

You are 50 years of age. You fall to be sentenced for 13 offences. The common theme is your utter dishonesty.

You are a con woman who traded on her charm, charisma and good looks to entice and ensnare victims without any regard to the trail of destruction being left behind in your wake.

Blinded by your greed, you persistently and manipulatively pulled whatever lever you thought necessary to extract as much as you could to fund an extravagant lifestyle. Your principal lever was emotional, convincing men that their sincere feelings for you were reciprocated. Two were recently divorced and, to some degree, more vulnerable and exposed because of that. Telling them – and others – that you were due to inherit a fortune (worth as much as £80m at one point) you spun an intricate web of lies – including false documents, bank appointments and multi-million-pound house viewings – to add credibility to your claims. And the image you portrayed was so fantastical that it not hard to envisage how your victims were taken in by it because, bluntly, most people are not that divorced from reality. And your lack of remorse was only matched by your guile in squeezing every last penny from one victim before moving on to the next. You were a financial predator always on the prowl for easy prey.

And whilst you profess remorse now, this court cannot fail to observe that your track records is to say whatever you think is in your best interests at any given moment... speaking colloquially, that is your M.O. And there was certainly no discernible reaction as the powerful VPSs were read.

And, notwithstanding that you did enter pleas, that was at a late stage and only after a basis of plea - attempting to water down your culpability - was rejected. Moreover, it was only after the original trial date was vacated that the victims learned that they would not need to give evidence. They had to carry that burden of having to re-live it at trial for many months and, IMJ therefore, the appropriate credit is only 15%. Mr. Gomulka has not sought to argue against that.

The prosecution has submitted a detailed sentencing note and the case has been opened in full. I do not propose to rehearse in detail what has already been said.

Suffice to say, the first victim in time was AL, a recent divorcee whom you met on an online dating site. He was besotted with you, so much so that having exhausted his available funds he went further into debt to meet your financial demands including legal fees for the family court which you never paid,.. and are the subject of a separate fraud on the second victim, a barrister, whose 12k bill remains unpaid. Even when AL became unemployed you didn't relent, still making promises that your fictitious money would drop any day and prioritising your selfish needs over his increasing anxiety, which must have been plain to see. Even when you purportedly came clean, you would lie again and again and - despite him forgiving you multiple times – you ultimately blanked him when there was nothing left in the piggy bank to raid (an expression you yourself used).

He was devastated, as is clear from his VPS. Not just because of the money, which was in excess of 135k, causing real financial hardship and affecting his plans for the future, but also because of the impact on his self-esteem, confidence and relationships. That will be longer lasting.

But you didn't care about that. Because as AL no longer had any financial value to you, you were calculating who else could fund your lifestyle. AG quickly became your next target, another divorcee ripe for deception. Once more the the lies came thick and fast, even portraying yourself as a rich lady in waiting who wanted to use her significant funds for philanthropy. Nothing could have been further from the truth. You didn't have a love for humanity, just a love for yourself. The only thing driving you was avarice. And you reinforced the fantasy of extreme wealth with meetings at Coutts, lavish house viewings and forged documents.

AG was on a perpetual emotional roller coaster but you had no regard for his emotions; at one point effectively leaving him homeless and another time telling him you were pregnant. All the while spending in excess of £30k in the full knowledge that it would never be repaid.

He correctly describes you as ruthless and totally lacking in empathy; never stopping at a little but always trying to take the lot. The sort of behaviour that could drive some people to suicide. So obsessed with creating a totally self-absorbed narrative so you could get rich and live the high life that you were oblivious, or simply didn't care, about the feelings of his daughter, let alone your own children.

But it didn't stop with these two. An additional count relates to another fraud borne out of romance where you obtained AN's bank details and made a payment after the brief relationship had ended.

A further two counts relate to yet another unsuspecting man – DM - where you surreptitiously tried to obtain his personal details to guess passwords, as well as sob stories to get him to pay for a hotel on your behalf.

But it wasn't just using your looks to prey on men... your greed was insatiable. Whenever an opportunity presented itself to live a life far beyond your means, you took it.

Two counts relate to faking documents to try and buy a Porsche 911.

One count relates to your own mother's carer when you falsely used her card to pay for a holiday with your mother notwithstanding that she was working looking after your mum. Your duplicity and brass neck is staggering

And another count where you just went out for lunch with an acquaintance and, on the pretext of using the bathroom, opportunistically looked in her purse before later using her bank card details to spend just shy of £1k in Waitrose.

And, finally, a notebook containing bank details from multiple people that you no doubt intended to use as personal piggy banks as when the whim took you.

Over a period of years you were a well-spoken, educated and glamorous serial fraudster, fleecing unsuspecting suitors and anyone else you could take advantage of, unwilling or unable to control your greed irrespective of the impact on others. Your methods were selfish, orchestrated, sophisticated and cruel.

When the police caught up with you your denials were vehement, portraying yourself as the victim. saying that your high profile as a model exposed you to stalking and harassment and how your allegeders were either infatuated or revenge fantasists. It was yet another pack of lies.

This is not the first time you have been in trouble. Whilst you have no previous convictions in this country, you cannot be described as a woman of good character. You have a conviction for deception In France which resulted in a suspended prison sentence and a ban from French territory for 5-years. That involved you spending 24,000 Euros on 4 and 5\* hotels in a high end Alpine resort

Both counsel have dealt with the sentencing guidelines in their respective notes, for which I'm grateful. The guidelines are broadly agreed and the only real differences are twofold:

Regarding counts 1, 3 & 4: is the impact on those victims so high that that I should move up a category in the guidelines. IMJ it is: your actions had a serious detrimental effect on them, both financial and emotional. To find otherwise would be an insult to what you put them through. However, I observe that whether I move up a category or keep it within the original category and simply move towards the top of the range is as broad as it is long... irrespective of the route I take the end destination is roughly the same as there is an overlap between the bottom of one and the top of the other.

Regarding count 2: are there any culpability A factors? IMJ yes: the fraud on the barrister was sophisticated and involved significant planning. A lot of hurdles have to be overcome before direct access instructions are accepted and, in the absence of an

instructing solicitor, there is more contact with a client. This wasn't just a casual fraud that you stumbled into as shown by the emails both before and after the case.

Accordingly, my approach is as follows:

Count 1	Fraud by False Rep (125k)	1A: Sp 7 years Range 5-8  But towards the lower end of the range given the value is below the nominal SP for cat 2	Culpability A: because it was sophisticated and committed over a sustained period. Harm starts in category 2 on assessment of monetary value but moves up a category due to the serious detrimental effect on the victim.
Count 2	Fraud by False Rep (12.5k)	4A: SP: 18 months Range up to 3yrs	Culpability A: because sophisticated nature. Harm category 4 because of value
Count 3	Theft (10k)	1A SP: 3.5 years Range: 2.5 -6 yrs But towards the lower end of the range	Culpability A for same reasons as count 1. Harm 1 because medium value (10k) and significant additional harm
Count 4	Fraud by false rep (30k)	2A SP: 5 years Range: 3-6 yrs  But towards the lower end of the range given the value is below the nominal SP for cat 3	Culpability A: because it was sophisticated and committed over a sustained period. Harm starts in category 3 on assessment of monetary value but moves up a

			category due to the serious detrimental effect on the victim
Count 5	Using false instrument (Solicitor's letter /Porsche 911)	No specific guideline	Max sentence 10 years
Count 6	Using false instrument (Bank statement/Porsche 911)	No specific guideline	[Max sentence 10 years]
Count 7	Theft (£360)	3A SP:1 year Range up to 2 yrs	Culpability A for same reasons as count 3. Harm 3 because low value and significant additional harm
Count 8	Theft (£990)	3B SP: High level Co Range up to 36 weeks	
Count 9	Theft (£365)	4B. In isolation, SP: Low level co	
Count 10	Fraud by false rep (Bank card not working)	5B. In isolation, SP: Medium level CO	
Count 11	Theft (£878)	3B: In isolation, SP: High level CO	
Count 12	Theft (£1k)	3B, in isolation, SP: High level CO	
Count 13	Possession of article for use in fraud (various bank details)	SP: 18 months Range up to 3 years	Culpability A as infer details collected over sustained period of time Greater Harm due to large potential number of victims

All of those factors are aggravated by your previous conviction in France for the offences post-dating that.

That would then need to be counter-balanced by any listed mitigating factors but IMJ there are none:

- I struggle to accept that you are genuinely remorseful. As previously stated, you lie when it suits you best. IMJ your feelings are better characterised as regret at the position you now find yourself in rather than heartfelt or sincere empathy for what you put your victims through.
- Likewise, I do not accept that you have genuinely serious medical conditions that will make custody unduly onerous for you. It is notable that your assertions of a terminal brain tumour – at your request – have not been objectively verified by a scan and you also refused surgery lower gastro-intestinal tract surgery under the cancer pathway.

There is also no mitigation set out in a PSR as none was sought. Nonetheless, I have regard to the mitigation put forward by Mr. Gomulka. In particular, but not limited to, the following:

- Since being in custody your mother has sadly passed away, and you were unable to attend her funeral
- You have lost custody of your children
  - Of course, both are entirely self-inflicted
- But, subject to my earlier observations, you have at least proffered an apology for the callousness of your actions.

But, in reality, there is very little mitigation beyond your late guilty pleas.

Balancing all those factors, taking a step back, keeping totality at the forefront of my mind and passing the least sentence I can commensurate with my public duty, the sentences – having applied 15% credit – are as follows

Count 2	Fraud by False Rep (12.5k)	4A: SP: 18 months Range up to 3yrs	20 months (After trial = 2 yrs)
Count 3	Theft (10k)	1A SP: 3.5 years Range: 2.5 -6 yrs But towards the lower end of the range	30 months (After trial = 3 years)
Count 4	Fraud by false rep (30k)	2A SP: 5 year Range: 3-6 yrs  But towards the lower end of the range given the value is below the nominal SP for cat 3	40 months (After trial = 4 years)
Count 5	Using false instrument (Solicitor's letter /Porsche 911)	No specific guideline	8 months (after credit)
Count 6	Using false instrument (Bank statement/Porsche 911)	No specific guideline	8 months (after credit)
Count 7	Theft (£360)	3A SP:1 year Range up to 2 yrs	12 months (after credit)
Count 8	Theft (£990)	3B SP: High level Co Range up to 36 weeks	6 months (after credit)
Count 9	Theft (£365)	4B. In isolation, SP: Low level co	1 month (after credit)
Count 10	Fraud by false rep (Bank card not working)	5B. In isolation, SP: Medium level CO	1 month (after credit)
Count 11	Theft (£878)	3B: In isolation, SP:	1 month

		High level CO	(after credit)
Count 12	Theft (£1k)	3B, in isolation, SP: High level CO	1 month (after credit)
Count 13	Possession of article for use in fraud (various bank details)	SP: 18 months Range up to 3 years	22 months (After trial – 26 months)
Count 1	Fraud by False Rep (125k)	1A: Sp 7 years Range 5-8  But towards the lower end of the range given the value is below the nominal SP for cat 2	In isolation: 5 years 6 months after trial. BUT TAKING THAT AS LEAD OFFENCE TO REPRESENT OVERALL CRIMINALITY:  9 years after trial less 15% = 7 years 7 months

All of those sentences will run concurrently making your total sentence>>>

7 years 7 months

Ordinarily you would serve 50% of your sentence before being released on licence. Under the temporary early release provisions that is currently 40% but it may change. Whenever you are released, however, you will be subject to licence until the end of your sentence and if you breach your licence conditions or commit any further offences you will be liable to recall.

As I have made a timetable for Proceeds of Crime proceedings I do not order the V/S at this stage.

I have already indicated that I will make my sentencing remarks available to counsel and, via the judicial press office, to the media which I hope makes the job of those reporting on this matter easier.

As already touched upon, however, I would respectfully ask that those who choose to report this case do so with compassion. As is often the case in cases of this type the victims suffer with acute embarrassment and self-blame. They needn't. But they do. I have already been made aware of some insensitive intrusions into their private lives which has not only impacted these men but also their children. Even if not intended, that is regrettable. And whilst I hope today brings closure, their suffering will only be compounded unless any further reporting is done with discretion.

The story should be told. But it may be felt that it can properly be told by the victims being referred to by their initials only, as I have done. This is not a reporting restriction but simply an invitation for the same level of sensitivity that one might hope for if it was a journalist's father or brother.

HHJ Jason Taylor KC  
Swindon Crown Court  
25/3/26