

REX V. JAVON RILEY

SENTENCING REMARKS

1. On Monday 18th August, you were convicted of three counts of attempted murder and one count of causing grievous bodily harm with intent, and I must now sentence you for those offences.
2. On 29th May 2024, three men - Mustafa Kiziltan, Kenan Aydogdu and Nasser Ali were sat at a table on the pavement outside the Evin restaurant on Kingsland High Street, Hackney. A fourth man, Beytullah Gunduz, had been sat with them. He left about 15 minutes before the shooting took place. Kiziltan, Aydogdu, Ali and indeed Gunduz, are all affiliated to the so called 'Hackney Turks'. The shooting of those sat at the table was clearly a planned attack on members of a rival gang by you and others members of, or connected to, the so called 'Tottenham Turks'.
3. At another table inside the restaurant was sat a 9 year-old girl. Because of her age her name is not to be reported and I will refer to her as 'A'. She was sat with members of her family enjoying a dinner.
4. At 21:19 the first shot is fired. In the next two seconds five further shots are fired into the Evin restaurant at close range from a gunman sat on a Ducati motorcycle that had pulled up and positioned itself very close to the restaurant. An off-duty police officer was cycling along the High Street at the time of incident. A camera was recording as he was cycling and so it captures footage of the incident. Once the shots had been fired, the Ducati made its way to a pre-arranged rendezvous point where you were waiting to spirit the gunman away from the scene. Inevitably a shooting will draw a quick response from the public and police and so it was essential for the plan here to make sure those responsible were not easily detected.
5. This shooting was part of an on-going dispute between two rival groups in London: the so called 'Tottenham Turks' and the so called 'Hackney Turks'. As was set out in the trial, over the last ten years this on-going feud has seen a series of 'tit for tat' murders and attempted murders in London and overseas. In this case, your acts and those of the others involved,

mean that a 9 year old girl and her family will have to cope with the life changing injuries she has sustained through the mindless violence of others.

6. After the shooting, as part of the police investigation leading to your arrest, recordings were made of conversations you had when driving about in a Mercedes car belonging to your friend, Cheryl Gutzmore. The recordings capture you in conversation with other people in the car with you, or people you speak to by phone whilst you were in the car. When you gave evidence you said that some recordings were simply you speaking out loud to yourself. From the text of the recordings, whilst it might be the case that you are not a ‘Tottenham Turk’ yourself, you clearly knew of them and were linked to them.
7. CCTV footage shown in the course of the trial demonstrates this was a very carefully planned attack. Little if anything was left to chance. You carried out extensive reconnaissance of the site of the attack, and meticulous organisation went into what was to happen. The attack involved the use of a stolen Ducati motorbike. Two other stolen cars - a Nissan Juke and a Mitsubishi Outlander - were cloned so as to avoid easy detection, and then used to undertake reconnaissance as well as transport to and from the site of the shooting. The Ducati motorbike was abandoned and both of the other stolen vehicles were subsequently set alight so as to destroy evidence linking them to those who had been in the vehicles.
8. Immediately after the shooting you drove the gunman from a rendezvous point close to the Evin Restaurant, to north London. Once in the Enfield area you abandoned the stolen Nissan Juke and drove your own car, a Range Rover Velar. Specific ‘mission’ clothing was worn by you and the gunman and that clothing along with the gun was moved to the stolen Mitsubishi Outlander. The Mitsubishi Outlander was also set alight in the aftermath of the shooting. On one part of the CCTV footage that was found you drew attention to where you said the gunman can be seen moving a petrol can from the Range Rover to the Mitsubishi. You claimed the petrol can was empty. It is also of note that you were also to return to the Mitsubishi before it was set alight. You claimed it was to remove a phone you had left there.
9. Looking at the events on 29th May, and in the days leading up to it, your role was to do conduct significant reconnaissance of the area where the shooting was to take place, to check on timings, sight lines, assessing when all the intended targets would be present, the prospects for a good rendezvous point and how to make a good getaway. You spent significant amounts of time – amounting to many hours - in the area where the shooting took place. You sat at a table in a bar opposite Evin to check on fine details so as to make sure this attack would work.

10. After the shooting on 29th May, you reported your own car as stolen. You recruited a friend to move your car, the registration plates were changed and you intended your car, suitably disguised, would be shipped abroad so as to further distance you from involvement in this attack. In evidence to the jury you took some pride in being an effective and efficient robber – avoiding detection by police by only targeting drugs dealers and scammers in the robberies you undertook and also in being meticulous to ensure you left no traces to you. You claimed here you had agreed to take part in a robbery rather than a shooting. You said you got involved and would make significant financial gain. The meticulous planning seems to have let you down in one vital aspect. The Range Rover you reported as stolen was found by the police. You clearly did not expect that to happen as is clear from the recording of a police call made to you. The SIM card sited in your Range Rover Velar led to its recovery. The text of the recording of the phone call between you and PC Denton on 6th July when you were in the Gutzmore Mercedes is highly significant. You were clearly concerned about any DNA traces that might lead to you or to others involved in this shooting who had been in your car.
11. Of the four people shot in this attack, it was the 9 year old girl, A, who has been impacted the most. Aydogdu sustained a penetrating wound to his left thigh and a wound to the back of his lower left leg. He underwent surgery to his left leg. He was discharged from hospital on 31st May. Kiziltan refused police consent to his medical records. He underwent two operations to remove a bullet from his left upper thigh. Ali had sustained a gunshot wound to his right upper arm and an injury to his chest. He needed to have a chest drain and also to undergo an operation on his arm to pin the bone that had been fractured and to treat nerve damage. On 1st June he was stepped down to a trauma ward, where the wound to his chest was cleaned and sutures applied.
12. A, sustained a brain injury as a result of the gunshot wound. On the day after the shooting, she was admitted to Great Ormond Street Hospital where she underwent a complex surgical procedure. On 14th June 2024, she was transferred to Birmingham Children's Hospital so she could be closer to home. On 12th July 2024, she underwent further significant surgery. The bullet fragments were not removed. She was then referred for multidisciplinary neurorehabilitation. The main concerns were and remain to be, significant left side paralysis (hemiplegia), left visual field defect (hemianopia), cognitive impairment, including impulsivity and reduced concentration and fatigue with concentration and physical activities.
13. She was discharged home on 30th August 2024. Subsequently, she was admitted to the Children's Trust from 16th September 2024 to 8th December 2024, where she underwent in-

patient intensive neurorehabilitation. On 6 January 2025, she was seen at the neurorehabilitation clinic at Birmingham Children’s Hospital. She had shown further improvements. On 28th May 2025, Professor Rajat Gupta, Consultant Paediatric Neurologist, expressed the view she had made some good improvements both physically and cognitively since she presented with the severe brain injury from the gunshot. However, she continued to have a significant left side hemiparesis (weakness to one side of the body) and some cognitive difficulties. She also fatigued easily with concentration and physical activity. Professor Gupta’s opinion then was that she will continue to have physical difficulties, cognitive difficulties and increased fatigue throughout her life. He expresses the view that whilst she is still young, she will not be able to live independently as an adult and will probably require some assistance with daily living.

14. In terms of victim impact there is a moving statement from A’s parents written by her mother. In the statement she speaks of the profound cognitive and emotional difficulties their daughter faces. I quote from part of the statement:

“Our daughter’s joyful spirit remains, but it is now wrapped in layers of frustration and silent pain. She watches her friends do what she cannot and she carries it all inside with quiet strength. This tragedy did not just change our daughter’s life — it broke something in us as a family. Every time we see her struggle, we ask ourselves why we came here and what we could have done differently. The guilt and helplessness are unbearable. For us, the trauma is relentless. We live with constant fear about her future, unsure how much more she will lose as she grows. We grieve for the dreams we once had for her — dreams of music, sport, and a carefree childhood — all replaced by therapy sessions, hospital appointments, and adaptations for survival. We are doing everything possible to show her that her life is still full of possibilities, to make her believe there is nothing she cannot do, and to make her smile. But the mental and emotional trauma we carry every day is heavy — a constant fear for her future and a constant grief for the life she lost and the life we imagined as a family.”

15. The statement also speaks of the financial impact on the family unit. They have had to relocate and make adaptations to their home at a considerable cost to them. The statement refers to a figure of £40,000.

16. You are now aged 33. As you told the jury, you have been involved in the commission of numerous criminal offences – many more than set out in your antecedents. The antecedents start back in 2008, when there is a conviction for battery. In 2011, in the Crown Court at Wood Green for affray, a Community Order was made. Later in 2011, you were before the Magistrates' Court for using a vehicle whilst uninsured and possession of class A and B drugs. Fines were imposed. In 2013, in the Crown Court at Wood Green for possession of cannabis, cocaine and dangerous driving you were made the subject of a suspended sentence order. In 2015, for failing to comply with the terms of the suspended sentence, it was activated. In 2018, also for using a vehicle while uninsured a further fine and period of disqualification. Then in November 2018 for possessing offensive weapon in public and possessing a bladed article further custodial sentences imposed. Whilst those are the convictions recorded, in your evidence you admitted involvement in numerous high-value robberies and drug dealing. You claimed to be a very successful robber and drug dealer – having never been caught by the police as you chose to steal mostly from drug dealers and scam artists. Whilst I am not sentencing you for those matters, your admission of that offending is relevant to sentence.
17. I have seen and read a letter from the mother of two of your children. In her words she says she knows you: “.. *as a supportive, caring and responsible person.*” She describes you as a: “..*kind, protective and involved parent who always puts the children's needs first.*” She claims to be: “..*aware of the matters before the court, and while I do not seek to excuse them, I believe they do not reflect the man I have known for so many years. He has demonstrated to me that he is committed to being a positive role model and continuing to provide stability, love and guidance for our children.*” The evidence in this trial is very much at odds with that impression. The account you gave to the jury of being a serial robber - someone who spent their days stealing from others using or threatening to use violence when doing so - and a drug dealer. On your own account someone deriving significant income from violent crime. Presumably some of the financial support provided to your family over the years has come from criminal activity. If the author of this letter is in fact aware of the matters before the court, it is odd to think you a role model for your own children.
18. There are a number of other references that have been provided today. They include the mother of another of your children. Each of the writers speaks in similar glowing terms about you. As with the letter I have quoted, to me it is unclear that they know what you do to make your money and if they did, whether they would still have the same thoughts about you. Whilst people can have many sides to them, and you may have appeared to others differently, the letters might have had some weight if written in a more open and rounded way.

Sentencing guidelines.

19. For attempted murder, in terms of culpability the three counts of attempted murder all involve the use of a firearm. That is a characteristic suggesting very high culpability. You gave evidence about the £30,000 to £40,000 you expected to get from taking part in a robbery and an offence committed for financial gain is another characteristic for very high culpability. In my judgment significant planning went into the attack. Planning or premeditation of murder are characteristics of high culpability. Balancing all the factors here, in my judgment this is clearly very high culpability.
20. On harm, serious harm was caused to the three men. In my judgment this is within Category A as to culpability and Level 2 as to harm, the guidelines suggest a starting point for sentence of 30 years' imprisonment and a range of sentence of 25 to 35 years' imprisonment. It must be noted that would be for a single offences and a single victim and before any uplift for aggravating factors.
21. For count 5, the guidelines for causing grievous bodily harm with intent need to be considered. On culpability the offence would come within category A as there was a significant degree of planning, the victim was vulnerable due to age, there was use of a highly dangerous weapon, you had a leading role as a planner and spotter, and this was an act in revenge for previous incidents. On harm, this would be in the highest category too in light of the impact the injuries will have. On count 5 alone, a start point for the category of 10 years and a range of sentence of between 10 and 16 years. In line with my observations in terms of counts 1 to 3, this is before consideration of any aggravating factors.
22. In terms of aggravating factors applicable here, there are your previous convictions. Others were clearly put at risk as six shots were fired at close range into a public restaurant. There are the actions taken after the offence to conceal and destroy evidence. You were not the gunman and your role is one that I need to have in mind.
23. I am required to consider the issue of dangerousness. The test is this: is there a significant risk to members of the public of serious harm occasioned by the commission by you of further specified offences? In making that assessment, as well as taking into account all the information available about the nature and circumstances of the offences here, I may take into account any other information about you that is available. There is significant information

about you that you told the jury on oath: a pattern of committing as many as five robberies a month – robberies of not insignificant sums of money and drugs from others.

24. On conviction I considered whether a Pre-Sentence Report should be ordered. The Sentencing Act 2020, makes provision for those aged 18 or over, that the court must obtain and consider a pre-sentence report before forming the opinion on dangerousness unless, in the circumstances of the case, it considers that it unnecessary to do so. In my judgement a report was unnecessary due to the extensive account you gave in the trial as to your background, family situation, and lifestyle. Mr Smith did not seek to persuade me such a report was required notwithstanding that a discretionary life sentence may apply.
25. In the light of the facts of this case - a targeted shooting of rival gang members - and all that I now know about you, in my judgment the test is met, and by some distance.
26. Having come to that view, I have to consider the provisions of s.285 of the Sentencing Act 2020, and whether the seriousness of the offence, or the offence and one or more of the offences associated with it, is such as to justify the imposition of a sentence of imprisonment for life. If so, then I must impose a sentence of imprisonment for life. I have very much in mind what was said by Lord Thomas CJ in *Att.-Gen.'s Reference (No. 27 of 2013) Burinskas [2014] 2 Cr App R (S) 45*, that a life sentence remains a sentence of last resort. In my judgment the seriousness of the offences here is such that such a sentence is justified and should be imposed. The issue for me is the appropriate minimum term to be imposed. When it comes to the minimum term, I make plain that I am not ordering that you are released at the end of it: whether you will be released or not at that stage will be a matter for the Parole Board to consider. Only when the minimum term has been served can the Parole Board decide whether it is safe to release you or not. If the Parole Board does release you, then you will remain on licence and liable for recall for the rest of your life.
27. I note in passing that had the victims died, and you had been convicted of murder it is very likely this case would have been met with whole life orders being made.

Sentence.

28. In my judgment, taking into account the aggravating and mitigating factors I have identified, and reflecting the overall offending here – three counts of attempted murder and one count of wounding with intent - the appropriate determinate term would have been one of 51 years' imprisonment. Taking two-thirds of that notional determinate sentence as the appropriate figure to determine the minimum term, there will be a life sentence with a minimum term of

34 years. The days on remand, which I am told number 398 days, will count towards that sentence and so the minimum term will be 34 years less the 398 days.

29. On each of counts 1, 2, 3 and 5 there will be concurrent sentences of life imprisonment with a minimum term of 34 years less the 398 days [32 years 332 days].

30. I order the forfeiture of all the drugs and paraphernalia seized. A schedule has been compiled identifying those items. I have postponed determination of any financial orders so that consideration can be given to how best to deal with any cash and other assets found. For example, some £7,000 was found in searches. The matter will be listed in due course for any financial orders to be considered. As and when it is listed, I will also deal with the statutory surcharge.

The Recorder of London
His Honour Judge Mark Lucraft KC
Central Criminal Court.
London EC4M 7EH
12th September 2025