



IN THE CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT

REX -v- NATHAN GILL

SENTENCING REMARKS

I direct that Count 1, Conspiracy to Commit Bribery, shall remain on file and shall not proceed absent the express authorisation of this court or the Court of Appeal.

I set the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 timetable as agreed between the parties and I impose the statutory surcharge.

Nathan Gill you were elected to the European Parliament to represent Wales, serving from 1 July 2014 until the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union on 31 January 2020. Initially affiliated with the UK Independence Party, which you led in Wales from December 2014 to 2016, you subsequently joined the Brexit Party and later assumed leadership of the Reform (UK) Party in Wales for a brief period commencing in March 2021.

The pertinent Code of Conduct for Members of the European Parliament emphasises that they must be guided by principles of disinterest, integrity, transparency, diligence, honesty, accountability, and respect for parliamentary dignity and reputation. Members are to act solely in the public interest, abstaining from the pursuit or acceptance of direct or indirect benefits or rewards.

On 26 September 2025, you entered guilty pleas to eight counts of bribery, contrary to section 2 of the Bribery Act 2010. Mr Heywood KC has set out the uncontested facts. Each count encapsulates specific incidents or periods between December 2018 and July 2019, during which, as an MEP, you agreed to accept monetary reward in exchange for the improper execution of your public duties.

The architect of these bribes was Oleg Voloshyn, a former pro-Russian Ukrainian MP and journalist. During your interactions, he and his wife were connected with the private Ukrainian television channel '112 Ukraine', owned by an associate of Victor Medvedchuk. It appears that in due course you joined the editorial board of that organisation. Medvedchuk, chairman of the 'Opposition Platform – For Life' pro-

Russian Ukrainian political party in 2018 and subsequently an MP, has since faced criminal allegations including of treason and looting of national resources in Crimea. He is a close friend of Vladimir Putin, Russia's President since 2012. Medvedchuk was the ultimate source of the requests and the money you received.

You were apprehended at Manchester Airport on 13 September 2021; your mobile device was confiscated, and you cooperated by providing its PIN, stating your journey to Russia was at the behest of a scientific conference in Moscow. Forensic analysis of your phone revealed extensive correspondence with Voloshyn from September 2018 to December 2020. The genesis of your relationship culminated in a visit to Kyiv in November 2018, when you toured 112 Ukraine's studios. Subsequently, Voloshyn solicited your participation in making statements within the European Parliament and to media outlets, for which you received payment. The statements advanced narratives advantageous to Russian interests concerning Ukraine. This was a period of considerable turmoil in Ukraine and a prelude to the full-scale invasion by Russia in February 2022.

Count 2: On 12 December 2018, you delivered a parliamentary speech, criticising Ukraine's purported undemocratic practices and suppression of press freedom. Ironically, your speech was meticulously scripted by Voloshyn, and you were remunerated for its verbatim delivery. You shared a video of the speech with Voloshyn, who praised your oratory; you replied, "*V should be pleased with this 3x what he thought,*" alluding to Victor Medvedchuk.

Count 3: On 5 February 2019, you gave an interview to 112 Ukraine, voicing concern over Medvedchuk's high treason allegation, as per Voloshyn's directive and using a list of talking points you requested from him. This was for a certain 'reward.' You referenced German MEP as a potential participant in the broadcast, noting he would not require 'rewarding'. Voloshyn, after consulting 'V', encouraged you to arrange the involvement of three MEPs, promising and later confirming a monetary reward of 5,000 euros. The interview, solely featuring you, aired under the headline "MEPs condemn criminal case against Victor Medvedchuk."

Count 4: On 6 and 7 February, you enlisted the MEPs for South West England, North West England and North East England, as well as the German MEP to give interviews to 112 Ukraine, at Voloshyn's request, adopting and in line with, a script he sent you. I must make it clear that the case has not been presented on the basis that any of those individuals knew the basis upon which you were acting, namely that you had been promised, altogether, '5k' for it. Voloshyn described your work as 'outstanding.'

Count 5: On 14 March 2019, following Voloshyn's proposition of a 'reward', you participated in a parliamentary debate concerning Kazakhstan. The underlying intent was to comment upon the Ukrainian election campaign. Employing Voloshyn's script, you claimed to have reliable reports of human rights watchdogs being concerned about growing challenges to democracy and you alleged governmental pressure on media, notably 112 Ukraine. Medvedchuk praised your 'brilliant' speech, and Voloshyn indicated a 'budget' was available for you, contingent upon the number of friendly MEPs you could muster for further supportive commentary with the promise of at least '5k' for your efforts. The subject matter was to be 'stability of gas transit through Ukraine' with praise for Medvedchuk and the Russian prime minister Dimitriy Medvedev, and Voloshyn supplied details of what was to be said.

Count 6: On 25 March, commentary from a French MEP was disseminated, followed by four others—three of them British—on 27 March. All followed the lines Voloshyn had fed you. Again, there is no evidence these participants, the MEPs for East Midlands, South West England and one who had already contributed, were aware of your pecuniary motivation. On 3 April, you received 5,000 euros and \$2,000 from Voloshyn. He told you Medvedchuk was boasting to his friends about the friendly words you had arranged for the MEPs to say.

Count 7: On 24 May, Voloshyn offered 2,000 euros for a television interview criticising the recently elected President Zelensky of Ukraine, questioning his commitment to pursuing a peace agenda with Russia and, by contrast, lauding Victor Medvedchuk's initiatives to find a compromise. You complied, and your interview was broadcast, with Medvedchuk describing your contribution as "brilliant and devastating for traditional establishment victory" Your enthusiastic reply was, "Thank you both. We have our work cut out."

Count 8: In late May and June, Voloshyn solicited your assistance in hosting Victor Medvedchuk at the European Parliament for the presentation of his 'Donbass peace plan' ahead of parliamentary elections in Ukraine in July. You agreed to be rewarded for inviting fellow Brexit Party members. The Donbass is an industrial heartland, rich in natural resources and Ukraine had declared it occupied by Russia in 2018. Voloshyn referred to \$13,000 he owed you and to having secured 4,000 euros he was bringing for you.

Count 9: Between 12 and 18 July, you agreed, in exchange for 'compensation', to facilitate positive commentary from MEPs regarding the pro-Russian channel NewsOne and its joint event with a Russian broadcaster. After 112 Ukraine's premises were damaged by a grenade launcher you were instructed to submit a written question

to the Vice-President of the European Commission and High Representative for Foreign Affairs, commending an urgent investigation of a 'terrorist' attack on the tv station. You acquiesced, submitting the question on 17 July, which was published on the Parliament's website.

Your subsequent communications with Voloshyn included requests for talking points and arrangements for new MEPs to make statements; Voloshyn acknowledged owing you for these endeavours. Your collaboration persisted after the UK's departure from the EU, with evidence indicating you received \$5,000 and 5,000 euros in Kyiv in December 2020, the maximum cash allowable for cross-border transport.

Voloshyn was intercepted by the FBI in Washington in July 2021 and sanctioned by the United States in January 2022. He was indicted for treason in Ukraine in February 2023. Victor Medvedchuk was placed under house arrest in 2021, eventually he was sent to Russia in September 2022 as part of a prisoner exchange.

You attended a police interview on 3 March 2022, responding "no comment" to all queries concerning the contents of your phone. Charged by postal requisition on 30 January 2025, you appeared before the court on 24 February. At a preliminary hearing on 14 March, you indicated not guilty pleas. You informed the prosecution of your intent to plead guilty to counts 2-9 shortly before entering those pleas on 26 September.

The statutory maximum for a single offence under s. 2 of the Bribery Act 2010 is ten years' imprisonment. No pre-sentence report was deemed necessary. I apply the relevant guidelines for the offence, for guilty pleas and for totality.

In evaluating culpability, I must consider your role and the sophistication of your offending. You abused a position of significant authority and trust, with your crimes spanning eight months, motivated by financial and political gain. The offending was sophisticated: you accepted payments from foreign nationals, made statements on important international matters at their behest, utilised scripted material presented as your own, and orchestrated the involvement of other MEPs. Your culpability is categorised as high, category A.

Mr Wright KC contends that the harm should be classified as category 2, arguing your actions had a significant but not serious impact on the European Parliament's proper functioning. The Crown asserts category 1 is applicable.

I agree with the prosecution. The harm inflicted is indeed, profound. Your conduct fundamentally compromised the integrity of a supra-national legislative body,

particularly in its dealings with Russia, a persistently hostile state, during a period of an Association Agreement between the EU and Ukraine reached in 2017. The revelation of your actions has a broad and deleterious effect on public confidence and trust in democratic institutions of importance to many dozens of millions of people. The aggregate financial gain, although difficult to quantify precisely due to the piecemeal and cash nature of payments, is substantial.

The sentencing guidelines prescribe a starting point of seven years' custody, with a range of five to eight years for a single offence. Given the imperative to signal deterrence and the multitude of high culpability factors, the gravity of this case elevates it to the upper echelons of the normal range, even before considering two additional features.

Firstly, the offending was persistent, rather than an isolated lapse of judgment. Secondly, the particularly egregious abuse of your position is exemplified in counts 4 and 6, where you enlisted other British MEPs without their knowledge of your financial motivation. Being careful to guard against double-counting for any feature, nonetheless, these factors warrant a substantial upward adjustment, and justice necessitates consideration of consecutive terms amounting to a total of at least sixteen years, exceeding the statutory maximum for a single offence, before mitigation.

There is scant personal mitigation. At 52 years of age, your previously unblemished character is of limited significance, as a clean record facilitates electoral success and thus the opportunity to perpetrate such offences. In character references you are described as a loving family man of deep faith who has demonstrated selflessness in public and private in the past. I have considered the impact of custodial punishment on your children. I must also reflect the mitigating effect of the passage of time since the offending and delays not attributable to your conduct. Weighing all the mitigation, I reduce the sentence by two years.

Thus, the aggregate sentence, prior to the mandatory reduction for your guilty pleas, is fourteen years.

The law compels a reduction proportionate to the stage at which you indicated your intent to plead guilty, reflecting your acceptance of responsibility and sparing the court and public the burden of a trial.

You pleaded guilty at the Plea and Trial Preparation Hearing, having made no admissions in police interview and initially indicated not guilty pleas. As already observed, the evidence is derived almost exclusively from your own mobile device, and the charges concern your agreement to accept money, rather than the content of

parliamentary and other utterances per se. After careful attention to the chronology, the Court of Appeal's guidance and the submissions, a 25% discount is appropriate.

Upon reviewing the case holistically and applying the principle of totality to ensure the sentence is just and proportionate, no further reduction is warranted.

When you were elected, you were entrusted to exercise independent judgment and uphold the highest standards of integrity—values of paramount importance. In seeking public office, one pledges to act in accordance with conscience and the public good. Parliamentarians wield significant influence over public and political discourse. It is incumbent upon them to speak with honesty and conviction, irrespective of whether their views are met with approval or dissent.

When you say what someone has paid you to say, you are not speaking with sincerity. If it were your genuine opinion, you would not need to be paid for saying it. Whether or not you believed any of what you said at the behest of Voloshyn and Medvedchuk, allowing money to corrupt your moral compass constitutes a grave betrayal of the trust vested in you by the electorate.

Your misconduct has ramifications far beyond personal honour, which is now irretrievably damaged. It erodes public confidence in democracy itself. When politicians succumb to financial inducement, the public can no longer rely on the veracity of political debate, which may be tainted by disinformation. The enlisting of fellow representatives into this activity compounds the wrongdoing, undermining the mutual trust essential to the proper functioning of democratic institutions. The corrosive damage to public life, caused by such actions, is enduring.

This Court regards bribery as a malignancy at the heart of public life, one that impoverishes the national interest. Those entrusted with public leadership are required to adhere to the highest standards of probity. The law will respond to such breaches with stern punishment, both to mark society's condemnation and to deter others from similar transgressions.

The sentence on count 2 is 5 years' imprisonment, the sentence on all other counts except count 4, is 5 years concurrent. The sentence on count 4 is 5 ½ years consecutive, making a **total sentence of 10 ½ years**. You will be eligible for release on licence after serving half the term and must abide by the conditions of the licence until the full sentence has expired.