



IN THE CROWN COURT AT LINCOLN CASTLE

REX

-V-

NATASHA ALLARAKHIA

SENTENCING REMARKS

1. At shortly before 9.45pm on the evening of 20th June 2024, as a result of a road traffic collision, William Ray, known as Will, aged 17, and Eddie Shore, aged 18, were killed. Their friend, Jack Prince, aged 17 was also seriously injured. A further friend, Luke Wood, aged 18, suffered injuries, albeit fortunately not in the longer term defined as serious. The deaths of Will and Eddie, the serious injuries caused to Jack, and the injuries to Luke, were the direct result of the dangerous driving of the defendant, Natasha Allarakhia.
2. Will and Eddie had just completed their A levels. They would never learn their results, but both achieved what they had worked so hard for and both would have headed for University last September. Their deaths have devastated their families and their friends. No one reading or listening to the victim personal statements could not be affected by them. They were greatly loved, there are greatly missed. Their loss has impacted many people. What comes through most of all is the opportunities lost, that is what the families refer to, what they now will miss out on together. If I may borrow the closing sentences of Eddie's big sister's VPS, which encapsulates the devastation caused: "That future was taken in a moment, and no amount of time can fill the space left behind. I will live with that pain for

the rest of my life". That is why such cases are always so difficult to hear. The horror of the night and days that followed is heart wrenching, but it is the months and years that come after, when others move on, but those closest to them will struggle to do so. I now everyone in this courts joins me in extending our sincere condolences to all those who are suffering.

3. Sadly, as is so often the case, others have also been impacted. Jack Prince: I have seen the statement from Marc Priestley, a sports therapy and rehabilitation expert worked with Jack to facilitate his recovery. It is pleasing to read that Jack has managed to rehabilitate himself, to start playing football again and to regain his past confidence. However, it is clear it has impacted his ambitions to join the RAF and there is a long road ahead for his psychological recovery. The impact upon his parents and others, both at the time and in the months and year that have followed, shows the impact of such tragedies.
4. Luke Woods: whilst he has physically recovered, psychologically he bears the scars, as do his family and friends.
5. It is plain, from all I have read that the community, the boy's friends, have been a great comfort and support. It is always encouraging to read such things even amongst such devastation.
6. For all those affected life will never be quite the same.
7. D's partner, Kim Booth suffered a linear undisplaced fracture of her vertebra, which was managed conservatively.
8. I am acutely aware, that nothing this court does today will change what has happened. I am conscious the sentence I must pass will for many seem inadequate, because it will not diminish your pain or grief. I am sure everyone understands, I must follow the law and the sentencing guidelines in coming to the conclusion as to the appropriate sentence, which must be just and proportionate and no longer than necessary; but I wish to emphasises whatever that sentence is, it does not in any way represent the value of the lives lost or the hurt and harm caused.
9. The defendant, Natasha Allarakhia is 36 of age, she was 34 at the time. She is a mother of 2 children, aged 7 and 12 at the time. Those two girls were rear seat passengers at the time of the collision. What happened will have impacted them. Fortunately, they were not notably physically hurt, but it will have affected them

nonetheless. They will also be affected by what will happen to today. They will lose their Mum for much of their childhood. They are innocent in all of this as well.

10. I shall set out the facts of the collision, I shall address the Sentencing Guidelines and then I shall announce the sentence.
11. PC Tristan Hudson is a Police Forensic Collision investigator – he has considered all the material from the other experts as well as undertaking an examination of the scene, undertaken a reconstruction and provided a comprehensive Collision Report, which I have read with care in its entirety and I am grateful to him for the care, attention and thoroughness he has shown.
12. The relevant facts of the collision I summarise, but there is greater detail within PC Hudson's report.
13. The A17 runs from Newark to Sleaford. It passes just south of RAF Cranwell, which many people will be familiar with. It is a generally straight road, with gentle corners, undulating in parts with various farm tracks and side roads coming off it. Where it passes through villages the speed is reduced but generally it is governed by the national speed limit of 60 mph. Sadly, for those who travel it regularly, it is not uncommon to be aware of people doing considerably in excess of that limit.
14. On 20th June 2024 road works meant temporary traffic lights were in place, just west of the North Rauceby cross roads – meaning they were 4 way lights.
15. It was 21.41 pm – so 19 minutes to 10pm on the 20th June, which in 2024 was the longest day of the year. The sun had gone below the horizon but there was residual daylight and no issue with glare.
16. As is required, there were road traffic signs in place indicating the presence of the roadworks and the temporary traffic lights. The first was the well known red triangle with a man and a spade showing roadworks – this was 268 metres or some 880 feet before the traffic lights. It warned of the road works 300m ahead.
17. At 166 metres, some 545 feet there was a red triangle with the sign for temporary traffic lights. Beneath this, in the same location was a red triangle indicating the road narrows to the left side, hence the side of the road on which the defendant and the Ford Fiesta with the boys in it were travelling.

18. Those signs were clear, and unimpeded. The view along the road travelling in the direction the D was travelling was clear and is straight. Within PC Hudson's report there is a photograph taken at 350 m from the collision site showing a clear straight line of sight to the traffic lights and showing the road signs I have referred to.
19. I have viewed the dashcam footage recovered from the car of a witness who was stationary at the traffic lights, travelling on the opposite carriageway to D and the Fiesta containing the four friends. The witnesses vehicle had stopped at the lights, moved forward when they changed in his favour but stopped again a few cars back when they turned red against him. The dashcam shows Will's Fiesta pull up. He is first in line. The evidence establishes he put his handbrake on. He also had his foot on his brake thereby illuminating his rear brake lights. He was stationary for 17 seconds before the car headlights for D's Audi become visible. There were no other vehicles between the two cars. From the moment those lights are visible some 12 seconds passes before the point of collision.
20. Examination of both vehicles after the collision showed neither suffered from any defect that caused or contributed to the collision.
21. The evidence from witnesses and from the Audi computer show the D had driven to Sheffield to collect her partner Kim. She had taken her two young children with her. The round trip distance was 292 miles. She had stayed in Sheffield for about 15 minutes before getting something to eat at McDonalds and starting the return journey.
22. The 4 friends had been out to watch an England football match at the pub. Will the driver had had no alcohol to drink, the others not a great deal. They had been mates for many years, through school and football teams and were looking forward to their summer post exams and to their futures.
23. The Defendant's Audi was fitted with a driver assist package which if functioning would give an audible warning of a collision risk some 170 m before, and also the ABS would give a warning jolt, but post collision the system showed an error code and hence it was not possible to say with certainty that it was active or working properly at the time.
24. However the Audi did contain a computer system. Another expert, James Griffin, a Forensic Collision investigator, examined the report obtained from the Audi vehicle computer management system – known as the ACM. This provides a plethora of information as to the pre and post collision data gathered by the cars

computer. Within his report at para 4.2.6 (repeated in Section 9 of PC Hudson's report) the record shows that the accelerator of the Audi was being depressed at between 56 - 58% in the 5 – 1.5 seconds before the collision. At 2 seconds before the collision there is a reduction in the level of depression to 46% – suggesting some deceleration in the half a second before the accelerator was released at 1.5 seconds pre the collision and the brake being applied at 1 second before collision.

25. The ACM data analysis shows that at 5 seconds pre collision the car was travelling at 94 mph and was accelerating up to 96 mph during the next 3.5 seconds – meaning that at 1.5 seconds before the collision the car was travelling at 96 mph. As the defendant released the accelerator and transferred her foot to the brake pedal, the car decelerated to 92 mph and at .5 of a second pre collision the car was still travelling at 85 mph – the braking taking effect and the ABS activating reduced the speed in that half a second to 70mph, at the point of impact.
26. From the available data, the Expert is able to deduce that given the speed at which D was driving and the time taken to travel a specific distance at those speeds, the Audi was some 37 metres from the Fiesta when the brakes were applied but that was only 1 second before the collision. Please note PC Griffin used the word “deducted” in his report, but deducted means something quite different and it is plain to me it is a typo or grammatical error and is meant to be “deduced”. PC Hudson therefore observes that the D reacted to the hazard, namely the stationary Fiesta at a distance of only 37 metres away. He sets out in his report the distances a car will travel per second when doing 96 mph – which is just short of 43 metres. At 96 mph on this road – having conducted relevant tests, the stopping distance allowing a 1 second reaction time is over 179 metres – or just over 7 seconds.
27. PC Hudson has created graphics which show the position of the Audi at the point it did brake – compared with the point at which it needed to brake to stop – given the line of sight – and given the road traffic warning signs for the roadworks more than 268 metres before, there was ample time for D to have reacted, even at the speed she was travelling, to come to a safe stop, had she been paying attention.
28. Reconstructions post collision (see Hudson report para 9.8.6 – 9.8.12) show the traffic lights were clearly visible some 620 metres away, the Ford Fiesta clear and unambiguously present from 550 metres away and both car and traffic light visible from 350 metres away. That means the D had nearly 14.5 seconds from when the traffic light was visible, nearly 13 seconds from when the car was clearly visible and over 8 seconds from the road traffic sign. Even allowing for what is commonly referred to as “Looming” and “Conspicuity” namely matters that may bring an

object to an observers attention, the traffic lights and Ford were visible to D from the distances I have referred to.

29. In short, looking at all the calculations following the reconstruction and the precise speeds due to the computer analysis, D had over 10 seconds in which to have seen the Fiesta and brake without any impact, but simply failed to do so. 10 seconds, we could sit here now and watch it pass, when you are driving, you cannot allow 10 seconds to pass without paying attention, not least when you are driving at in excess of 50% above the speed limit. It goes without saying had the D been driving at the speed limit, she would have needed far less distance to stop – some 80m and almost double the time frame – some 20 seconds to cover the 540 metres available.
30. D had been drinking alcohol. She was not recorded as being over the legal limit. Precisely what her reading was at the time is not known, but she has accepted she had had a drink earlier in the day and had taken a couple of sips from a can being drunk by her partner during the journey. Her alcohol consumption was not a cause of this collision, but whether it played a small part in slowing her reaction time will never be known, nor whether it played any part in her driving at the speed she drove.
31. It is clear she was not paying attention, and not for a split second but for the best part of at least 10 seconds, whilst driving at in excess of 90mph on a road with the national speed limit of 60mph. She failed to see the warning signs; she failed to see the traffic lights; she failed to see the Fiesta despite its brake lights being illuminated.
32. In short, there was nothing the boys in the car could have done. They were blameless.
33. The fault lies with this defendant, who drove in a manner which was obviously dangerous, far in excess of the speed limit and without paying proper attention for a considerable period of time for any driver, let alone one travelling at that speed. It is not suggested the Defendant set out to harm anyone, let alone take two young men from their families, but this was not a momentary lapse in concentration, this was extremely poor driving, far in excess of the speed limit, and without paying proper attention for a considerable period of time, in the context of the facts of this case. It was exceedingly dangerous, and the consequences have been catastrophic.

34. At the scene, when members of the public went to help, the defendant came up with a lie and embroiled her passenger in that lie. They blamed someone called “Jay from Sheffield” and said he had run off over the fields. When the police arrived they persisted in that lie, for over an hour. Police dogs and a drone were deployed to locate the driver. It was only when an officer pointed out blood on the airbag and said they would be able to identify the driver from that, did D then come forward and admit she was the driver at 23.16 hrs.
35. The emergency services attended. The four boys had to be cut from the wreckage. They were taken to the QMC. It is not necessary for me to detail the medical evidence, save to say Will died that evening; Eddie survived on life-support for a couple of days before that was switched off and he passed away.
36. Luke suffered concussion and confusion at the time, but has made a good physical recovery.
37. Jack suffered significant physical injuries, a dislocated and fractured hip and a small tear to his spleen. He required two operations. The physical impact he has detailed in his VPS alongside his parents; the psychological impact has been equally challenging.
38. D was arrested on 3rd June 2024 and interviewed. She provided a pre-prepared statement suggesting a momentary lack of attention.
39. VPS: I have already made reference to the impact on others at the start of these remarks. There has been utter devastation.

40. Sentencing Guidelines.

I must and have had regard to the offence specific SG, both for causing death by dangerous driving, as well as causing serious injury by dangerous driving, and I have also had regard to the overarching SG for custodial sentences and community orders.

41. I must decide the appropriate “Starting Point” based solely on the factors identified in the table within the SG. These factors are based on the level of culpability of the defendant. The level of harm is always of the utmost gravity in such cases, but in this case I must take account of the fact that two lives have been lost. I will also take into account the serious injury caused to Jack, the injury and impact upon Luke, and upon the passenger in D’s car, as well as the presence

of her children in her car. There are others who will be affected, civilians who helped at the scene, the emergency services as well, no one walks away from such incidents without being affected. Totality.

42. I have considered the written and oral submissions of both Counsel.

43. I have read the PSR and I have read the letter from the defendant to the court. I have also read the letter from Travis Simpkin, a friend of the defendant, who speaks of her support of him during challenges he has faced, albeit some of the content of his letter I have ignored because with respect to him, they are matters for me and not him.

44. Having identified the correct SP, I must then have regard to any aggravating factors, matters which make the offending more serious, and any mitigating factors, matters which may make it less serious and any matters of personal mitigation. I must then consider what degree of credit to give for her guilty plea.

45. The Pros submit the case is a Cat A offence in terms of culpability: They submit the D made a deliberate decision to ignore the rules of the road and disregard for the risk of danger to others. They also submit there was a lack of attention to driving for a substantial period of time – pointing out a failure to observe the road signs and brake until just 37 m before the collision.

Lastly, they submit her speed was significantly in excess of the speed limit or highly inappropriate for the prevailing road conditions.

A Cat A offence has a SP of 12 years with a range of 8 – 18 yrs imprisonment.

46. The Defence submit, the offence should fall into Culpability B – with a SP of 6 yrs – range 4-9 yrs. However, having made that submission the defence then immediately concede the defendant was driving significantly in excess of the speed limit or highly inappropriate speed for the prevailing road conditions, but then submit because none of the other Cat A factors are present the case should fall into Cat B. Mr. Renvoize submits the absence of other factors that may make a case to be even worse, and he gives examples of those in his written note, may mean it falls within Cat B.

47. With respect to Mr. Renvoize, that is to misunderstand the approach I must take. The presence of a Cat A Factor may place a case in Cat A, the absence of other Cat A factors does not mean the court should come to a lower Category. In a case where there are factors from more than one category, the court must balance those and each will attract a different weight, depending on the circumstances, before arriving at what is just in each case.

48. In this case, I also do not agree with Mr. Renvoize that no other Cat A factors are present. In my judgement, for the reasons I have outlined in the facts, the defendant drove not just at a substantially excessive speed, but she was plainly not paying attention for a significant period of time in the circumstances of this case. Every case will be different on its facts, and the precise duration of time that amounts to significant, in one scenario, will be different to another scenario. In this case, the D had line of sight for some 620 m, she had 2 warning signs, the first some 268 m from the collision. She did not react until she was about a 1.5 seconds from the collision. More than 10 seconds – at the very least passed when she should have seen what was in front of her but did not. On the facts of this case, in my judgement, that is a lack of attention to driving for a substantial period of time.

49. I do not agree with the prosecution characterisation that this was a deliberate decision to ignore the rules of the road, save to the extent of her speed, but that would be to double count her excessive speed and so I do not conclude that is an appropriate factor to take into account.

50. Therefore, the presence of the two factors, significantly excessive speed and lack of attention to driving for a substantial period of time, mean this is very clearly and obviously a Cat A case.

51. I must then have regard to any aggravating factors.

52. Aggravating factors:

- The first is obvious, sadly two young men lost their lives – the devastation that has followed has been unimaginable.
- Jack Prince suffered significant injuries, that will affect his life choices and have impacted him and his family.
- Luke Woods suffered injury and has been psychologically impacted as have his family and friends.
- D's then partner was injured.
- Her two young children were in the car, when she drove in the manner she did; that in itself is a frightening fact and a significant aggravating factor,

and I note one was not wearing a seatbelt, although it cannot be said D would have been aware of that.

- Her previous convictions: I have not addressed these yet, because they are a specific statutory aggravating factor in her case:

In summary: 5 appearances for 12 offences. The matters of Theft in 2009 and 2022 of if very little relevance. However, in Dec 2023 she was sentence for Theft to 20 weeks custody suspended for 12 months- which means she was subject of that sentence at the time of this incident – the SSO has expired and so cannot be activated, but it is an aggravating factor. In 2009 she drove without a licence or insurance. In 2022 she contravened a pedestrian Crossing regulation, and drove without due care and attention and without insurance.

In May 2024, so the month before, she was prosecuted for speeding in Norfolk, driving in excess in a 40mph zone – speed unknown?

On 13/6/24 so the week before, she was required to provide details as to the driver of a car – she did not do so.

On 5th July 2024 – so shortly afterwards, she was again required to provide the details of the driver – she did not do so. She was sentenced for both offences on 31st Jan 2025 – and disqualified as a totter at that time.

- The statement of her partner, Kim, states that not specifically on this occasion, but in the past, she had warned her against driving too fast. When set alongside that history, this is a defendant who has had multiple warnings as to the manner of her driving and that is an aggravating factor.
- Blaming others is a specific aggravating factor. In this case, that is what D did, albeit a fictitious person, and persisted with for over 70 minutes, resulting in police resources being used to try and catch a fictitious driver. However, she did then admit she was the driver and did not persist in the lie as others sometimes do, and I accept the panic of the incident and the effect on her own children would have influenced her decision at the time, so whilst an aggravating factor in the overall context it is of limited weight.

53. Causing serious injury by dangerous driving – I am taking this into account when considering the overall sentence but it would be a Cat A in its own right, for the same reasons, and the SP would be 4 yrs – range 3-5 – the maximum sentence being 5 years.

54. Mitigating Factors:

- D is 36 yo – she was 34 at the time.
- I have read the detailed PSR.
- I have read that she is neuro-divergent, but not that this impacts upon her culpability, but that it will have an impact on how she copes with the inevitable sentence of custody.
- I have seen reference to other mental health issues, but I have not been provided with any psychiatric report, and so again, whilst I acknowledge their presences, they do not reduce her culpability.
- I accept she is genuinely remorseful. The content of her letter does demonstrate genuine remorse, and not because of her own predicament but because as a mother herself she has contemplated the horror of the harm she has caused. The author of the PSR came to the same conclusion that her remorse is genuine.
- There will be an impact on her children. The defendant is acutely aware of this. They are innocent victims as well. Arrangements have been made for them, but the consequences for them will be profound, but the fact they were in the car when D drove in the way described, only serves to remind us all, what we owe to others when we get behind the wheel of a car.
- I have read the letter from her friend, Travis – who speaks of her kindness to him when he needed support.

55. I accept the defendant is not a bad person, did not set out to cause anyone any harm, but her chaotic lifestyle, as she describes it herself, meant she did not stop to think of the danger she was causing to others on the road, despite several warnings from past driving behaviours.

56. I accept her background and own personal issues will make custody particularly challenging for her compared with others.

57. I will turn to my conclusions in a moment.

58. **Disqualification:** This is mandatory for a minimum period of 5 years. In my view given her previous convictions that should be increased to one of 6 years. I must then work out the period of time she will serve in custody and add that to the 6 year period. I shall set that out in a moment.

59. **Sentence:**

The SP is 12 years.

The aggravating factors combine to result in a significant uplift in this case, towards the higher end of the range.

The personal mitigation results in a downward adjustment but the aggravating factors significantly outweigh the available mitigation.

60. **Credit for plea:** I confess I have not found it simple to make this assessment. The guidance is clear, to receive a 1/3 reduction a clear unequivocal plea must be entered or indicated in the Magistrates Court. It was not. However, the BCM does say D accepts the driving and was seeking Counsel's advice. Whilst in my view this case could only ever have been a case of dangerous driving and not by any stretch of the imagination a case where careless driving would meet the facts, where a solicitor seeks the advice of Counsel on that issue, and so advises a defendant, it seems to me I cannot criticise the defendant. Her pleas were indicated in writing before the PTPH hearing. Therefore, with some hesitation I am giving 1/3 reduction, because I have exercised the benefit of the doubt I had in my mind on this issue in favour of the defendant, which the law requires me to do.

PLEASE STAND UP

61. Therefore, having taken the SP as 12 years – I make an upward adjustment to 16 ½ years because of the significant aggravating factors that are present and a reduction of 18 months for the matters set out in mitigation, which results in a sentence after trial that would have been one of 15 years before credit for her plea. The sentence therefore is one of 10 years concurrent on both counts 2 and 3. In respect of count 1 – after trial the sentence would have been one of 3 years 10 months – therefore giving 1/3 credit for plea slightly rounded down in favour of the defendant – the sentence is 31 months – but concurrent because I have already taken it into account.

62. **Disqualification.**

D will serve 2/3rds of that sentence before she is eligible to be released. That is 6 years 8 months.

For the purposes of disqualification, I must calculate that in terms of days. That equates to 2433 days.

The period of disqualification as I have stated is one of 6 years – or 2190 days.

Therefore the total period of disqualification is one of 4623 days.

D is required to take an extended re-test before she will be eligible to drive again and her licence will be endorsed.

63. VS applies with a collection order.

64. The defendant may be taken down.

65. May I thank everyone for the dignity and composure they have shown during this extremely difficult day.

HHJ James House KC

18th August 2025