

IN THE CROWN COURT AT AYLESBURY

Between:

R

V

ANDREW GEORGIU

SENTENCING REMARKS

24th March 2026

1. Andrew Georgiou, you are to be sentenced for the murder of Carol Georgiou on 2nd November 2024.

Carol Georgiou in life

2. Carol came from a large extended family. She was the second of five sisters. Words cannot explain the depth of loss felt by her parents, her sisters and her children, your children, Reece and Jamie, and the wider family.
3. The court has heard brave, sad and very moving accounts from eight victims closely affected by Carol's loss, from her sisters, parents, and very importantly from her sons.

4. Carol has been described as a wonderful mum, sister and friend, a person who was fun and outgoing, empathetic and caring, glamorous and attractive. She would often light up a room, or bring excitement to an outing. She was the fun and happy mother, finding joy in small things. She was her sons' biggest supporter and cheerleader. She shared with her sisters the chaos, delight and glory of happy times in a noisy extended family.
5. You brought all of that to an end by your cruel actions. Now for the family she has left behind, the silence is deafening. No sentence could possibly meet the extreme gravity of taking this young life, with so much in Carol's own future still to look forward to, the milestones in her childrens' future they hoped she would share.

Background

6. You met each other in 2000 and had two children together Reece and Jamie Georgiou. You lived happy lives together as the children were in primary school. You were working as a delivery driver. Carol did not work at that time, being focused on supporting you and bringing up the children. You brought in the family money and managed the major elements of the family finances. You were proud of your achievements together and were keen to move into more comfortable surroundings when you felt you could afford it. In retrospect you were probably more driven to move on and up than she was, and you probably did not understand that this may not have been entirely right for Carol or the children.
7. By all accounts 2017 was a difficult time for you both. Carol was then aged 35 and you were 36. The children were around 9 and 13. At the beginning of the relationship she had confided in you that she had been the victim of offending against her as a child, well before you were together. In this year 2017 her perpetrator came to trial and Carol supported the prosecution. She found it intensely difficult. She was conflicted about giving evidence, but also about bringing things up from her past. Everyone would understand if she did not articulate her needs at this time, but the fact was that she felt that you had disengaged during this critical time and you had not supported her as she would have wished. Your relationship deteriorated and although there were many good

moments thereafter, her feelings of abandonment by you during this period remained something that persistently undermined the relationship. Being less engaged with her, you perhaps did not appreciate this at the time, or understand the depth of her discomfort.

8. Over the succeeding years your relationship came to have more snags over its future and direction, over day to day issues like respect, and also physical issues between you, where each of you probably felt rejected at different times. Your sons picked up on this. Both provided accounts of the deterioration in your relationship. There were issues as to managing money. You held the belief that she liked to spend and could not save, and she felt that your frugality was limiting to you and her, and that you would only give her full respect if she got a job.
9. Carol kept a diary, she was in contact with her five sisters. She went to counselling. She also kept WhatsApp messages between herself and sisters and with you. A reasonable picture emerges of the public and private Carol during several years in which broadly she had not been happy.
10. By 2023 she was very conflicted. At the age of 40 she was reflecting on her married life, her parenting, her future, and your role in it. Her texts make clear that she had loved you very much and to a large extent still did, she respected your role as a father, was physically very attracted to you, but that years of what she perceived to be your emotional absence had undermined her confidence in herself, and in you as a partner for the future.
11. Her writings to others – and frequently to you as well - make clear that she felt there were times when you had belittled her, sometimes in public, and gave her insufficient time, consideration or respect. She felt you were sexually attracted to other people and this made her doubt your attraction to her. As time went on she felt she could not live up to your expectations. She felt she had become invisible and inaudible to you. She questioned your financial management and priorities, and she reflected back on happier times and places in your life together where you had lived happily and simply without taking on commitments, like the new house, that were hard to meet and which stressed you both.

12. It was in this swirling context that she returned to the question whether the two of you should split up. This had first emerged in her diary entries in 2017 but came to be a subject that arose from time to time especially in late summer of 2023 when your house was already on the market, you were contemplating potential redundancy and the possibility of a relocation. It seems that you had discussions together about separating, and although this was not resolved it left both of you feeling vulnerable and apart, looking outwards from the relationship in some trepidation at the prospect of starting over again.
13. You were both parts of very close knit extended families. It is the nature of families that there are challenges at different times for individuals and couples within it. Inevitably everyone came to know of your difficulties and at these times your respective families were both a support and, sometimes, an additional challenge. You were both very sensitive to letting your respective families down. I say respective families, but in practice you were close to both sides of the family – they had welcomed you into their family, loved you, and treated you as a son. Your parents were close to Carol. The extended family was close knit, bonding in particular around your own two children and their many cousins. You also had a wide circle of lifelong friends who supported each of you in their different ways.
14. The residual evidence of discussions between you about separating do not reveal anything that was especially heated. This may or not have reflected your conversations face to face. The written texts and WhatsApps were sad, low key and rather mundane. Much focused on future living arrangements for Reece and Jamie, and financial arrangements for you and Carol, and the turmoil that a separation would bring to your own lives and those around you. At that time you both seemed quite fed up, and neither of you felt inclined to fight for the relationship. You seem to have recognized that it had run its course and gone rather cold. With the house already on the market you began to live separate lives. This was halting and uncomfortable for both of you, adapting to a different way of engaging around each other and around the children.
15. Months after discussions of separating, but before it could be achieved in practice, you were spending some time apart. This brought tensions and

sometimes recriminations as you each asserted your independence, however hesitantly. You went out without telling her where you were going or when you would come back. Carol herself set out on a new path.

16. In around November 2023 she resumed contact with an old friend of you both and it developed haltingly into an affair. This was quite limited – it involved only a smattering of texts and a few encounters together over the course of the next 10 months or so.
17. Those who knew Carol, and her attraction and devotion and loyalty to you over the previous years of your relationship would have been shocked and surprised by her behaviour with anybody outside your marriage. Carol feared that her family would find it difficult to understand or condone any kind of affair, let alone one with Dan Jarvis – who was well known to several members of the family. This helps to explain why the evidence suggests she was racked with soul-searching, doubt and guilt over these months. But she was also able to recognize the reality - which she acknowledged privately - that her actions, completely out of character as they were, stemmed from a thirst for something that was missing at that stage of the marriage. She felt Dan listened to her, and was available to her, in a way that you were not.
18. You were seriously upset at this time. You may have contemplated suicide – you certainly spoke about it - and there may have been a time when you were drunk and were thinking of taking an overdose when Carol found you. You were sufficiently troubled to go to your GP and describe your despair. You were referred to talking therapies. Whether this genuinely reflected mental turmoil or whether it was a way of seeking more attention from Carol is unclear.
19. You were certainly both considering your futures. At one point towards the summer of 2024 Carol proposed a holiday together to reset your relationship but it did not happen and she said she would travel instead with friends to Benidorm. In fact, unknown to you, or indeed her travelling companions she met up with Dan while she was abroad, and whilst he was there with his son. She posted pictures from Benidorm, as you would have expected, but you became aware that Dan had done so as well. You put two and two together. This shocked and upset you. On her return she explained that she had had a chance

encounter with him at the airport, but that they were not together. Although you did not say so at the time, you did not believe her. In the uncomfortable lives you were living under the same roof together – you had already offered to sleep in the box room and she agreed - you decided to find out more about what was going on. You installed a tracker on her car and put a security camera you had in the back garden into the roof space looking into the bathroom and bought another for the living room through the TV.

20. Within a short time of your surveillance, you realised that Carol had indeed spent time away, that she had stayed in a hotel, and that she was seeing her new friend. You phoned the hotel purporting to be Dan, confirming the reservation in his name and enquiring how many beds in the room. You followed her on a date and saw for yourself it was romantic and it was indeed your friend Dan.
21. The following day you confronted her, claiming a false backstory as to how you were in the vicinity. On this day you were hurt and upset. You had swapped the bedrooms around upstairs, putting Carol in the box room and a lock on the main bedroom door. There was the main bathroom for her to use, and a shower over the bath that did not work well. Your actions came from hurt. They were designed to make her feel bad. Snippets of the conversation were picked up by your living room camera. It was matter of fact rather than angry, and you were saying then that you wanted this moment and her affair to pass and that you wanted to get back together with her. As part of this strategy you put moral pressure on her by sharing your discovery with her sisters by text – something you knew would be acutely distressing and embarrassing to Carol – and you publicly declared that you wanted to continue with the relationship despite everything. You told the children about what she had done. You filed for divorce, probably to try to call her bluff, and to get her to call off the affair with Dan.
22. To start with it seemed that this strategy might work. The reaction Carol feared was that no-one would speak to her. She was wrong. She was supported, but the shock of her behaviour, especially having an affair with Dan, did provoke at least one of the people close to you both to react with surprise and consternation. She was profoundly upset and apologetic to you and to others. She blocked Dan

from sending messages.

23. The public revelation of the affair was one element of a complete change in your behaviour towards Carol. Up until then you had stewed in silence. You were now publicly fighting for the relationship to continue. You took her out on dates, you gave her more compliments, you asked her how you should be with her. Although she appreciated the attention and compliments, she found them uncomfortable. At this time she was depressed and anxious, and continued to do herself down, whether as to her conduct with Dan or her appearance and weight, or having let you and the boys down. Partly she felt she did not deserve your attention, partly she felt she had always deserved it and it was long overdue, and another part of her felt she did not want it.
24. The reason was that she had come to the view that you had let her down so frequently and so deeply in the past that she simply did not believe that your new-found behaviour would last in the long term. Your protestations to her and to her family about your own feelings fell rather flat. She confided in her counsellor that she was confused and upset by the situation but ultimately had a firm wish to move out of the relationship. By now in October 2024 the house had been on the market for 18 months or so, but with new agents and a new price an offer was made. Things were moving towards a full separation. There had been pleasant evenings with each other but events were moving on.
25. Looking back, you have come to accept many criticisms of your behaviours during the marriage. The reality is that you woke up to those realities only when you saw Carol being wanted and admired by another man. This spurred you to being more of the husband that she needed in the years when you were becoming more distant. Rather than being too little, too late, your attentions in the final weeks were probably too much and too late.

1st November 2024

26. On Friday 1st November 2024, the day after she had confided in her private counsellor – unknown to you - that she really was resolved to move on, you decided to go into MK together and have an evening at a club. You both drank a lot, she more than you, and she seemed to be unsteady on her feet as she came

back into the house with you. On your return at around 1.50am you both went to the toilet and when you emerged you found that she had put the hot tub on which was in the garden and she was in it. By now it was after 2am and your children were asleep upstairs. You joined her. Perhaps you hoped for some physical intimacy – this had continued sporadically during the period.

27. Audio from a neighbouring Ring doorbell shows that you conversed quietly together, at some point she was heard making laughing noises, consistent with a relaxed and comfortable night together. Although a transcript has been made of individual words that can be made out at different times, it is quite impossible to piece together a conversation, or which utterances might have had some significance. True, it might be possible to make out the words ‘we’re done’ being said at some point, but whether this was the start or the end of a conversation, or what it might have referred to, is unknown.

28. The reality is that whatever was said there do not appear to have been raised voices, no angry argument. It would appear that Carol was secure and relaxed with you until the moment when unexpectedly, without any obvious provocation and without any significant premeditation, you chose to submerge her and to hold her below the water for long enough to drown her. The audio records splashing at about 0217 for several minutes, then silence. You had killed her.

Taking stock

29. I have set out this narrative at some length. It seems to be important to do so not least because I am asked by the prosecution to say that the context of the killing was some level of abusive, controlling and coercive behaviour going back several years. Mr Panayi KC put forward submissions over the course of a full court day based on evidence going back to diaries and WhatsApp messages from 2017. For myself I accept that you certainly behaved badly at times, well at others, but I note that you did not put Carol in fear of violence on any previous occasion. Your use of force to kill her was the first time you had ever used or threatened force on her in the twenty years of your acquaintance, and marriage. This will have made your actions all the more shocking to your victim. It is fair to say that you were a hard-working husband, receiving the bulk of the money

coming in to the family and you tended to control finances. To gain more independence and strength in the relationship Carol had decided for herself to take a job. The evidence suggests that you encouraged her to do so and supported her as she did it. You did not coerce her into doing it or seek to control her by restricting her choices. This was a time of strain for both of you as you yourself faced the prospect of compulsory redundancy, and the possibility of a move to a different city.

30. During this time, as Mr Panayi KC fairly conceded on behalf of the prosecution, there was no doubt about the warmth in certain of the messages between you. He accepted that it was a complicated separation. He did not suggest that your behaviour would ever have met the statutory definition of the term.
31. Turning to the events around the time you were suspecting your wife to be having an affair, it is undeniably true that you tracked her and eavesdropped on her for a period and for a specific purpose. You suspected, rightly that she was having an affair and was not telling you the truth about what was going on. Your actions were certainly an invasion of her privacy, both as a person within her home and a person able to choose for herself how she spent her time. Your recording from a hidden camera in the living room of conversations, and indeed of sexual intimacy between you, was also a gross and unsavoury breach of trust. It may well have constituted a free-standing criminal offence, but it was not the offence of controlling or coercive behaviour.
32. It suffices to say that I have looked carefully at every submission made by each side about your behaviours, I have considered your basis of plea and your own counsel's carefully reasoned objections, and I certainly cannot say to the required standard that your conduct, upsetting as it was to Carol at various points, comes anywhere near this description. It seems to me that there are other important factors in arriving at the appropriate sentence, but not this.
33. I note in passing that I am required by the Mental Health guideline to consider whether there is anything in your mental state leading up to this crime to diminish your culpability for your behaviour. Whilst you were upset and probably rather depressed, there is nothing in that to impact your culpability or responsibility for what followed.

34. Ultimately, this sentencing exercise must focus on the fact that this killing took Carol's life and was the ultimate means by which you took away her autonomy once you understood her resolute wish to leave. In addition, any sentence must take into account your appalling conduct immediately after your actions in killing Carol, your deceit to emergency services, your family, your boys in particular and in due course to the police investigating the case, to your lawyers and to the court. I will come to those features now.

Aftermath

35. I return now to the events in the early hours of 2nd November. Nobody suggests that the killing was significantly premeditated. There is no evidence to suggest you were contemplating this action any significant time before it occurred. You may yourself have been shocked at your sudden and uncharacteristic outburst of destructive and violent behaviour, but very swiftly it was replaced with a clear-headed focus on avoiding detection. In particular:

- a. You moved around the house repeatedly for about 15 minutes. You seem to have remained immobile for a further 15 minutes. There is no evidence you came to the assistance of Carol at any stage during this time. You say you do not remember ever having tried to do so.
- b. You did not call emergency services for 40 minutes, and then you told them you had found Carol Georgiou unconscious in the hot tub. Paramedics arrived, noting that you were not attempting CPR. You told them the same story. Your children aged 20 and 17 woke up and became aware of their mother's death. In due course you told them the same account.
- c. Even before leaving in the ambulance you were seen accessing your phone, apparently removing access by the Tapo app to both the cameras you had installed. At some point, whether then or later, you also removed the physical camera in the living room. It has never been recovered.
- d. At hospital you said that you had passed out and found her when you came to. You embellished this again, until a fuller narrative emerged –

throughout 2nd to early part of 3rd November. It is fair to describe this as a cynical, dishonest tale of a natural, sudden and unexplained drowning. It was a calculated attempt to mislead everyone around you.

- e. Your story needed to develop, however because in the light of day it became apparent that you had obvious scratches to arms and face and forehead. You were to say these related to work, or a fall on arriving at home. The truth was that these were apparently injuries caused by Carol in the course of your attack on her. Her sisters were rightly suspicious and one called police.
- f. On Sunday 3rd November you took your sons to Carol's sister, Sarah Eldridge. DS Jarrett telephoned you there and asked you to come to 8 Holywell Road to speak to him. In fact you had already seen police arriving at your home on the Tapo app. Rather than go and meet him you left instead to go to a 14 storey hotel in MK and said that you would commit suicide by jumping off a balcony. This was probably your intention at the time and you very nearly went through with it. Having been talked down from doing so you returned home and continued to assert your innocence to your sons, Carol's sisters, your own siblings and your parents. You maintained this even after you were charged with Murder in June 2025. You prepared to fight a trial on the basis of a lying defence. Only in December 2025, after the first listing of trial had had to be aborted because your defence team were not ready for trial, did you indicate that you would plead guilty on a full facts basis.

Defence submissions and position paper

- 36. You provided a basis of plea describing your behaviour. You set out what was called a position paper. Although there were extensive submissions about this from both sides it is simply unnecessary to resolve all the issues that have been raised, save to say that if I were to conclude that anything in your basis of plea were incorrect I would have to do so on the basis that it was either obviously unworthy of belief, or that I was satisfied so I was sure that it was false. Neither side has sought to call any evidence on any such points, simply presenting rival submissions on the written material contained in the sentencing bundle.

37. I have considered all this with care. In short I do not consider the evidence available to me to be sufficient to make any further adverse findings against you. I will proceed to sentence on the basis you set out. Of course that has to be considered in the context of sometimes unsavoury behaviour in the period prior to the killing which you accept, and other appalling behaviour thereafter which again is documented and unchallenged.

Aggravation

38. There can only be one sentence for murder and I will impose a sentence of life imprisonment. I must set the minimum term to be served. The starting point for sentence in a case of this type is a minimum term of 15 years. It is important not to double count any factors that are already taken into account in categorising this case as having that starting point. For example, as your basis of plea accepts, at the point that you applied force to Carol, you intended to kill her. This is not the case in every murder, because intention to cause really serious harm is enough. Your concession in this case is therefore very important. This puts to rest any notion that the killing arose as a consequence of something that was intended to be less destructive. By your guilty plea you have owned your behaviour and the intent that went with it. However this element, intention to kill, is taken into account in the starting point and therefore cannot itself aggravate the sentence beyond that figure.

39. I consider that the central elements of aggravation which are not already contemplated in the starting point are these.

- a. This was killing as a manifestation of domestic abuse. That is, the killing was of a female by her husband, when she was in her own home, where her children were sleeping upstairs. She was entitled to feel safe. She was entitled to trust you not to harm her. Her defences were down, she was not anticipating any kind of an assault. You abused that trust and took advantage of her vulnerability at that moment. The Domestic Abuse guideline reminds the court that this context makes the killing significantly more serious, not less serious, than it would have been otherwise. This element is not taken into account in the starting point and must significantly aggravate the sentence, in accordance with the

Domestic Abuse guideline and subsequent authorities.

- b. One aspect of this is that, suspecting her to be having an affair, you tracked her and observed her over a period. Your domestic relationship made that easier than otherwise it would, and you spied on her in her most intimate moments. I am satisfied this was for no other reason but for the power it gave you. In doing so you were responsible for a gross breach of her privacy and of the most intimate trust that she had placed in you as part of your relationship together.
- c. The murder was clearly linked with Carol making clear that your intimate personal relationship was coming to an end. You had sought to persuade and indeed apply moral pressure on her to resume the relationship with you, seeking to engage her sisters and your own children in that process. As I have indicated earlier, your murder of her was the ultimate means by which you took away her autonomy once you understood her resolute wish to leave. This gives further focus, without double counting, to the domestic element I have just referred to.
- d. Your victim was vulnerable in that she was intoxicated and naked and within the hot tub at night, making it more difficult in practice to respond to your assault. Once again these are matters that must not be double counted with the vulnerabilities inherent in the domestic nature of the case, but I do consider that they amount to additional and separate matters of aggravation in fact. The reality is that if your assault had been on a fully dressed sober woman elsewhere in her home in day-time, it might not have had the awful result it did.
- e. As to the killing itself, although it is submitted by the defence that this was not violence beyond that which was necessary to kill, the court is entitled to consider the means chosen to kill and the mental and physical suffering inflicted before death. The fact is that the nature of this particular killing was brutal. That your victim fought back is evidenced from the scratch injuries you sustained to your face, your head and to your arms. The physical effort required to hold a fighting person underwater for sufficiently long to kill them is sufficiently unusual in

my view to require an upward adjustment from the starting point. Unlike authoring a single stab wound to a victim you had time during the course of the physical struggle to reflect, to pause and to desist. The fact is that this was a sustained assault, and the suffering you caused continued for many minutes. At the time it occurred, with Carol held below the water, and occasionally gasping for air, the two of you will both have realised that this was behaviour that could only have had the single intent of bringing about her death. There could have been no possibly ambiguity about that. Carol met her death knowing this was the wish of the person she had chosen to live with, have children with and to whom she had given her most intimate trust.

- f. The presence of your children in the house is an aggravating factor. Both Jamie, who was a child at the relevant time, and Reece Georgiou were present in the home at the time of the murder, and were woken by the arrival of paramedics. Reece saw his mother deceased and under paramedic treatment. The adverse effect upon the sons caused by the murder of their mother by their father significantly aggravates the offending.
- g. A further element to consider is the additional and unnecessary harm caused to your children by your actions immediately after the killing and in the many months that followed. You lived with your children under their own roof for a further period of months, lying to them on a day-to-day basis by asserting your innocence to them. You apparently had no compunction about doing so. The impact on each is significantly exacerbated by knowing that they lived with you for many months not realising they were living with the man who had killed their mother. You have described your own behaviour in killing their mother as leaving a “forever scar” on each young man. It is difficult to imagine how this could have been made any worse or more horrific for them, but the behaviours you chose to adopt after doing this terrible deed could only have deepened this scar still further.
- h. Finally I consider your specific behaviours on the night in positively

obstructing the police investigation and laying a false trail. Your initial instinct was for your own protection and to positively obstruct a proper investigation. You made concerted efforts to do so on the night itself, even as Carol was being taken into the ambulance, including disposing of one of the cameras, and deleting access to the cameras from your telephone. In the aftermath you took steps to cover your tracks, to destroy evidence and to mislead police in multiple ways. Long after you denied your crime in your two police interviews, you provided a DCS that detailed your innocence. It emerged that you had created a wholly self-serving paper trail of lies, including fictitious diary entries, to support your false defence. When it emerged, later, that Carol had a previously undiagnosed heart condition, you enthusiastically latched onto that on the basis that she may have drowned as a result of a cardiac event, rather than as a result of your assault upon her, delaying a resolution by aborting the first trial listing.

40. Ms Dempster KC submits, in opposition to this latter point, that your lack of candour is not to be treated as an aggravating matter, and that you are not to be criticised for testing the prosecution's case, because that is your right. She is undoubtedly correct at least in principle to say it was your right to test the prosecution's case, however your repeated and ever more inventive lies went far beyond simply testing the prosecution account. They amounted to a calculated and long-term deception and whether it is something which aggravates the seriousness of the offence, as I consider it does, or undermines aspects of your mitigation as she acknowledges it might, it is an element which must be considered in assessing the appropriate sentence – albeit it should be included once, and without double counting.

Mitigation

41. Turning to mitigation, you are now 45.
42. Ms Dempster KC refers to your basis of plea that suggests you are deeply remorseful. She acknowledges that remorse is late coming. I respect your basis of plea, but I consider that any remorse, although welcome, is very late in coming. The following points were submitted:

- a. Firstly, as to the events of the night immediately after the killing. No doubt the action was profoundly shocking to you, and since it had arisen spontaneously, you did not immediately have a strategy for how to behave thereafter or how to deal with the consequences. You might have chosen to try to resuscitate your wife, to treat your wife's dead body with dignity, and given the reality of the fact you had killed her, to minimise the immediate distress for your children. In a moment when considered remorse would have been most valuable to those who loved Carol and were devastated by her loss, you did none of these.
 - b. You purported to try to kill yourself by jumping off a tower block. This might have been considered as an obvious expression of total remorse if you had not told police who came to your aid, at personal risk to themselves as they prepared a winch to bring you to safety, that the truth would emerge and would exonerate you when the coroner had finished his findings. Had you died at that stage - you were balanced precariously on a narrow ledge at that point - your children would have been left mourning both their parents, believing wrongly that you were not responsible. This was cowardly, self-serving and manipulative. If there was any remorse in your mind it was not until long after this moment.
 - c. Your own close relatives do now describe you as fully remorseful, at least in the last weeks and months awaiting sentence and I accept this is their genuine view. I am mindful, however, of the fact it would appear that every one of those who provided character references and who spoke up for you were themselves deceived by you for over a year.
 - d. Finally, I am mindful that you have written a helpful and insightful letter expressing your guilt, shame and shock at the consequences of your behaviour.
43. Taking all these matters together, I consider the evidence of remorse is relatively recent and somewhat shallow, and so the court must look to other elements if it is to find significant mitigation. Three elements in particular are relevant:

- a. You were of previous good character. In particular there is no history of violence or the threat of violence whether inside or outside the relationship. Testimonials from your family express utter shock at your behaviour, they condemn it very rightly and directly, but each in their own way ask the court to consider that your previous good character was not simply an absence of bad but a great deal of good whether in your role as husband, father, brother, and son. They say that this behaviour is utterly out of character, an entirely fair observation.
- b. Whatever the previous history of your behaviours in the months leading up to this offence, when you were spying on her and trying to get her to remain in your relationship, it is not said that you contemplated resorting to violence, let alone fatal violence, at any time before the killing itself. No-one suggests your actions in killing Carol were significantly premeditated. This is a mitigating factor.
- c. Your guilty plea, on what I consider broadly to be a sensible, realistic and proper basis, ultimately saved witnesses who were close to you from having to participate in a trial. Your guilty plea demonstrates that in the final reckoning you took ownership of your appalling actions.

Guilty plea

- 44. There is a statutory maximum reduction of 1/6th, for pleas entered at the first reasonable possibility. In this case the reduction – falling between PTPH and the second trial listing – should be half that, namely limited to 1/12th.

The appropriate minimum term

- 45. The starting point is life imprisonment with a minimum term of 15 years imprisonment before the Parole Board will consider your release. This starting point incorporates many of the elements to be considered in the appropriate final sentence, but not all. I emphasise that this is the minimum term and you will not be released as of right at its end.
- 46. The combination of aggravating factors would have taken this case just beyond 20 years, and even with the mitigation of your previous good character and in

particular, the lack of any previous violence or threat of violence, the lack of premeditation and, to an extent, your subsequent remorse, the shortest minimum term after a trial could have been no less than 18 years. From this there must be a deduction of 1/12th, to recognise your late plea, so that means a minimum term of 16 and a half years. You must have a reduction for the period spent so far in custody which is 256 days, and so the total minimum term will be expressed as 15 years and 286 days. I emphasise that this is the minimum term and you must understand that you may well serve longer before the Parole Board considers you ready for release. Much will depend on your progress in prison. Pleading guilty on a full facts basis to the murder of your victim is a good start to your work there but as you yourself acknowledge in your letter to the court, there is much work and reflection still to do if you are to be deemed suitable for release at the first opportunity. If and when you are released, if you were ever to be in breach of the terms of your life licence you would be liable to return to prison.

47. Andrew Georgiou, stand up please. The sentence is imprisonment for life with a minimum term of 15 years and 286 days. The statutory surcharge applies to the case. I make no order for compensation or costs. You may leave the dock.

Concluding remarks

[Judge expressed condolences to Carol Georgiou's family and remarked on their dignity and restraint throughout the proceedings; commended the Family Liaison Officers DC Melanie Frost and DC Serena Bellis and the remarkable work of the investigative team, DCI Mike Roddy, OICs DS Alex Trevivian and DS Steph Burrows-Thompson, and Case officer DC Sophie Lovelock; and thanked counsel].

24th March 2026

HHJ Jonathan Cooper

ENDS