appears to confirm that as a result of your mental health at the relevant time the defendant you no memory of actually viewing any particular images and you do not

know whether or which you did view; I further accept you did not store the images on any device; did not use them for any personal gratification and did not gain any gratification from the indecent images; you did not keep them; you did not send them on to anyone else and did not and never have sought any similar images from any other source.

8. I accept that you had issues with your mental health. The degree to which you in fact did receive any sexual gratification from the indecent images as opposed to the more general pornography received is difficult to assess and I defer to the medical evidence.
9. I accept there is no evidence of you storing the images, doing anything with them or attempting to source such images from anywhere else, I must proceed on the basis as you set out in your submissions through Mr Evans KC.

12. It is against this background that I must sentence you. I ordered a pre-sentence report because of your lack of previous convictions, cautions or warnings, your known mental health struggles, as evidenced in the expert reports and to properly assess your risk of reoffending, motivations behind your offending and risk of harm to the public generally and children specifically, I indicated that custody was a real possibility as is committing you for sentence if I am unpersuaded my powers are sufficient.

Material considered

13. In addition to the helpful submissions from both parties, I have read the Pre-sentence report, 2 reports from Mr Issacs and a report from Dr Appleyard, whilst you have relied on your medical reports and placed them into the public domain I will only briefly refer to the conclusions in them where they have influenced my decision making, your medical records are private and only need recital where absolutely necessary to convey my reasoning.

14. Dr Appleyard is a Forensic Psychosexual therapist and provided a report, the salient parts are as follows;

Mr Edwards was particularly destabilised through the process of commencing a social media presence which allowed him to interact with people that otherwise he would have never engaged with.

His social media engagement presented as an easy way to manage his low mood and provided him with a number of men and women who were motivated to be sexual with him which not only boosted his fragile self-esteem but allowed him to re-engage with his sexual interest in men

which had been managed since 1994. The feelings of being desirable and unseen alongside Mr. Edwards' unresolved sexual orientation created a perfect storm where he engaged in sexual infidelities and became vulnerable to people blackmailing him.

Mr. Edwards has denied having a sexual interest in children or actively and purposefully seeking out indecent images. Combining all the assessments above, Mr. Edwards has a low risk of reoffending.

There is a tangible risk that Mr. Edwards may attempt suicide as he recognises that his life trajectory, both personal and professional, may have been irretrievably damaged by events and he remains concerned about how events have and will impact on his family. Mr. Edwards considers that his family's situation may be improved if he was not alive.

15. Michael Isaac, a Consultant Psychiatrist & Neuropsychiatrist provided 2 reports, the second by way of update to the first.

16. The reports primary relevant findings are;

Mr Edwards is a complex individual, with a psychologically challenging upbringing, in which his relationship with his father was particularly challenging and probably damaging psychologically. The restrictive, puritanical, but often hypocritical, background of growing up in the particular cultural milieu of South Wales, with a father who was highly regarded and lauded outside the family, but was perceived as behaving monstrously within the family, created both an enduring cognitive dissonance and low self-esteem, compounded by a sense of being inferior (by not getting into Oxford and going to Cardiff instead) and being therefore something of an outsider at the BBC.

I consider that all of this, including and, as well as the persistent depressive disorder, with intermittent bouts of clinical depression, though none as severe as the current one, significantly and adversely affected Mr Edwards' decision making in relation to looking after himself and, crucially in this context, his interaction with co-workers and strangers via social media. His reported conduct reflects this.

I consider that from approximately 2018, although there are earlier references to depression, and Mr Edwards had undergone psychotherapy in the past, when Mr Edwards took two months of sick leave following an anonymous denunciation, Mr Edwards on balance exhibited a mental impairment that had a significant (non-trivial) effect on his ability to carry out day-to-day activities, including his decision-making capacity

and judgment. Without the medication (and therapy), the effects on mental impairment would have been even more manifest, with earlier onset.

I consider that Mr Edwards satisfies the nature, longevity, and severity of the required mental impairment, noting at the same time that a formal diagnosis of a psychiatric disorder is unnecessary to convey this impairment.

(Updated report)

Mr Edwards is currently doing well therapeutically, with a tailored regime of medication and psychotherapy, within a safe environment. The concern, as he himself touched on, is that outside this protective 'bubble,' and subject to intimidating public opprobrium, the current state of affairs will not last.

I consider that, notwithstanding Mr Edwards' mental state today, his mood remains volatile and subject to significant fluctuation. His underlying cerebrovascular disorder further reduces his emotional inhibition and is likely to increase his impulsivity to behave in a way that risks himself. I consider overall that although there are protective factors (such as, albeit limited, family and friend support), Mr Edwards remains at high risk of suicide, due chiefly to the presence of an underlying mental illness (clinical depression), a history of impulsivity and, although it is not apparent at present, a history of agitation.

It is almost impossible to predict with certainty the suicide risk presented by an individual. Our understanding of this derives predominantly from studies of population, where one can identify risk factors. The standard of care in these circumstances is adequately to assess risk, identify particular vulnerabilities to suicide and mitigate them as far as possible. It is not part of care to predict suicide in an individual. The term 'major' is a term of art in DSM5. In UK and European practice, the term 'clinical' depression would be more usual. The point is to describe depressed mood that goes beyond simple unhappiness and which involves a pattern of unremittingly bleak mood.

If Mr Edwards is subject to a custodial sentence, I consider that he would be exceptionally vulnerable within the prison population, not only due to the nature of his offence, but to his inescapable public prominence. I consider that he would be at considerable risk of harm from others, but, more pertinently, I consider that his suicide risk if he were imprisoned

would be high and significant. I do not consider that custody of any kind would reduce what I consider to be the almost negligible risk that

I could find no evidence that Mr Edwards would be unable or unwilling to comply with any Community Order imposed by the Court.

I do not consider that Mr Edwards represents any risk to people under the age of 18, or, indeed, to anyone. He has shown insight, shame, and remorse at his actions; these actions appear to have arisen with no context of interest in child pornography at a time of significant stress, underpinned by medication conditions that have already been discussed, but, especially in relation to the cerebrovascular disease, were not then appreciated.

17. The Pre- Sentence report is comprehensive; the important matters are as follows

At the time of the offences and over a period of 2 to 3 years, Mr Edwards described a deterioration in the relationship. His wife was experiencing high levels of stress as her mother was nearing end of life and the couple became increasingly distant from one another. Mr Edwards recognises that he was also detached and "not present" at a time when she needed his support. Despite having previously been very close, he recalls this period as the most difficult part of their marriage and their levels of intimacy had significantly decreased.

Mr Edwards has been keen to stress that he does not consider his bisexuality as permission for infidelity and he expresses high levels of remorse for the betrayal of his partner and children and is aware that he has eroded the trust placed in him.

Since the last court appearance when matters were adjourned for the production of the Pre- Sentence Report, Mr Edwards has been residing as an in -patient at the Nightingale Hospital in London. Initially it had been anticipated that his stay there would be limited to a week but upon the advice of his Consultant Psychiatrist, this was extended until the sentencing date.

At the time of the offences, Mr Edwards describes an unhealthy lifestyle featuring excessive use and misuse of prescribed medication. He has expressed some disappointment that although family members had commented on these changes, there had not been a greater effort by those

around him to challenge him openly about this. He asserts that he does not seek to place blame on others for his own failings but he became so entrenched in his own situation and deteriorating mental health, that he was unable to objectively assess and take positive action.

I have read the Neuropsychiatric Report prepared by Dr Issac and do not intend to repeat the information contained within that report but note the comments relating to the impact of his diagnosed mental health problems at the time of the offences;

"The overarching diagnosis is major depressive disorder, moderate, recurrent, without psychotic features". Additionally, he has been diagnosed with small vessel disease (arteriosclerosis) which is described as cognitive disorder with behavioural disturbance.

"The qualifier 'with behavioural disturbance' reflects changes in Mr Edwards' behaviour, but in my view fed into his overall judgment and capacity to make decisions, mainly because of the development of his mood disorder, but compounded by the presence of the neurocognitive disorder, from 2018 and well established by the material time at the end of 2020. This condition will have reduced Mr Edwards' cognitive reserve, rendering him more vulnerable to the adverse cognitive effects of alcohol.

Since approximately 2018, both of these conditions (neurocognitive disorder and mood disorder) are more likely than not to have impaired Mr Edwards' decision making and judgment, including his ability to comply with management instructions, reducing his normal inhibition and becoming 'stuck' in behaviours, such as obsessive messaging, whether appropriate or not, but at the same time detached from his communication, in that he would either forget what he had said or do so on a kind of 'autopilot,' without any real judgment of how such communications might be perceived or his actions impact on others." (Dr Isaac, 28/08/2024)

Since his arrest for these offences, his lifestyle has changed significantly. His ability to move freely in public areas has been curtailed by the media attention attracted by his case. He is at a stage of considerable change and is beginning to evaluate how he will be able to develop an alternate lifestyle and focus for the future and this uncertainty is causing him a level of anxiety.

Likelihood of Reoffending

.....Mr Edwards' static characteristics (age, number, and type of previous), 4% will be re-convicted within a two-year convictions period. Mr Edwards' score places him as a low likelihood of reconviction. Using the Probation Risk of Serious Recidivism (RSR) tool, the likelihood of being convicted for a new seriously harmful offence over the next two years is 3.16% which is deemed as medium.

The Offender Assessment System, (OASys) which underpins the Probation Service's risk assessment of offenders, contains the Sexual Reoffending Predictor (OSP) tool which is a more indicates that Mr Edwards' risk of internet or indirect sexual offending is medium and that his

Assessment of the Risk of Serious Harm

In assessing the level of risk that Mr Edwards poses to others I have considered the above risk assessment tools along with the circumstances of the index offences, Mr Edwards' current behaviour, attitudes, and personal circumstances.

The risk of harm presented by Mr Edwards is based upon the fact that viewing indecent images of children perpetuates sexual and psychological harm through exploitation of victims. The risk of harm to children that Mr Edwards presents is indirect. I would therefore assess Mr Edwards as presenting a medium risk of causing serious harm to children. There is no evidence that he poses a risk of harm to other groups, including partners, public or staff.

Mr Edwards has described a period in his life where he became fixated on online of a sexual nature, he was experiencing poor mental health, increased use of alcohol and a deterioration within his intimate relationship. These factors appear to be linked to future risk and a repeat of one or more of these factors may increase the likelihood of repeat behaviour.

The above circumstances may also reflect an increase in risk of harm to self. Whilst he has disclosed previous suicidal ideation, his mental health appears to be stable and well managed.

He assures that he does not consider himself at risk of self-harm at this time but this remains and which would require ongoing monitoring. The status of his mental health may be further impacted by the anticipated media attention following today's sentencing hearing. Although it is positive that he reports improved coping mechanisms assisted by

professional and personal supports, adverse media attention has resulted in increased levels of distress and anxiety in the past.

Whilst a custodial sentence would serve to remind him of the serious nature of his offending and act as a punitive measure by restricting his liberty, it is unlikely to address the underlying causes of his offending.

If the court is minded to consider a community-based proposal, I have assessed Mr Edwards as suitable for a period of supervision.

He has engaged in the preparation of this report and has been able to recognise those factors which have contributed to his offending along with an acceptance that there are areas thinking and behaviour which would benefit from further exploration. He has stated his willingness to engage with the Probation Service to undertake planned intervention to reduce the likelihood of further offending. In addition, he has indicated that he would welcome further assistance in developing his future plans, particularly in the area of vocational or volunteering endeavours which he is mindful will need to be managed alongside restrictions placed upon him. Ensuring that Mr Edwards is able to develop pro-social activities in the future which provide him with a sense of purpose and social investment will be important protective factors alongside development of his internal behaviour controls. It is my view that there is a clear focus for intervention in these areas and Mr Edwards has expressed his commitment to engage fully in any order imposed by the court.

I have considered the benefits of programme intervention such as iHorizon in this case but have to measure these benefits alongside the potential impact upon other group members, given the specific concerns regarding media attention. Further to these concerns, I am also aware from the report prepared by Victoria Appleyard, Forensic Psychosexual Therapist, that in addition to the sessions already attended since December 2023 (a total of over 21 hours intervention), Mr Edwards has also committed to attending ten further sessions. Having read her assessment of the identified risk factors, these correspond with my own assessment and therefore any programme content is likely to duplicate the treatment being undertaken by Ms Appleyard.

Given that Mr Edwards will be undertaking further formal sessions via the Forensic Psychologist, it is my view that a structured programme is not necessary in this case and that delivery of the Maps for Change toolkit can be undertaken to address offence related risks and need.

Intervention to promote desistance can complement that being offered by the psychologist and Mr Edwards has indicated his agreement to allow for information sharing to take place between his supervising officer and Ms Appleyard.

Legal Framework

18. In sentencing you I am obliged to have regard to both the five principles of sentencing and any relevant sentencing guidelines

19. The sentencing purposes are –

- The punishment of offenders.
- The reduction of crime (including its reduction by deterrence)
- The reform and rehabilitation of offenders.
- The protection of the public.
- The making of reparation by offenders to persons affected by their offences.

20. In respect of the sentencing guidelines the relevant guidelines are.

- Sentencing Council guideline for possession of child exploitation material
- Sentencing Council's guideline on overarching principles.
- Sentencing council's Guideline on the Imposition of Community and Custodial sentences
- Sentencing Council's guideline on sentencing offenders with mental disorders, developmental disorders, or neurological impairments.
- Sentencing Council guideline on totality.
- Sentencing Council guideline on ancillary orders / Sexual Harm Prevention Orders in particular.

21. The maximum sentence for an offence of Possessing Indecent Images of Children contrary to section 1 of the Protection of Children Act 1978 is 10 years' imprisonment. It is a specified offence for the purposes of extended sentences.

22. The sentencing guidelines are designed to categorise seriousness according to culpability and harm, the categorisation of the images into A-C according to the nature of the images reflects culpability and harm, although it should not be thought that images in Cat C are not nonetheless serious or causing of harm.

23. The parties agree, as do I, that Sentencing Guidelines for simple Possession of Category A images provides a Starting Point of 1 year's custody and a Category Range of 26 weeks to 3 years' custody.

24. The notes go on to say that where there is a sufficient prospect of rehabilitation, a community order with a sex offender treatment programme requirement can be a proper alternative to a short or moderate length custodial sentence.

25. Sentencing Guidelines for simple Possession of Category B images provides a Starting Point of 26 weeks' custody and a Category Range of a high -level community order – 18 months' custody

26. Sentencing Guidelines for simple Possession of Category C images provides a Starting Point of a high- level community order and a Category Range of Medium level community order – 26 weeks' custody

27. Having identified the category , starting point and range, I must the consider the aggravating and Mitigating factors.

Aggravating factors

28. I consider that the fact that there were moving images, as an aggravating factor , especially in relation to the Category A and B images.

29. The age and / or Vulnerability of the Child depicted is an aggravating factor of 'significant weight' (See the Guideline) although it only applies to two of the Category A images where one of the children is aged around 7 to 9, this, in my view, is a significant aggravating feature. None of the other non -exhaustive list of aggravating factors referenced in the guideline are present.

Mitigating Factors.

30. I consider the following matters to be relevant mitigating factors.

a. No Previous Convictions;

b. Remorse,

c. Positive Character in the past.

d. Mental disorder, showing that his decision-making across the relevant time was or could have been adversely impaired by a mixture of mood disorder, neurocognitive disorder, and alcohol consumption . I accept you will be particularly vulnerable in a custodial setting, although this alone would not have prevented an immediate custodial sentence.

e. Mr Edwards would appear to have voluntarily desisted, or at least asked not to be sent underage images at points in time during this thread consistent with images of younger pre-teen children having been sent, albeit after the initial receipt of images.

31. I make clear that the loss of your distinguished career and the financial and reputational damage caused are not, in my view, significant mitigating factors, but rather natural consequences of your behaviour which you brought upon yourself.

Sentence and Reasons

32. I cannot put it any better than the author of the Pre-Sentence report, “Sexual abuse over the internet involves forcing or enticing a child or young person to take part in sexual activities regardless of whether the child is aware of what is happening, a child never does nor can consent. The continued distribution of child abuse images perpetuates a cycle of abuse to fulfil the demand for the sexualisation of children. Victims may be aware that their images may be or are still circulating on the internet, and this can lead to feelings of on-going traumatisation. The impact of child sexual abuse involving imagery can be severe and lifelong, with the potential for children to be re-victimised each time images are viewed. They may feel guilt, shame, and self-blame, and be vulnerable to further sexual abuse.”

33. It is obvious that these are extremely serious offences and the combination of the fact that the Cat A Images include very young (7-9 years of age) children and moving images is a significant factor in coming to the conclusion ,

34.As such I have concluded that the custody threshold has been crossed.

35. I consider that as a starting point , following trial ,the appropriate sentence for the Cat A images would be 12 months custody, 4 months custody for the Cat B images and 2 months custody for the Cat C images , to run concurrently, however, taking account of the mitigating factors reduced to 9 months and applying credit for a guilty plea a further 3 month reduction, meaning a 6 month sentence in respect of the Cat A images and no separate penalty on the other matters, the seriousness of the offending being sufficiently captured by a custodial sentence on the first offence.

36. However, I have also carefully considered the guideline on imposition of custodial sentences and considered factors both for and against suspending such a sentence, I am of the clear view that you do not present a risk or danger to the public at large and specifically children , that the focus of the sentencing purposes should be on rehabilitation and that punishment is not only achieved

by way of immediate custody and that in fact there is a realistic prospect of rehabilitation and strong personal mitigation, in particular your neuro vulnerabilities at the time and your remorse, which I accept is genuine.

37. I am of the firm view that the combination of being forced to confront your wrong- doing in a very public way, your seeking of professional help and the supportive blanket which that and the input of probation will provide, within a suspended prison sentence with requirements, will rehabilitate you and thus strike the balance between public protection and rehabilitation.

38. Whilst grateful for and fully understanding the logic I disagree with the author of the report, I do not consider a structured programme unnecessary in this case and that the comfort the court requires in order to satisfy itself of the realistic prospect of rehabilitation can only be delivered through the compulsion of an order to attend a programme rather than risk him discontinuing the voluntary assistance he currently receives.

39. The sentence of the court is therefore as follows

- Count 1 – Possession of 7 indecent images of children , Cat A – 6 months Imprisonment suspended for 2 years with 2 requirements
 - a. To complete a Sex Offender Treatment Programme Requirement lasting 40 days
 - b. 25 Rehabilitation Activity Requirement (RAR) sessions
- Count 2 - Possession of 12 indecent images of children , Cat B- No separate penalty
- Count 3 - Possession indecent of 22 images of children , Cat C – No separate Penalty

Consequences of breach

40. There will be a custodial term of 6 months which will be suspended 2 years. If in that period you commit any offence then you will be brought back to court and the sentence may be brought into operation. In addition, the suspended sentence order is subject to the above requirements:

41. You will be subject to and cooperate with both requirements That means you must meet your supervisor when and where you are told to and you must cooperate fully with any instructions that your supervisor gives you.

42. If you fail to comply with these requirements then you will be in breach of this order, which means that you will be brought back to court and will be liable to serve the sentence.

Ancillary Matters

Sexual Harm Prevention Order ('SHPO')

43. The prosecution invites the Court to make an indefinite Sexual Harm prevention Order "SHPO".

44 . In order to make a SHPO the court must be satisfied that it is necessary to make a SHPO for the purpose of:

(i) Protecting the public or any particular members of the public from sexual

harm from the defendant, or

(ii) Protecting the children or vulnerable adults generally, or any particular

children or vulnerable adults, from sexual harm from the defendant outside

the UK.

45. The Court must assess whether the offender presents a risk of sexual harm to the public (or particular members of the public) and must be satisfied that an order is necessary to protect against this risk.

46. Having regard to the Sentencing Council's guidelines relating to Ancillary Orders and specifically section 224 Sentencing Act 2020 , I remind myself the that in making that decision, the details of the offence are likely to be a key factor, together with the offender's previous convictions and the assessment of risk presented by the probation service in any pre-sentence report. Although the probation officer expresses the risk as being 'medium' I have regard to the conclusions of both experts reports. Ms Appleyard who has already gained extensive experience of the defendant does not characterise risk in a way that would make a SHPO a necessity to protect the public.

47. I am satisfied on the balance of the evidence before me that an order is not required in order to minimise the risk of harm to the public or to any particular members of the public, is not proportionate in the circumstances, given the protective impact of the sentence and his continued assistance by mental health services , although it could be policed effectively.

48. I do not conclude that I am satisfied the defendant presents any such risk of sexual harm to the public or that it would in all the circumstances be necessary

to protect against that risk. This is clear on the expert evidence, when read as a whole and not selectively. I decline to make a SHPO for all these reasons.

Notification requirements

49. By virtue of Ss 80-82 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 and as a result of the sentence imposed you are subject to notification requirements as set out in S82, that is:

“A person who, in respect of the offence, is or has been sentenced to imprisonment for a term of 6 months or less7 years beginning with that date”

50. An order setting out your obligations will be served upon you, breach of the requirements is an offence for which you could go to prison , pay a fine or both.

Costs and Court surcharge

51. You will pay a contribution towards prosecution costs of £3000 and the statutory charge of £128 within 14 days, I make a collection order in default, that means the court can take enforcement action if you fail to pay and if, having exhausted all options, the court is of the view you are refusing to pay or in culpable neglect a prison sentence in default can be substituted.

Senior District Judge Paul Goldspring (Chief Magistrate) for England and Wales Court

16.9.24