



JUDICIARY OF
ENGLAND AND WALES

MANCHESTER CROWN COURT

THE KING

V

MARCIN MAJERKIEWICZ

Sentencing Remarks of Mr Justice Cavanagh

28 March 2025

1. Marcin Majerkiewicz, you were convicted on 21 March 2025, after a trial at this court, of the murder of Stuart Everett on the night of 27 March 2024.
2. There is only one sentence that the law allows me to pass for the offence of murder. It is a sentence of life imprisonment. That is the sentence that I will pass, but I am also required by Schedule 21 to the Sentencing Act 2020 to specify a minimum term which must elapse before you can be considered for release on licence. It will be for the Parole Board to consider whether, and, if so, when, you can be safely released.
3. It is important to make one thing clear at the outset, so that you – and everyone concerned with this case or watching, reading, or reporting this sentence – understands what your sentence for murder in fact means. The minimum term is not a fixed term after which you will automatically qualify for release, but is the minimum time that you must spend in custody before your case can be considered by the Parole Board. It is for the Parole Board to say, after expiry of the minimum term, whether or not you are fit to be released. There is no guarantee that an offender upon whom a minimum term order has been imposed will be released once the minimum term has expired, or at any particular time thereafter. If and when you are released, you will be subject to licence and this will remain the case

for the rest of your life. If for any reason your licence were to be revoked, such as if you reoffend, you will be recalled to continue to serve your sentence in custody.

4. The victim surcharge will apply, and the minimum term will be reduced by the amount of time that you have spent in custody on remand. You have spent 334 days on remand.
5. I was the trial judge. Even though neither you, nor anyone else who was closely involved in the events surrounding and following the murder of Stuart Everett, gave evidence, the evidence at trial enables me to be satisfied so that I am sure, to the criminal standard, that what follows is an accurate description of the circumstances of Stuart Everett's murder and of the events before and after it. I am also in a position to be sure of the reason for Stuart Everett's murder, and, as I will come on to explain, this is relevant to the starting point for the minimum term.
6. I should add that some of the details that I am about to recount are distressing and even gruesome, but there is no alternative but to refer to them in these sentencing remarks.
7. You shared a rented house in Worsley Road, Winton, Greater Manchester, with Stuart Everett and with another man, Michal Polchowski. The three of you had lived in the house together since 2017, and each had your own bedroom. You had moved in after you had broken up with your partner, Agnes, who lived with your two children not far away, in Worsley. You remained on good terms with Agnes, and visited often. There was no history of any hostility between you and Stuart Everett, prior to 27 March 2024. Indeed, it is clear that Stuart Everett had, with your knowledge, referred to you as his partner, to friends and family members.
8. Stuart Everett was 67 years old when he died, and was retired. He was in poor health. He was a heavy smoker and was somewhat overweight. He had suffered a stroke some years before, and walked with the aid of a walking stick.
9. At some point in the late evening or the night of 27 March 2024, in your bedroom at the house in Worsley Road, you hit Stuart Everett on the top and back of the head at least four times with a heavy blunt instrument, probably a hammer. You

hit him with such force that his skull caved in. The medical evidence showed that Stuart Everett lived for a short while, long enough for him to inhale blood from his skull injury into his lungs, but he must have died soon after the attack began.

10. You then undertook the grisly, bloody, and macabre task of dismembering Stuart Everett's body into small pieces. You did this on the floor of your bedroom. You used a knife and also a hacksaw that you had purchased for this purpose, along with some spare blades in case they were needed. You packaged the dismembered body parts into small pieces which you then wrapped up in clingfilm or tied up in black bin bags.
11. Over the next week or so you disposed of the body parts. Only about 1/3 of Stuart Everett's body was ever found, so it is not possible to be sure of all of the methods that you used to dispose of his body parts, or of all of the locations where they ended up. However, very skilful and dogged police work has established that, in relation to the body parts that were discovered, you made some 11 trips from the house in Worsley Road to various locations in the North Manchester and Salford areas, in order to deposit the body parts. On each occasion you left the house with the body parts in a shopping bag, or a travel bag, and walked or travelled by bus to the chosen location, where you deposited the remains. You left the body parts in parks or open spaces and, on at least one occasion, in and beside a reservoir, Blackleach Reservoir. You dumped the hacksaw that you had used in Blackleach Reservoir. You took a break over Easter weekend, when there would have been too many people about, and you stored the body parts in a freezer until they were deposited.
12. The body parts were dismembered and spread across a large number of different locations in this way, in the hope that they would never be found, or, if they were, that they would never be identified. One of the most gruesome and unpleasant aspects of the whole episode was that you separated Stuart Everett's face from his skull, and then split his skull into several sections, before depositing them separately, with a view to minimising the chances that he would be identified from the body parts.
13. You also embarked upon a careful, elaborate, and lengthy exercise to conceal the fact that Stuart Everett was dead. You told your housemate, your landlord, and a neighbour that he had suffered a stroke, was in hospital, had moved to Derby or

to a different location in Manchester, and would not be moving back to the house in Worsley Road. You faked messages from Stuart Everett to yourself. You took over the use of Stuart Everett's phone. You went so far as to impersonate him on the telephone to a phone company and to a skip company. In speaking to the phone company you deliberately slurred your voice so as to give the impression that the speaker was recovering from a stroke. You accessed Stuart Everett's government gateway and pension scheme details, no doubt to see what his pension entitlements were. You took steps to inform the local authority, various utilities, and others that he was moving away. You closed his accounts with various organisations. With almost unspeakable cruelty, after Stuart Everett's death, you messaged his brother, Richard Ziemacki, and his brother's family in Derby, using Stuart Everett's phone, to give the impression to them that he was still alive, but had fallen ill and was too unwell to speak to them. You told them, as Stuart, that he was moving house, and faked video messages, purporting to be Stuart showing them around his new home. You sent a birthday card and birthday wishes to family members, purporting to come from Stuart Everett. You responded to their good wishes, sent to Stuart Everett on his birthday in April 2024, as if you were him.

14. You worked very hard to remove traces of evidence of the murder from the house in Worsley Street. You got rid of the murder weapon. You bought bleach and antibacterial wipes and tried to get rid of the bloodstains. You informed the landlord that all three of you were moving out, and you told your housemate, falsely, that the landlord had given notice. You then cleared out all of Stuart Everett's possessions from the house, telling your housemate that Stuart's family had come to collect them, when in fact you had bagged them up in bin bags and then hired a man with a van and a skip in order to get rid of them. There was heavy bloodstaining on the carpet in your bedroom, where you had killed and then dismembered Stuart Everett, and so you cut out the bloodstained section and threw it away, replacing it with a piece of carpet from Stuart's room. The missing section was concealed under a bed. You brought in a Rug Doctor machine to deep-clean the carpet. You threw out all of his possessions and eradicated any trace of Stuart Everett from the house.
15. The whole exercise of covering up what you had done took about a month. By coincidence, it had more or less come to an end on the day of your arrest on 25 April 2024, which was the day when you planned to move out permanently from

the house in Worsley Road. I have no doubt that your intention was shortly to move away from Manchester, probably to go abroad, in the hope that your offending would never be discovered, or at least that you would never be traced.

16. In fact, you almost got away with your crime. It was only the result of truly outstanding police work, plus one great piece of luck, that led to your arrest and ultimate conviction. On 4 April 2024, some body parts were discovered by a member of the public at Kersal Dale in Salford. DNA was obtained from them, but there were no DNA records of the victim on file, and so he could not be identified. Police officers and civilian investigators trawled through many, many, hours of CCTV in order to trace the movements of people in the vicinity of the find. They identified a person, who turned out to be you, who was seen entering Kersal Dale with a heavy bag some days before the discovery, and then leaving without the bag. A wider investigation was commenced, and the breakthrough occurred when a police Investigation Support Officer, Clare Daly, spotted you by chance, walking in the street, and recognised you as the man from the CCTV footage. With great presence of mind, she and her colleague, ISO Matthew Ross, notified uniformed officers and you were arrested whilst travelling on a bus. Following your arrest, further investigations enabled the police to trace CCTV evidence of other trips that you took. This led eventually to discoveries of other body parts. This breakthrough also enabled the police to identify your housemate, Stuart Everett, as the victim. Once the house in Worsley Road was identified as a place of interest, a very great deal of exceptional forensic work was carried out there and in other places which provided further evidence of your guilt, as did examinations of activity on your phone and Stuart Everett's phone.

17. Before I go on to consider the appropriate minimum term, I want to say something about Stuart Everett. He was of Polish heritage, and his birth name had been Roman Ziemacki. His parents had suffered terribly in the Second World War, before coming to the United Kingdom. As I have said, Stuart Everett was in poor health when he died. But he had not lost his zest for life. He was a jolly, friendly, mild-mannered, and caring man, and was very close to his family. He was dearly loved by his brother Richard, his other brother, John, his sister Barbara, and his wider family, and he had a wide circle of friends, particularly in the Derby area, where he grew up. He loved his visits to pubs and clubs, and he loved the occasional bet on the horses. The murder of Stuart Everett, particularly in such awful circumstances, has had a devastating effect on his brother, Richard, and on

his loved ones. In his moving victim personal statement, Richard Ziemacki said that “My wife and my family have been devastated by the inhumane and cruel way his life was ended.”

18. I now move on to address the considerations that have enabled me to decide upon the minimum term.
19. I say at the outset that this is not a case in which a whole-life term would be appropriate. I have considered and taken into account the guidance of the Court of Appeal in the case of **R v Ian Stewart and others** [2022] EWCA Crim 1063 in this regard. However, the nature of your offending is such that a very substantial minimum term must be imposed.
20. You are now 42 years old. You are Polish, but you have lived in the UK for nearly 20 years. You had worked in fast-food restaurants, latterly in the Trafford Centre. You are of previous good character, and I will take this into account in your favour.
21. Before I go on to consider the appropriate starting point, and the aggravating and mitigating features, I should say that, though the way in which you behaved in the aftermath of Stuart Everett’s death showed an extremely distasteful willingness and perhaps even enthusiasm to butcher his body, I cannot be sure that the murder itself involved sexual or sadistic conduct, and I do not consider that it did. There is no reason to think, on the evidence, that any of the dismemberment took place whilst Stuart Everett was still alive, and the method of killing, through blows to the head, did not demonstrate any sadistic features.
22. The first three matters that I must decide are interrelated with each other. These are whether you intended to kill, whether the murder was planned or premeditated, and whether this was a murder done for gain, or in the expectation of gain as a result of Stuart Everett’s death. Intention to kill is not an aggravating factor, because it is already taken into account in the categorisation of an offence’s seriousness in Schedule 21 to the Sentencing Act 2020, but it deprives an offender of potential mitigation. A significant degree of planning or premeditation is a statutory aggravating factor. If a murder is done for gain, or in the expectation of gain from the victim’s death, then the seriousness of the offending will be particularly high and the starting point for the minimum term, as laid down in Schedule 21, will be 30 years. If the murder is not done for gain or in the

expectation of gain, and if the seriousness of the offending is not particularly high, then the starting point will be 15 years. However, the Court of Appeal has made clear that there can be cases of mixed motives, in which gain is only part of the motivation, and that, in an appropriate case, this should be reflected in a discount to the 30 year starting point. In this regard, I take account, in particular, of the authorities of **R v Narendra Tailor** [2007] EWCA Crim 1564, **R v Height and Anderson** [2008] EWCA Crim 2500, and **R v Raymond Hoadley** [2021] EWCA Crim 1885.

23. In your case, for the reasons that I am about to summarise, I am satisfied so that I am sure that you did intend to kill Stuart Everett, that his murder was premeditated, indeed that the murder and the steps that you took afterwards were carefully planned, and that this was a murder done for gain.
24. I take first the intention to kill. You hit Stuart Everett a number of times on the back and on the top of the head, with a heavy weapon. You used so much force that you stove in his skull. There can be no doubt that you intended, from the outset, to kill him.
25. I turn next to planning and premeditation. I am fully satisfied that the murder of Stuart Everett on the night of 27 March 2024 was planned and premeditated. Why else would you have a heavy weapon, such as a hammer, in your bedroom? Stuart Everett had his back to you for at least part of the time when you assaulted him. Stuart Everett's death did not happen in the course of a fight or scuffle. You had already provided yourself with a hacksaw and a pack of blades, so you had aimed from the first to dismember Stuart's body as soon as you had killed him, and to do so on that same night. It is plain that you had thought through in advance your plans for depositing the body parts, clearing out the house, and impersonating Stuart to third parties, and for giving the impression to his family and others, after his death, that he was still alive. As early as 8.11 am on 28th March you sent a message on Stuart Everett's phone to your housemate, pretending to be Stuart Everett and saying that you were going to your brother's for Easter. The first deposition trip began before 10 am on 28 March, only a few hours after Stuart Everett's death, and there were two further trips that day. This shows that you had already dismembered Stuart Everett's body by the morning of 28 March. It is inconceivable that the idea for this came to you on the spur of the moment, only after you had killed Stuart Everett.

26. I turn now to evidence that you murdered Stuart Everett for gain. Once again, I am fully satisfied that you did so. The evidence of this overlaps with the evidence of intention to kill, planning, and premeditation. The evidence of planning and premeditation shows that there was a carefully thought-through purpose behind the murder of Stuart Everett. The fact that you did not have any history of violent conduct supports the conclusion that you had a particular reason to kill on this occasion. There was no evidence that would lead to the conclusion that there was any other motive but financial gain. For many years you had been close friends, and probably partners, and there was no evidence that you had fallen out. There was no evidence of a disagreement or a fight on 27 March 2024. Stuart Everett had been watching an international football match that evening and was in his nightclothes when he was killed. There was no suggestion, or any evidence, that drink or drugs was a factor in your offending. On the other hand, there was a great deal of evidence, albeit mostly circumstantial, that you needed money and that you intended and planned to gain financially from Stuart Everett's death.
27. You had been out of work since November 2023, and you were in a great deal of debt. At the time of Stuart Everett's death, you had no source of income. You had taken out a number of loans in September and October 2023, amounting to £60,000. By the time of Stuart Everett's death, that money had gone, and you were failing to make repayments on the loans. In addition, you owed £13,000 or £14,000 on credit cards and had made no repayments since early December 2023. You had been unable to pay your rent since November 2023. On 22 March 2024, you carried out an internet search on how much it would cost to borrow £50,000.
28. Before Stuart Everett's murder, you had put in place plans to steal his identity and the identity of your housemate. You set up email addresses in the name of Stuart Everett and his housemate, and set up a phone account in Stuart Everett's name. Almost as soon as Stuart Everett died, you took over his bank account with HSBC, changing the password and treating it as your own. You later changed the password on his American Express account. You opened a bank account in your housemate's name, without his knowledge. You transferred funds from your own bank account to Stuart Everett's account. You used Stuart Everett's account to withdraw cash and to pay for various expenditures, ranging from buying a meal at KFC to paying for the skip and for the man who helped you clear the house. You were treating Stuart Everett's bank account as if it were your own. On 5 April

2024, you commenced the process of applying for a bank loan in Stuart Everett's name. Bank cards belonging to Stuart Everett were found in your possession when you were arrested. It is true that you did not take large sums from Stuart Everett's account, and had not made a significant financial gain from his death before you were arrested, but I am satisfied in light of all of the evidence that this is only because you were arrested before you could do so. You did feel able to spend several hundred pounds from your own bank account on purchases at the Trafford Centre on 29 March, despite your financial difficulties. You were planning to leave the area and you had carried out an internet search for properties to rent in Alicante in Spain. You had no money of your own to fund a life in Spain and I am satisfied that you intended to use Stuart Everett's financial resources to do so.

29. I am also conscious that I have not heard any detailed evidence about Stuart Everett's financial resources. But he had worked all of his life and he was a single man who lived simply, and so I can infer that he had significant savings, or at least that you would have assumed that he had substantial funds, or credit, that you could make use of after his death.

30. I should add that you sub-let your room from Stuart Everett, who leased the house from the landlord, and so you paid your rent to him. Shortly before Stuart Everett's death you were notified that the rent was going to go up, but I do not take the view that this was, in itself, a major motive for the murder of Stuart Everett. The increase was not large and it was not Stuart Everett's decision to put up the rent. The increase in rent and other costs may, however, have focused your mind and may have helped to crystallise your decision to kill Stuart Everett in order to help you out of your financial troubles.

31. In light of all of this, in my judgment, this is not a case of mixed motives. I am driven inexorably to the conclusion that your only motive for killing your friend was to gain financially from doing so. It follows that the starting point for setting the minimum term is 30 years. The starting point is not the end point, however. I must also consider the aggravating and mitigating features.

32. The first statutory aggravating feature is that the murder was planned and premeditated. I bear in mind, however, that I must avoid double-counting, and that, in a case such as this, the fact that the murder was planned and premeditated

is a key aspect of the fact that the murder was for gain and so, to a significant extent, this feature has already been accounted for.

33. The second statutory aggravating feature is that the victim was particularly vulnerable because of age and disability. As I have said, Stuart Everett was 67 and in poor health. This is not why he was targeted by you, but it means that you knew that he would not put up a fight.
34. The third and, in the context of this case, the most serious statutory aggravating feature is the concealment, dismemberment, and destruction of Stuart Everett's body. You dismembered Stuart Everett's body in your own bedroom. You cut up his body in a particularly unpleasant and disrespectful way, using a hacksaw, and even separating his face from his head. You wrapped the parts up in clingfilm or bin bags and placed them in shopping bags. Then you spent a number of days travelling to various places so as to dispose of the body parts, mainly travelling by public transport. Your aim was that the body parts would never be found and, if all went well for you, the death of Stuart Everett would not come to light for a long time after you had made your getaway. On at least one of the trips you went for a meal in a fast-food restaurant immediately after dropping off some body parts. You acted in an almost unbelievably cold-blooded and macabre way, and showed complete disrespect and contempt for your friend's remains. This denied dignity to Stuart Everett even in death, and greatly increased the pain suffered by Stuart Everett's family when the murder came to light.
35. There are a number of other aggravating features. These are:
 - (1) Stuart Everett was killed in his own home;
 - (2) You left Stuart Everett's body parts in places where they were likely to be disturbed by animals, and where there was a possibility that they would have been discovered by members of the public, to their shock and revulsion;
 - (3) You travelled with the body parts on public transport, and walked along the street with them, often with them contained within open plastic bags;
 - (4) You went to very great lengths to cover your tracks, and even went to the extent of impersonating Stuart Everett in calls to third parties;
 - (5) With great callousness and cruelty you impersonated Stuart Everett to his own family members, so as to give the impression that he was still alive; and

(6) You have not assisted the authorities in locating the missing parts of Stuart Everett's body.

36. The only mitigating feature is that you are of previous good character. I take it into account, but it is not strong mitigation in the context of this case. You have shown no remorse.

37. There are very substantial aggravating features in your case, which are not balanced by substantial mitigating features. As a result, there must be a significant increase from the starting point, but the increase will not be as great as it would have been if the starting point had been very much lower.

38. I now come to the sentence.

39. Marcin Majerkiewicz, for the murder of Stuart Everett, I sentence you to imprisonment for life. Taking account of all the relevant circumstances, and the aggravating and mitigating factors that I have set out, the appropriate minimum term will be 34 years. This will be reduced by the time spent on remand, which is 334 days, resulting in a sentence of 33 years and 31 days.

Commendations and thanks

40. The investigation which led to this trial and these convictions was complex and difficult. As I have already said, the work of the police officers, civilian investigators, and the forensic scientists was truly outstanding. Some indication of the scale and difficulty of the case can be seen from the facts that, during the course of the investigation, the police and police investigators managed 19 separate complex and vast open land searches and crime scenes, examined over 2000 hours of CCTV footage, dealt with approximately 3000 exhibits, and took over 450 statements. It should not be forgotten that the investigation began with the discovery of unidentified, and at that stage unidentifiable, body parts in Kersal Dale, with no leads for a suspect, and yet the police, investigators and forensic scientists managed from that inauspicious start to identify a suspect and to compile the case against him.

41. The police officers, investigators, and forensic scientists who played their part are to be commended for their exceptionally hard work, and for the extremely professional and skilful way in which they carried out their duties.
42. The officers and investigators from Greater Manchester Police whom the Court would like publicly to commend in particular for their excellent work are the following:
- Detective Chief Superintendent Lewis Hughes, the Senior Investigating Officer, Senior Identification Manager and Strategic Investigator, who was in overall charge of this investigation;
 - Detective Sergeant Susannah Holt, the Officer in the Case;
 - Detective Constable Anouska Barker, who was in charge of disclosure;
 - Detective Constable Adam Smith, who led on telephony and digital evidence; and
 - Investigation Support Officer Stuart Hynes, from the Greater Manchester Police Visual Evidence Review and Analysis Unit (VERA), who was heavily involved in the trawl for, review, and recovery of CCTV evidence.
43. The following officers and investigators from Greater Manchester Police also deserve the Court's commendation for their hard work and great skill and dedication in the course of this investigation:
- ISO Courtney Greenhough, responsible for the management of exhibits;
 - Ms Faye Jones, Analyst;
 - Detective Constables Sharon Manning and Rhian Toland, the Family Liaison Officers;
 - The following members of the VERA Unit who took part in the retrieval and examination of CCTV evidence: Detective Sergeant Heidi Cullum, and ISOs Toby Coshall, Zoe Clough, Clare Daly, and Matthew Ross;
 - Emma Wright, Crime Scene Manager;
 - Natalie Webster, Crime Scene Investigator;
 - Lynsey Leach, Forensic Submissions Manager;
 - ISOs Ryan Bellis and Dale Walker from the Digital Investigation Unit;
 - Sergeant Joseph Doyle, Lead Police Search Adviser;
 - Inspector Isobel Hunt, Underwater Search Lead; and
 - Detective Sergeant Danielle Bullivant, responsible for search management.

44. Finally, I would like to thank all members of the counsel teams and their solicitor colleagues, for their hard work, the skilful way in which they presented their cases, and for the positive and co-operative manner in which this case was conducted. I would also like to thank the interpreter and the Court staff, especially the dedicated court clerk and usher, whose contributions to this case could not have been better.