

**REX V. GEOFFREY BAULCOMB**

**SENTENCING REMARKS**

1. On 22<sup>nd</sup> April this year you pleaded guilty to allegations of distributing and making indecent photographs of children as well as the possession of extreme pornographic images. A few weeks later, on 6<sup>th</sup> June, you pleaded guilty to a separate allegation of causing grievous bodily harm with intent, and I must now sentence you for all those offences.
2. This case has connections to that involving Marius Gustavson before this Court last year, and in particular in May 2024 when Gustavson and a number of others were sentenced. On 30<sup>th</sup> April this year the Court of Appeal gave judgment (*Rex v. Gustavson and others* [2025] EWCA Crim 493) confirming the approach to be taken in cases of extreme body modification upholding the sentences passed in respect of those procedures carried out by Gustavson and five others.

Background.

3. Geoffrey Baulcomb, you are a former Church of England Vicar. You are also a long-time associate of Gustavson and a subscriber to his “Eunuchmaker” website. The police investigation shows that you and he were in regular contact over a period between 2015 and 2022. Gustavson’s number was stored in your phone as “Marius Burdizzo” – a reference to the name of a castration device Gustavson used on numerous occasions.
4. Messages passing between you and Gustavson include images of genitalia and show an interest in ‘chemsex’ and in particular the taking of ‘t’ or ‘tina’ – both slang terms for crystal meth, a Class A drug. In other messages Baulcomb, you describe your home address in Eastbourne using the acronym ‘FRC SSD’ said to mean the ‘Filching Road Clinic for Sexual and Social Deviants’.
5. You were also in contact with David Carruthers. Carruthers was sentenced to 11 years’ imprisonment for his offending in undertaking various extreme body modification procedures.

The image the subject of count 1 of the indecent images indictment, is of a 16 year old boy being harmed by Gustavson that you Baulcomb, send to Carruthers.

6. There are also links to others of the victims of Gustavson including a male referred to in the previous proceedings and here as TF. He was a former flatmate and victim of Gustavson. You paid for TF to have a tattoo of a eunuch on his arm.

**The investigation.**

7. Material from the investigation into Gustavson led the police to your home in Eastbourne in December 2022. It was suspected that, at your home in 2019, you had undergone an extreme body modification procedure – in your case a splitting of the penis.
8. When the police search took place on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2022, you put your phone in the toilet no doubt in a move to prevent what was on it being found. When recovered, the material on the phone was downloaded. The search of your home also led to the finding of a ‘Burdizzo’ clamp, surgical tools, needles, medical supplies, drug paraphernalia, bags of cannabis resin, a bag of crystal meth and a bag of ketamine. I note that you accepted a police caution in relation to those drugs.
9. In the police interview that took place after arrest you said you had taken crystal meth and that you didn’t want to die “without having experienced everything in life”. You said you were not an addictive person, but drug use is part of your interest in people. You said “.. *that’s part of my kind of thing with Theo. I can’t get my head around how he thinks and so in a way that made me concentrate on him and what he was doing, when I talk to him on occasions and he’s in Portsmouth or wherever he’s living he just seemed a kind of fantasist, saying things that were unbelievable*”.
10. You said you were very surprised that the police had come to you as part of the investigation and you claimed not to be connected with it. You also claimed, that no body modification procedures had taken place at your house, that no procedures were carried out on you and that the only procedures you witnessed were on the internet. As the material found on your phone demonstrates, all those assertions are untrue.
11. The count alleging that you caused grievous bodily harm with intent, involves you carrying out a procedure known as a meatotomy – enlarging the opening of the urethra – sometimes known as splitting the penis. A video recording was made of you carrying out this procedure.

The video is found on your phone. You are seen to cut open the head of the penis of DA, using a pair of nail scissors. This takes place on 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2020, at your home in Eastbourne. An earlier procedure in September 2019, was carried out by you. That first procedure was also recorded. It shows you placing a large Burdizzo clamp on DA's testicles. The clamp appears to be closed. You are naked and your full body tattoos can be seen. DA's right leg, groin, testicles and penis are visible. The recording is 18 seconds long. DA can be heard groaning.

12. There are then some significant exchanges of messages in the Autumn on 2019. Those messages are sexual in nature and lead to events in early 2020.
13. It is the procedure in January 2020 that is the subject of the indictment. It is recorded on a 9 second video by DA. The video shows you naked and kneeling on top of the bed, over DA's left thigh. As mentioned, a pair of nail scissors are used to cut the skin, and the head of the penis is split open. The wound immediately bleeds. DA can be heard to exhale and groan. The camera pans to the wounded penis before the video ends. The next day you sent a message to DA thanking him for a "fun night" and telling him "it was very enjoyable".

14. The exchange continues:

DA: *"Good Morning – I'm still high after yesterday's cut procedure"*

DA: *"No sleep tho at all, Auntie Tina (a reference to crystal meth) is definitely a diuretic – 7 times up for the loo but in fact this turned out to be a good thing. Every time I peed I naturally flushed my dick and each time showed how quickly Mr Cut Dick was healing"*.

DA: *So today I will take it easy and hopefully have a few naps. Will take a photo of healed Mr Cut later so you can see how far the FRC has progressed over the last few months.*

15. Mr Dawson, a Consultant Urologist, viewed the footage. He says that the division of the urethral meatus is a recognised surgical procedure used as a treatment for men with a narrowing of the urethral opening. The procedure is one normally performed in a hospital setting under a general anaesthetic. The area is cleaned, a small clip is placed into the tip of urethra and left on for a minute, the damaged tissue is then divided with scissors and sutured. As he observes, the procedure here was carried out without general anaesthetic, in an unsterile environment and for no recognised medical reason. He says that the main risk to the victim is bleeding or infection. Long term effects could include scarring and the ability to control the direction of the flow of urine.

**Indecent images.**

16. Count 1, covers your conduct in sending a version of an indecent video of 16 year old, JF, to Carruthers. You and Carruthers had been messaging each other between October 2019 and June 2021. Carruthers, is stored within your phone as “David Carruthers Zeusup”. The video was sent on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2020. It shows 16 year old JF with Gustavson who is electrocuting JF’s genitals and anus. The title of the video reveals that it was a ‘free to view’ video from Enochmaker.com. There are a number of relevant messages between you and Carruthers that show your interest in JF who you refer to as a young lad.
17. It would seem that your interest in JF doesn’t end with viewing and distributing this indecent video. You start to chat to JF via WhatsApp when JF is 19. The conversations are sexual in tone. JF asks you to castrate him because he is scared of Theo (meaning Gustavson). You offer to do other procedures.
18. 42 indecent images of children were found on your phone. Count 2, covers one image within Category A depicting a girl aged 13 giving oral sex to an adult male. Count 3 covers four Category B images. Three of those images are of a 16 year old boy, JF. Gustavson pleaded guilty to making and distributing these images which show him clamping the testicles of this 16 year old using a Burdizzo clamp. The fourth image is of another child showing an erect penis and another teenager or young adult licking it. Count 4 covers 37 images. 30 of those images are of the same child and the other 7, another child. There is a chat conversation between you and Gustavson relating to some of these images and also messages on other images of teenage boys.
19. Counts 5, 6 and 7 relate to extreme pornographic images found on your phone. There were 195 such images- some stills and some moving images. 182 of them portray in an explicit and realistic way, acts which resulted in, or were likely to result in, serious injury to a person’s anus, breasts or genitals; 5 images portray acts which threaten a person’s life, and 8 images portray a person performing an act of intercourse or oral sex with an animal. Some of the images include the removal of penises with knives and one has the Enochmaker logo on it. Another image shows a young man removing his scrotum with a sharp implement and on another, a woman severing a man’s penis.

**Sentencing Guidelines and authorities.**

20. As mentioned already in *Gustavson and others*, the Court of Appeal endorsed the general approach taken in relation to the sentencing for extreme body modification procedures. In sentencing the ten defendants I have dealt with to date, I have made reference to s.57 of the Sentencing Act 2020, and in particular to the issue of deterrence, and I restate that here.
21. On the s.18 offence, as in the previous cases, I need to consider culpability, harm, role and consent. Starting with culpability, there are some aspects of the offending here that might suggest this is within the highest category – including considering the implement used, and whether it should be considered a highly dangerous weapon or equivalent. As I observed when dealing with others before the court for similar offending, with any extreme body modification procedure, there has to be some significant planning or premeditation. Whilst I note that DA has not positively assisted the police investigation, that does not necessarily mean he is not a victim. In my judgment, this is a Category A case. It is primarily such based on the degree of planning and premeditation. The messaging shows this was something that had been spoken about. It involves the use of scissors which in the circumstances is highly dangerous on the facts and circumstances of this case.
22. In terms of your role, you undertook the procedure and did so in conditions far from being sterile and you are someone without any medical skills or training. In considering harm, in my judgment the activity here is either at the low end of category 2 or at the top of category 3. The procedure and the resulting injury is one that is serious. It is a permanent and irreversible procedure and may have long-term effects on the victim with risks of infection and the ability to urinate.
23. In my judgment it is an aggravating feature that the procedure was filmed. Whilst this is a feature specifically included in the aggravating features for offences in the sexual offence guidelines, it is not in the offence specific guidelines for causing grievous bodily harm with intent, but bearing in mind the obvious sexual nature of this offence, it is something that adds further to the seriousness of what took place. Whilst I accept DA consented to what took place, it is still a feature of the case of some significance.
24. In terms of other aggravating features, this was overtly sexual in nature and, as the messages make clear, drugs had been consumed.

25. Turning to factors reducing seriousness or reflecting personal mitigation, you have no relevant convictions, just a caution for possession of drugs, you are now aged 79 and were 74 at the time of the offence.
26. On the issue of consent, as before, I propose to reflect that element in the sentence imposed by a measured reduction for that aspect of the case.
27. The s.18 offence requires consideration of the issue of dangerousness. I will return to this issue when I turn to the pre-sentence report.
28. Turning to the relevant guidelines for the indecent images of children, count 1 relates to the distribution of a single Category B video where the start point is 1 years' custody and the range of sentence 26 weeks to 2 years custody. Count 2, the possession of a single Category A image, a start point of 1 year and a range of sentence between 26 weeks and 3 years custody. Count 3, the possession of 4 Category B images and a start point of 26 weeks custody and a range of a high level community order to 18 months' custody.
29. In terms of aggravating features there is the chat between you and JF, albeit he is an adult when that conversation takes place. The video also shows JF in some distress.
30. For counts 5, 6 and 7 there are no offence specific guidelines. On count 7, the maximum sentence is one of 2 years' imprisonment and with counts 5 and 6, it is 3 years' imprisonment.
31. This conduct is separate to the conduct in the s.18 offence, and consecutive sentences may be appropriate. If consecutive sentences are appropriate, I must have regard to the overall totality of sentence.

### **Pre-Sentence Report [PSR]**

32. A detailed PSR dated 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2025, has been prepared. I express my thanks to the probation officer for her detailed analysis. When interviewed for the report you sought to distance yourself from what you had done and to downplay the significance of your offending or the vulnerability of those who had had procedures carried out on them. I note what is said about it being difficult to appreciate your assertions of having no sexual interest in children when that is looked at in the context of the various chats you had with Gustavson. The report reads: “ *Therefore, whilst Mr Baulcomb is keen to present himself as intellectually interested in Mr Gustavson and his activities, it seems that he had his own sexual motivations, which are*

*perhaps at odds with the image he presented to the world and his image of himself, and seems likely to be linked to feelings of shame. “*

33. From the report I note that you seek at various times to seek to minimise the potential for harm in what you were doing and display a real lack of understanding as to the impact of your offending. I note what is set out on page four of the report about the indecent images that were found. As I observed in the course of the hearing, the extreme pornographic images here are concerning.
34. In terms of the issue of dangerousness, the test is whether there is there a significant risk to members of the public of serious harm occasioned by the commission by you of further specified offences? I have considered all the material before me. I do not find the test to be met.

#### **Mitigation.**

35. There is a detailed sentencing note and I am grateful to Mr Gowan for that note and his helpful submissions as to sentence. I have read that and will take the personal matters set out there into account. There is also a bundle of references about you from family and friends as well as some personal medical information.
36. In the letters of reference, those who have written about you speak warmly and highly about you and your many qualities. It is clear that many have been assisted by you over the years. I suspect that some who know you will be deeply shocked by some of your conduct that has been outlined in the course of this hearing. Friends and family stand by you and make clear their love for you.
37. Mr Gowan invites the Court to give consideration to the custody threshold and the imposition of a suspended sentence order. I am very much aware of the impact that a sentence of immediate custody can have – and in particular those with conditions such as those you have and age. If it has to be immediate custody, then he asks the court to impose the least sentence on in the light of all the factors here.

#### **Sentence.**

38. For the s.18 offence, the procedure of splitting of the penis, the starting point for sentence, allowing for all the identified aggravating and mitigating factors of the offence as set out, but

before considering the impact of consent, would be one of 5 years' imprisonment. A sentence of that level is the starting point for a case with culpability A and harm category 3, and in my judgment best reflects this offending and allows for the aggravating and mitigating features identified. As indicated earlier, harm may fall between category 2 and 3 and I have adopted the position most favourable to you in light of the facts set out. Next, making allowance for consent, I reduce the sentence to be within the range for lesser culpability, 4 years' imprisonment. Giving credit for your plea at 25%, and making allowance for the personal mitigation advanced, in my judgment the least sentence that can be imposed on the s.18 matters is a sentence of 2 years' 6 months' imprisonment.

39. Turning to the indecent image offences, on count 1, distribution a video, and making adjustment and allowance for overall totality, your age and the period that has elapsed since the offending, a sentence of 6 months to be consecutive to the sentence of 2 years' 6 months' imprisonment on the s.18 offence making a total sentence of 3 years' imprisonment.
40. On counts 2, 3 and 4, 3 months on each count and on counts 5, 6 and 7, 4 months on each count. Those sentences are to be concurrent to each other and to the sentence of 3 years' making the total sentence one of 3 years' imprisonment. You are likely to serve just under one half of that sentence and then be released on licence for the remainder of the sentence. Whilst on licence, you must comply with the terms of that licence: at any time it may be withdrawn and your return to custody ordered.
41. As the statutory surcharge applies in this case, the appropriate orders will apply and can be drawn up. I order the deprivation of all the items listed in the schedule that has been provided to the court.
42. Sexual offender registration follows automatically following the conviction on the indecent images indictment.

The Recorder of London  
His Honour Judge Mark Lucraft QC  
Central Criminal Court.  
London EC4M 7EH  
1<sup>st</sup> September 2025