

## IN THE CROWN COURT AT NOTTINGHAM

### R v Edward Vines

#### Sentencing Remarks

*Edward Vines has refused to attend. I am satisfied that his refusal is deliberate and that an adjournment would not ensure his presence, either in court or over a video link. He disengaged from these proceedings during the trial. I shall therefore pass sentence in his absence but direct that a copy of these remarks are sent to him.*

It is a tragedy that I have to once again deal with you for breaking the restraining order imposed to stop you having contact with Emily Maitlis and her family.

You have been told repeatedly that your wishes to explain yourself to her do not give you good reason to break the order but yet you persist in trying to make contact.

You have shown complete contempt for this order and have instead place your own subjective wishes above the authority of the prison, the court and above the continuing need to prevent Miss Maitlis from harassment by you. And to be clear, contact from you is harassment of her, whatever the contents of your letters may be. Furthermore, when you are caught, you then try and use the proceedings to indirectly contact Miss Maitlis through your efforts to air your

grievances publicly to a jury, such is your entrenched position. When you were prevented from doing so in this trial, you became obstructive and angry, threatening at one stage to launch your papers across the court room from the witness box.

A sentence of 8 years' imprisonment was imposed on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2022 for attempts to breach the RO in 2020 and 2021. A subsequent and further breach of the order in 2022 was dealt with by way of a concurrent sentence. These offences were committed whilst you were serving that sentence at HMP Lowdham Grange. They amount to a series of letters that you wrote and posted to Emily Maitlis, her elderly mother, Marion Maitlis and on one occasion to both Marion and Peter Maitlis. You also asked your brother to call Marion Maitlis on your behalf, telling him that because he was not named on the RO that he might get away with it and that even if he was caught, he was likely to receive no more than a warning. This was in breach of a RO imposed on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2022, which order was a revision of a previous order and was drafted specifically to make it clear to you that even posting letters was prohibited.

Counts 1 and 2 reflect courses of conduct between 20<sup>th</sup> May 2023 and 20<sup>th</sup> February 2024. Over that 10 month period, you sent 23 letters to both Emily and Marion Maitlis; these had been intercepted by prison authorities. By your own admission however, more letters had been sent to Marion Maitlis but which had not been stopped. You were interviewed on 17<sup>th</sup> August 2023 and 20<sup>th</sup> November 2023 and so despite knowing that you were being investigated for breaking the Restraining Order you continued to send letters. Count 3 represents a different kind of effort by you; this concerns asking your brother to

make contact on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2023. Count 4 relates to the single letter, addressed to both Marion and Peter Maitlis: so a third person you were not to contact.

There is a short personal statement from Emily Maitlis. She feels vulnerable and worried about what you might do. She has past experience of you attending her address and of her children needing an escort to the school bus. She is deeply worried and is concerned for her safety and that of her family should you be released. Inherent in this type of offending is a fear of the unknown. Your refusal to recognise the court's order that you stay away from Miss Maitlis is bound to make her, and others, wonder what you are capable of doing, even if that fear is in the background. In this case, she has been fearful for 3 decades. In 2018 she described the effect then of the fear she felt as a result of your behaviour. She described it like a chronic illness.

In determining the right sentence, I must have regard to the sentencing guidelines unless it is not in the interests of justice to do so. Because of the history of this case, I regard each single letter as a very serious breach, thus falling into culpability A. I cannot say there is evidence of **very** serious harm but I am bound to conclude that the overall effect of your efforts has been profound and so within category 2 and towards the upper end; the starting point is 12 months the range is between a CO and 2 years. But these were not single letters; this was a course of conduct over 10 months where 24 letters were intercepted and which continued even after you had been interviewed twice. So counts 1 and 2 are also persistent breaches as well as very serious ones.

Your sentence is aggravated by your previous convictions. In 2002 you were convicted of harassing Miss Maitlis and sentenced to 4 months' imprisonment. The first restraining order was made upon that conviction.

Since then, you have repeatedly sought to make contact with Miss Maitlis in breach of court orders. You have been convicted of breach offences in 2008, 2010, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022.

The sentence is further aggravated by the fact these were sent by you whilst in custody and as you wrote in one of your letters, you had been warned not to continue otherwise you would receive longer sentences. A warning you chose to ignore.

On your behalf, I recognise that this was arm's length contact as opposed to attending at her address or making in person contact. These were also letters which did not get through, and were not threatening or meant as abusive. I also accept that after asking your brother to contact Marion Maitlis, you did reflect and very soon after your call, you did tell him not to, although I am sure this was for his benefit rather than Mrs Maitlis's given his concern about getting into trouble himself.

I also have regard to your culpability, which is undoubtedly affected by your psychiatric history. I have read the reports prepared in earlier proceedings by Dr Saleem as well as his most recent report dated 13<sup>th</sup> December 2024. In this report, he details that your psychosis was under control and stable. In his report

dated October 2022, he considered that you may have a persistent delusional disorder; that you live with an enduring mental illness which did contribute to your inability to exercise appropriate judgment. You have had episodes of psychosis since 2003 and received treatment as an inpatient in 2007 and whilst in custody. And so I have regard to the guidelines for sentencing offenders with mental disorders and I do accept that because of your mental health issues, there is some reduction of your culpability: as I have said, your condition does affect your inability to exercise appropriate judgment. You are however capable of making rational decisions and of understanding the nature and consequences of your actions.

You are 55 years of age and you are a very bright and articulate man. You could have been many things. Your obsession with Emily Maitlis has tortured you without release. You have wasted more of two decades of your life and, regrettably, look set to waste more of it in custody.

Overall, this is an extreme case and I am satisfied that the appropriate sentence is outside the guidelines for this type of offending. This is because the utter contempt for the court's order requires condign punishment; because the only way to deter you from further offending is to send you the message that longer sentences will follow and because of the need to protect the public, namely Miss Maitlis and her family from you. I am quite satisfied that your imprisonment is the only thing stopping you from making contact with the Maitlis family.

Furthermore, you have made it clear that you will not stop. This is evident from the content of the letters themselves and from your own evidence to the jury. By way of example, in your letters dated 10<sup>th</sup> June 2023 and 16<sup>th</sup> February 2024 you wrote that you will not abide by the order; you said you will continue to write for as long as you felt wrongly convicted; you told the jury that but weeks before the trial, you had sent yet another letter to Marion Maitlis. To quote your evidence: “you do not give a hoot about the restraining order”.

Having regard to the totality guidelines, in my judgment, consecutive sentences are appropriate and justified. These offences are of a similar kind but the overall criminality will not sufficiently be reflected by concurrent sentences: this is because you tried to contact three different people overall; you also tried to contact Marion Maitlis by phone and because your offending was punctuated by two interviews with the police; you plainly couldn't have been on bail but the effect was the same.

I must and do pass the least sentence that I can but for the reasons I have set out, it is bound to be of some length. You will serve up to half of the sentence in custody and will then be released on licence. If you fail to keep to the terms of that licence, you shall be liable to be recalled to serve some or all of the balance of the sentence in custody. The statutory surcharge applies.

Balancing the aggravating and mitigating features the sentences are as follows:

Count 1 – 3 years' imprisonment

Count 2 – 2 years' imprisonment c/s

Count 3 – 12 months' imprisonment c/c

Count 4 – 12 months' imprisonment c/c

Total of 5 years – c/s to the 8 year sentence you are currently serving.

HHJ Watson

26<sup>th</sup> June 2025