

IN THE CROWN COURT SITTING AT WOOLWICH

BETWEEN:

THE CROWN

-v-

MARK WEATHERLEY

SENTENCING REMARKS

OF

HIS HONOUR JUDGE GROUT

1. Mark Weatherley, you are 43 years' old, and I must sentence you in respect of two offences of causing grievous bodily harm with intent, matters which you pleaded guilty to at your first appearance in this court on 29 July 2025.

The Facts of the Offending

2. The facts of the offending are as follows. On 30 June 2025, Police Constable Rita Gregasz and Police Constable Adrienne Parmenter were on uniformed duty, crewed together. At about 12:30pm, whilst on their way back to the police station, they were tasked to attend an address in Sidcup following a report of a domestic assault. The report had been made by a neighbour who said that your mother had attended his address in a distressed state.
3. The two officers attended 95 Hatherley Road in order to speak with your mother. Having arrived at the address, they noticed bruising on your mother's arm; she told

them that you, who she explained suffers from psychosis but that you had not been taking your medication, had been verbally abusive to her and then grabbed her arm. She did not want you to be prosecuted but wanted support for your mental health issues.

4. The officers began to complete the Domestic Abuse Risk Assessment. They then attended your mother's property next door, 93a Hatherley Road, along with two other officers, PC Benjamin Gregory and PC Jake Lodge to ascertain whether you were present and whether you required assistance from the Ambulance Service. However, you were no longer there.
5. PC Gregory and PC Lodge left the two officers to finish concluding their assessment and to assist your mother in returning to her home address as well as making arrangements for her to go and stay with her daughter.
6. Ten minutes or so later, you returned to the address with your bike. You became immediately aggressive and verbally abusive towards the officers who moved together and towards the front door to the property due to your demeanour.
7. What then occurs was captured on the officers' Body Worn Camera, the footage from which I have seen. There can be no doubt at all that what is captured on that footage constitutes one of the worst attacks on serving police officers I have ever seen.
8. You make various references to your former dealings with the police, accusing them of fucking up your life, and you repeatedly shout at the officers to leave the property, calling them "scum" among other insults. The officers attempted to calm you down but to no avail.
9. PC Parmenter momentarily stepped outside of the address to ask for more units to attend over her radio. It appears that that action angered you further.
10. PC Gregasz advised you that she has called an ambulance and, once again, both officers, attempted to calm you down which was met with further insults and abuse, including, "fucking slags", "you're all cunts" and "I hate you with a passion, I hate the lot of you".

11. You did, for a moment, appear to calm but that changed once the officers began to tell you of the nature of the allegations.
12. PC Gregasz took the decision to try and arrest you. She moved towards you in an effort to place you in handcuffs but was unsuccessful as you began to resist. PC Parmenter tried to assist by removing her PAVA spray and taking hold of your arms.
13. Unsurprisingly, both officers say that they have a limited recollection of what happens thereafter but much of what did occur is caught on the Body Worn Footage.
14. You punched PC Parmenter in the face. She stumbled backwards onto the floor. You then turned your attention to PC Gregasz who was already unsteady on her feet having stumbled backwards when you assaulted her colleague. You also punched her to the face, causing her to fall backwards onto the floor.
15. You then returned again to PC Parmenter who had not yet been able to stand; you continued punching her and then kicked her to the face with a shod foot.
16. You then turned back to PC Gregasz. She had managed to get to her feet, but you pinned her to the wall and repeatedly punched her in the face and head until she fell to the floor, unconscious.
17. Once again, you returned to PC Parmenter who, by this point, was bleeding profusely from her nose and mouth. As she tried to stand, you then hit her again with such force that she ended up face down on the sofa. You then continued to punch her. She managed to stand but you hit her again with such force that she ended up on the floor.
18. PC Gregory and PC Lodge were first on the scene and as they approached the property, you were attempting to leave through the front door. They prevented you from doing so and detained you on the floor. You were then cautioned and arrested.
19. PC Gregory tended to PC Gregasz who was still unconscious and unresponsive on the floor. He put her in the recovery position and noted that her pulse was weak, her

breathing was shallow and only her left pupil was reactive to light. PC Parmenter was conscious but still bleeding heavily and in extreme pain and distress.

20. The London Ambulance Service arrived and both officers were conveyed to Kings College Hospital for treatment.

21. Other officers also arrived on the scene to assist. You continued shouting and being verbally abusive, including calling the officers "cunts". As you were transported to custody in the police van, you were recorded on footage saying,

"I think I killed her; I think I snapped that girls' neck when I punched her. She fucking (inaudible), that cunt. That'll teach her for coming in my house without a search warrant and not leaving when I asked her to."

22. When you arrived at the police station you continued referring to your previous encounters with the police. In relation to the incident that had just occurred, one officer heard you say,

"They could have been two geezers, and I would have fucking killed them. The only reason I didn't stamp on them was because they were women."

23. The verbal abuse continued even once your solicitor arrived such that the interview had to be conducted through the police cell wicket. You stated that you had punched the officers in response to them being at your house. You were asked whether you had attacked them more than once, including stamping on PC Parmenter, and you replied that they deserved it. You stated that you would plead guilty to GBH. You said that your actions were as a result of times when you had been harassed and had your life ruined by police in the past.

Injuries and Victim Personal Statements

PC Gregasz

24. Photographs of PC Gregasz's injuries were taken which I have seen. The streamlined forensic report, dated 28 July 2025, recorded that a CT scan of the officer's head and neck confirmed the following:

- (a) a bruise to the right side of the brain;
- (b) a bleed to the front of the brain;
- (c) a fracture to the right wall of the right eye-socket, extending upwards into the right side of the forehead and into the right side of the skull and bones of the midface; and
- (d) a collection of blood within the right eye socket causing the right eyeball to become displaced downwards and to protrude from the eye socket.

25. It also recorded that on 2 July 2025, PC Gregasz was still suffering from persistent vomiting and fluctuating levels of consciousness. A further CT scan showed no new brain bleeds; however, on 4 July 2025, the report recorded an ongoing decline in thinking ability (cognitive function).

26. An MRI scan revealed known bruising and bleeding to the brain along with no evidence of damage to the long connecting nerve fibres within the brain. Ongoing dizziness and fatigue associated with nausea when moving was recorded on 7 July 2025, but an MRI showed no new bleeds to the brain. On 8 July 2025, the officer was discharged from hospital.

27. A further report, dated 21 August 2025, concluded that the injuries the officer suffered caused a mild to moderate traumatic brain injury. It was not associated with a significant threat to her life, but it is apparent from the clinical information that it caused significant concussion symptoms (nausea, vomiting, tiredness, difficulty thinking and dizziness). These were, the report states, quite debilitating and kept the officer in receipt of medical

care for at least a week. Though the report considered it unlikely that the injury would have been life threatening without any timely treatment, it nevertheless made clear that the officer had suffered a significant concussion injury. Her symptoms, the report states, are likely to persist for a number of weeks to months. They are likely to affect her ability to return to employment for at least a few weeks. The report adds that a small minority of patients (presumably who suffer similar injuries) may experience residual symptoms and experience difficulties with activities beyond a year. There is a small risk (under 5%) of post-traumatic epilepsy (seizures/fits). There were no records provided to evaluate the impact on the officer's eye, though the CT and MRI scans did not identify any overt damage to the nerve of the eye or entrapment of any eye muscles in the fractured bones. The report noted that if the officer has no problems with her vision at present, then it would be unlikely that any further issues would arise in future.

28. PC Gregasz has provided two Victim Personal Statements, the most recent of which is dated 29 August 2025.
29. Among other things, the officer makes clear that she has been unable to return to driving following the significant head injury; she still suffers from feelings of pressure in her head that have impacted upon her day-to-day life, including walking and exercising; she still has issues with her jaw and suffers pain when eating, which were expected to have gone away by now; she continues to suffer from sleeplessness and exhaustion and I am told that, as of today, she has not been able to return to work. She is unsure as to whether she will be able to do so in future.
30. She also describes the impact on her mental health and how the trauma impacts on her day-to-day activities in terms of her confidence in going out and socialising.

PC Parmenter

31. Photographs of PC Parmenter's injuries were taken which I have seen. A streamlined forensic report, dated 29 July 2025, recorded the following:

- (a) PC Parmenter had lost consciousness for 6 minutes;

- (b) the heart rate was abnormally high (HR 110 bpm);
- (c) the blood pressure was abnormally high (BP 146/100 mmHg);
- (d) there was a graze to the front of the scalp;
- (e) the back of the scalp was tender to touch;
- (f) there was swelling to the right side of the scalp;
- (g) the right cheekbone was tender to touch;
- (h) the left side of the upper jawbone was tender to touch;
- (i) there was a wound to the left side of the upper jawbone, measuring 3cm; and
- (j) there was a wound to the left side of the lower jawbone, measuring 1cm.

32. The officer underwent a CT scan that showed swelling to the soft tissue of the left side of the face. She was then referred to the Maxillofacial Surgery Team who recorded the following:

- (a) bruising to the left side of the forehead;
- (b) a wound to the left upper lip;
- (c) a wound to the left lower lip; and
- (d) multiple superficial grazes to the face.

33. The Emergency Medicine Team found an injury to her shoulder but concluded that no further treatment was needed and she was given injury advice.

34. The clinical impression was a fracture to the nose and wounds to the face, which were treated with painkillers and anaesthetic injected into the skin surrounding the wounds. The wounds were closed with steri-strips. Wound and head injury advice were given, which included massage therapy to the wounds and the application of scar gel. The officer was then discharged from hospital with a follow-up appointment with the Maxillofacial Surgery Team organised for two weeks' later.

35. PC Parmenter has provided several Victim Personal Statements, the most recent is dated 29 August 2025.

36. Among other things, she describes the pain she has experienced from the initial pain from her injuries and having to take gas and air; having to return to the Minor Injuries Unit due to the injury to her shoulder and having to wear a sling and apply deep freeze; and having to return to A&E when her mother noticed a bruise behind her ear and dilated pupils, which she was told related to trauma but did not require further treatment.
37. PC Parmenter describes still having a scar to her left lip, which she is told will be permanent, and is still suffering from shoulder pain, which is impacting upon her sleep and lifestyle. She describes the struggle with her mental health, having to return home to live with her family and has requested to be referred for therapy. She also explains how her heightened anxiety is affecting her day-to-day life. As of today, I am told that she is still unable to return to work.
38. In addition, both officers were assessed by a Clinical Psychologist, Dr Tabitha Backhouse Spriggs. Her conclusions contained within the reports she has prepared confirm that both officers are currently suffering from PTSD, severe depression, severe anxiety, and a presence of panic attacks and insomnia as a result of what occurred, and both have been recommended to undergo further psychological treatment to address these concerns.
39. Furthermore, I have read and considered the content of the witness statements of PC Gregory and PS Cundy, both of whom attended the scene, as well as the statement of Commander Peter Stevens.

Approach to Sentencing

40. In sentencing you I have considered the relevant offence-specific sentencing guideline as well as the guidelines on the imposition of community and custodial sentences, credit for guilty pleas and totality.
41. The maximum sentence for causing grievous bodily harm with intent is life imprisonment. By reference to the offence-specific guideline, the prosecution submits

that your offending falls into high culpability for three reasons- first, because the officers were “obviously vulnerable” due to being female and smaller than you, secondly, because the assaults were “prolonged and persistent”, and thirdly because this was a “revenge” attack on account of the things you said both before and after the assaults. I am unable to agree with the first and third of those reasons. I do not consider that, when drafting the guideline, its authors had in mind that police officers, of whatever sex or size, were to be considered “obviously vulnerable” when dealing with situations like the one I have described. The fact that they were police officers acting in the exercise of their functions is, of course, highly relevant as a statutory aggravating factor but I do not agree that, for the purposes of culpability, the officers were obviously vulnerable. I also do not agree that, within the meaning of the guideline, this was an offence motivated by revenge. True it is that you said some truly appalling things to the officers, and about the police more generally, but this was not an attack which can properly be said to have been one borne out of revenge. What prompted the attack was your misguided belief that you had done nothing wrong and that the officers had no right to be at your address coupled with the officers’ attempt to arrest you. As to whether the assaults were prolonged or persistent, whilst the duration of the actual attacks was limited to about 30 seconds, in that time you repeatedly punched and kicked the officers, returning to each of them to continue with the assaults. I am satisfied that this amounts to a persistent assault within the meaning of the guideline. Indeed, if one considers the body worn footage of the officers, no other sensible conclusion could be reached.

42. As to harm, the prosecution submits that the case falls into category 1, the defence says category 2. Although I have only sought to summarise the evidence in these sentencing remarks, I have considered with care the content of the relevant witness statements (including Victim Personal Statements) and medical and psychological reports. As is correctly pointed out by the defence, the offence of causing grievous bodily harm with intent covers all manner of serious injuries which fall short of death, including brain damage, paraplegia and loss of limbs or sight. Horrific though the attacks were, I am not persuaded that any of the category 1 harm criteria are met. Whilst it is suggested by the prosecution that there is evidence of “psychological conditions that are continuing to have a substantial and long-term effect on both victims’ ability to carry out their normal day to day activities and their ability to work”, I am not satisfied that that is right. There are, at present, undoubtedly psychological conditions that are continuing

to affect the officers, neither of whom have yet returned to work. But it must be remembered that it has only been three months since the incident. Dr Spriggs makes clear in her reports that “without appropriate psychological treatment” the officers are likely to continue to suffer with conditions such as PTSD, insomnia and depression but the corollary of that is that with appropriate psychological treatment these conditions are likely to abate. That is why the doctor goes on to make recommendations as to appropriate treatment, including recommending 8-12 focussed sessions and more if deemed clinically appropriate. Accordingly, it is too early to say whether category 1 harm is present in this case but, on the available evidence, it appears, for the reasons I have given, that it is not. Accordingly, I agree with the defence that the totality of the physical and psychological injuries and trauma (as well as the impact that these have had on the officers’ day-to-day activities) is best characterized as category 2 harm.

43. A single A2 offence has a starting point of 7 years’ custody with a range of 6-10 years’ custody.
44. As to factors which increase the seriousness of the offence, the most significant is the fact that the offending occurred against police officers who were acting in the exercise of their functions. It is important not to downplay how serious an aggravating factor this is. These two officers had attended your property that day in order to help a member of the public, your mother, who they believed needed assistance. As a result of trying to help someone they were subjected to the most brutal of attacks. A significant increase from the starting point provided for in the sentencing guidelines will nearly always be called for where a police officer has been attacked, particularly where the attack has led to the sorts of consequences that this one did. In addition, you do have previous convictions. True it is that you do not have any convictions for offending of this seriousness, but you do have convictions for, among other things, offences of racially aggravated common assault and assaults against emergency workers. Most recently, in 2023, you were sent to prison for malicious communications which I am told involved you making hundreds of phone calls to a solicitor’s office threatening to harm staff, throw acid, and burn the building down. Finally, there is the fact that I am sentencing you for two offences, not one. Whilst concurrent sentences are appropriate in this case, given the very serious nature of the attacks, the overall sentence will need to be uplifted

to recognise the fact that you caused very serious injury to two different people albeit during the course of one incident.

45. As to factors which reduce the seriousness of the offending, along with your personal mitigation, I have listened very carefully to everything that your counsel has helpfully said this morning, and I have read with equal care the content of the pre-sentence report in this case. The probation officer reported you as having been “polite and cooperative” throughout the interview process and your counsel today says that you express remorse for what has happened. That, I am bound to say, is difficult to reconcile with your behaviour as captured on the police body worn cameras, not only in terms of the acts of violence you committed but also in terms of your behaviour and language both pre and post the assaults. That having been said, although I have no expert evidence on the issue before me, I have noted what has been said in the report, and by your counsel, as to your mental health. You say that you have been diagnosed in the past with borderline personality disorder that has been linked to previous incidents of aggressive and violent behaviour. In addition, I take on board everything that has been said about your personal and family circumstances.
46. It seems to me that the totality of your offending, coupled with the aggravating features I have mentioned, significantly outweighs what mitigation you have available to you. Following trial, I would have imposed a global sentence of 12 years’ custody. I recognise that that is outside the identified category range for a single offence but that, it seems to me, is entirely justified in light of the aggravating factors in this case and the fact that there were two victims.
47. However, in fairness to you, you did plead guilty to these offences at your first hearing in the Crown Court. Nothing was indicated in the magistrates’ court in terms of pleas but, having looked at the Better Case Management form, it appears that that hearing was not without its difficulties. You had not been produced at court from the police station, and your solicitor was unable to have any sort of meaningful conference with you. I was told today that an application to adjourn that hearing was made but was refused on the basis that the offences were indictable only in any event and so you had no meaningful part to play in the hearing. Whilst you may well have been responsible for that state of affairs on account of your behaviour, the fact remains that once you

appeared before the court in person with your counsel you pleaded guilty straight away. In the circumstances, I consider that plea to have been entered at the first reasonable opportunity and so you are entitled to a one third reduction in the sentence, thus reducing the overall sentence in this case to one of eight years' custody.

Dangerousness

48. That is not, however, the end of the matter as I need to go on to consider the question of dangerousness. In making that assessment, I have considered everything that I have heard, read and seen about the nature and circumstances of the present offending, as well as matters relating to your previous convictions, and matters relating to you. Matters relating to you include, but are not limited to, all which your counsel has said today as well as that which is recorded in the pre-sentence report to which I have referred.

49. The author of the pre-sentence report concludes, among other things, that you pose a medium risk of reconviction and a medium risk of further serious recidivism. As to the risk of serious harm, the author notes that you were

“...previously assessed and managed on his last sentence as a high risk of serious harm offender. That risk was primarily posed to members of the public, that included strangers, alongside staff at a law firm he had targeted, as well as lone females, due to his previous sexual offence. There were also concerns raised regarding racially aggravated offending, which indicated concerning attitudes towards certain groups. His records also highlight previous concerns regarding comments he made in supervision...which were of sufficient concern.”

50. The author continues:

“That risk was deemed heightened and most prominent when he is misusing drugs, especially cannabis to excess, as it impacts on his mental health, causing him to become paranoid and angry. His poor conflict management skills and

inability to regulate his emotions and anger were also deemed risk factors for him. I would concur with his previous risk of serious harm assessment to this group. At this stage, I do not intend to decrease his previous high risk of harm in this area as the defendant has demonstrated that he still prone to behaving in a highly aggressive and violent manner. Furthermore, the index offences are viewed as being a clear escalation in relation to seriousness, offending behaviour and potential harm posed.”

51. Based upon all that I have considered, I have reached what I consider to be the inevitable conclusion that there is a significant risk to members of the public of serious harm occasioned by the commission by you of further specified offences such that you are, within the meaning of the law, a dangerous offender.
52. I have considered whether the seriousness of the offences is such as to justify the imposition of a sentence of imprisonment for life but have concluded that it is not.
53. I have considered whether a standard determinate sentence is appropriate. If imposing such a sentence the least period of detention I could have imposed in all the circumstances of your case (including credit for your pleas of guilty) would have been one of eight years.
54. Such a sentence would not fully address the risk you currently represent, and I do consider it necessary to impose an extended sentence in order to protect the public in the future. The extended sentence is made up of two parts: a custodial period, which will be no longer than the eight-year period I mentioned, and an extended licence period of four years making an extended sentence of 12 years duration in total.
55. You will serve two-thirds of the custodial period in prison before the Parole Board will consider whether it is safe to release you, and if so on what terms. Once released, you will serve on licence any part of the custodial period which remains, and you will then be subject to an extended licence for a further period of four years.
56. If, when you are subject to licence, you commit another offence or fail to comply with the terms of your release, you are liable to be recalled to custody and may serve the entire sentence in custody.

57. The days which you have spent on remand in custody will automatically count towards the custodial term of your sentence.

Final Sentence

58. Accordingly, in relation to count 1 on the indictment, causing grievous bodily harm with intent, I impose an extended sentence of 12 years comprising a custodial period of eight years and an extended licence period of four years.

59. I impose a like sentence on count 2 to run concurrently.

Ancillary Orders

60. Insofar as compensation is concerned, there can be no doubt at all that both officers are entitled to compensation as a matter of principle for the injuries they have suffered as a result of what you did to them. However, even putting to one side the issue of your means (and I am told that you have nothing), this is not a straightforward case insofar as calculating the amount of compensation is concerned, not least because there are still some aspects of the injuries where it remains unclear as to when they will resolve. Having discussed the matter with both counsel, it seems to me that it is appropriate to leave the issue of compensation to another forum. I therefore make no award in that regard.

61. I am, however, required to impose the statutory surcharge in the sum of £228 which I do.

HHJ Grout
26 September 2025