

R v Owen Maughan and Patrick Maughan

Sentencing Remarks

1. Owen Maughan and Patrick Maughan – son and father, respectively – you are to be sentenced for the offences manslaughter (Count 2, in relation to Peter Maughan) and inflicting grievous bodily harm (Count 5, in relation to Peter’s father, Lovell Mahon) arising from a road traffic collision that occurred near Northfleet, Kent on 1 June 2025.
2. That afternoon, a Sunday, you drove to Rochester to meet friends. You were in your Ford Ranger ‘pick-up’, Owen Maughan, and you were driving. The journey is about 13 miles and involved you travelling eastwards along the A2/M2. You started drinking at soon after 2.30pm. By 9pm, you had drunk nearly 12 bottles of lager, Owen Maughan, and you had drunk 13 pints of lager, Patrick Maughan. In evidence, you accepted being drunk, Owen Maughan, and you said your father was also drunk. Nevertheless, you decided to drive home, Owen Maughan – following the same route back. This was no ‘spur of the moment’ decision. As you accepted in evidence, your plan all along had been to drive to Rochester, to drink and to drive back. You have no right to ‘drink drive’. It is illegal. And it places other road users at risk. But you did not care. Because it was something you wanted to do. And so you did it.
3. Also travelling along the M2/A2 westwards was Lovell Mahon and his family. They had been out for the day and were en route home in an almost identical Ford Ranger pick-up. Lovell Mahon was driving, his wife Hayley Maughan was in the front passenger seat and their children Peter (then aged 4) and Annarica (then aged 1) were in the rear seats. None of them was strapped in and nor were you, Owen Maughan, as you accepted in evidence. You are both related to Hayley Maughan but, for some time, there has been a rift between the two sides of the family. As Hayley Maughan’s brother Sean Maughan put it in his statement – speaking of you two, “...*they’re not considered our family and we do not speak to each other. For years, my dad and his sister, Owen’s mum, haven’t spoke – they fell out and the rest of our family’s followed...*”. There is

an echo of this in your psychiatric report, Patrick Maughan – and the reference to your mother and uncle, to paraphrase, not having a relationship due to something that happened years ago. And, recently, there had been a flare-up involving Hayley Maughan and Nicole Maughan, with words exchanged.

4. Being on the motorway at the same time, at the same location and travelling in the same direction was coincidental. But when you two saw Lovell Mahon and Hayley Maughan's vehicle ahead of you in the fast lane, you pulled up alongside it, in the middle lane. The time was 9.20pm. For the next 6 minutes, on a fast stretch of road which was busy, you terrorised Lovell Mahon and Hayley Maughan – chasing them, drawing up next to them, drifting between lanes, slowing down and then accelerating, driving up close behind them, flashing your lights, intermittently braking; and, when you were close enough, which you often were, shouting at them through an open window.
5. That during this time you, Owen Maughan, Facebook-messaged with your phone in your hand and then for nearly two minutes conducted a phone conversation via your vehicle's audio system only compounds driving which I am satisfied was very dangerous – those whose safety you endangered being the occupants of the other vehicle and other road users who from time to time had to move to accommodate or avoid your movements.
6. Your purpose in behaving in this way was to get Lovell Mahon to stop so you could have a fight. No doubt, Lovell Mahon gave as good as he got, verbally – he was prepared to fight but only after he had dropped his family at home. But I am sure that it was you who came across their vehicle and you who were the aggressors from the outset. I am also sure from the evidence that even on the M2/A2 you, Patrick Maughan, were encouraging Owen Maughan to drive as he did.
7. At about 9.26pm, Lovell Mahon turned off the M2/A2. He was heading home, along New Barn Rd. This was your turning for home as well and you followed them onto the slip road and then the roundabout. There, you pulled up alongside them. You two and Lovell Mahon were angry. Lovell Mahon shouted that he would come to your place to fight. And, still shouting, he added that

there were children in his vehicle. If you did not know this at that point, I am sure from the footage and the volume at which Lovell Mahon was speaking that you then did. And I am also sure that you will have known, then, at least that Lovell Mahon and Hayley Maughan were not wearing seat belts – you are likely to have seen this when the cars were side-by-side on the motorway but will clearly have seen this on the roundabout. Lovell Mahon then sped off with you chasing; and about 300 metres later you deliberately collided with – in other words, rammed – his vehicle. Ramming him being what you had said you were going to do in the call you were still on, adding “...we don't give a fuck...”. You were angry that he had not stopped and wanted to teach him a lesson.

8. This was no ‘nudge’, as you claimed in evidence, Owen Maughan. New Barn Road is a standard, single-carriageway road about 6.6m wide. As a blind bend approached, you pulled out onto the wrong side of the road and, travelling at about 60mph, you angled your vehicle into theirs and rammed it, clipping its rear offside. Their vehicle rotated, lost grip and rolled three times before coming to rest on the other side of the road, facing a hedge. In the process, Lovell Mahon and his son Peter were ejected. In evidence, you said this: “*The effect of me turning into the other vehicle was immediate. It happened in front of my eyes. I had the clearest view in front of me. It was horrific, yes. I see the car rolling over once...*”. In spite of which, you drove on – with a baby’s pushchair, ejected as the other vehicle tumbled, stuck to the underside of your vehicle. You told the jury that it was cowardly not to stop. This was not cowardice. Cowardice implies realising that you should stop but worrying about the consequences to you if you did. You were never going to stop. You did not care what had happened to Lovell Mahon and his family and you wanted to get on. ‘We don’t give a fuck’, as you had put it. Selfishness, a disregard for the harm and damage caused, a callousness, a sense that they deserved it – these were the emotions going through your mind as you drove on with the baby’s pushchair issuing sparks as it made contact with the road.
9. It was not long before your focus turned to self-preservation. A short while later, you removed your vehicle’s front number plate – with pushchair still in place; and, in due course you, Owen Maughan, fled to Manchester and you, Patrick

Maughan, fled to Maidenhead. To your credit, Owen Maughan, you surrendered the following day whilst you, Patrick Maughan, were arrested in Maidenhead – lying when you said you had no phone and then declining to assist the police with its PIN number.

10. Owen Maughan, you answered ‘no comment’ in interview. Charged with the offences of murder and causing (and attempting to cause) grievous bodily harm with intent, through your lawyers you gave no indication that you would plead ‘Guilty’ at your first appearance. The Better Case Management form continues: *“Real issues in the case: Yet to be identified. Any other information to assist the management of the case: Murder – defendant denies murderous intent. Crown invited to consider whether any other pleas are acceptable. The defendant offers a plea to death by dangerous driving”*. This stance was repeated at the 48-hour hearing. At the PTPH in October 2025, you were arraigned on Count 2, the offence of manslaughter, and pleaded ‘Guilty’. You were not arraigned on Count 5, the offence of inflicting grievous bodily harm, because ‘further time was needed to advise’. You pleaded ‘Guilty’ to this Count at the next available occasion – in fact, the start of the trial. By then you had served a Defence Statement (in November 2025) denying an intention to cause any harm to the occupants of the other vehicle and asserting that you had pleaded guilty to manslaughter on the basis that your dangerous driving *“...amounted to gross negligence manslaughter...”*.

11. You gave evidence at your trial. Your account contained a number of lies including, for instance, that Lovell Mahon had been the initial aggressor (it was the other way round), that you had ‘shadowed’ the other vehicle (when you had been chasing it), that you had not realised there were children in his vehicle when you rammed it (you had), that you had not uttered the words ‘we don’t give a fuck’ (when you had), that you pulled out in New Barn Rd because he was ‘brake-testing’ you (he had not braked – you were pulling out to ram him), that your father had told you to slow down (he had not, as the jury’s verdicts intimate) and that you were ‘upset’ at Lovell Maughan’s behaviour (when in fact you were in a rage).

12. Those moments when you gave evidence were your opportunity to express your true remorse by admitting the truth – what better way to say ‘sorry’, to take on the burden of the consequences of what you did, than to accept that you had been the initial aggressor, that you had chased them, that you had realised there were children in their vehicle, that you had uttered the words ‘we don’t give a fuck’, that you pulled out in New Barn Rd to ram him, that your father had egged you on and that you were in a fury at Lovell Maughan. Even to volunteer your phone, which has never been recovered. But you chose instead to lie and to minimise; and, as a consequence, you leave me with no basis to find that the remorse your counsel speaks of is genuine. Sorry for what happened, yes. Sorry for the situation you are in, yes. But the immeasurably heavy burden of responsibility for the consequences of what you did – Peter’s death and Lovell Mahon’s terrible injuries – is yet properly to weigh upon you.
13. Patrick Maughan, you issued a Prepared Statement claiming your intention was to go home (it was not – your intention was to chase the other vehicle so that your son and Lovell Mahon could have a fight) and then answered ‘no comment’ in interview and did not give evidence at your trial. To date, you have not facilitated police access to your phone. The jury were sure that you encouraged your son to ram the other vehicle. They will have come to this conclusion on clear evidence, namely the footage (where you can be seen from the outset angrily shouting and gesticulating at Lovell Mahon) and Hayley Maughan’s evidence. Concentrating on the latter, Hayley Maughan explained the part you played in the collision in these terms: *“I said, ‘They’re coming’. I said, ‘They’re gonna hit us’. He [referring to Lovell Mahon] looked at me. He said, ‘I’m scared’. I said, ‘I’m scared too’. I said, ‘They’re gonna kill us’. And then all I remember...”* and she clapped her hands together, to signal the collision. Still speaking of the collision, she added this: *“I looked at him [referring to you, Owen Maughan] and he was flashing his lights and his dad [referring to you, Patrick Maughan] was doing this...”* (and she waved her right arm in the air) *“...with his hand. His face was really, really, really, really red – it was like a volcano, just, like, ready to explode. It was really, really, it was so red. I said, ‘They’ve got us, they’ve got us’. I said, ‘They’ll hit us’. As I said that...”* (and she smacked her hands together again) *“...they hit us...”*.

14. Asked in more detail about your involvement, Patrick Maughan, she described you “...giving as good as what Owen was giving...”. Your face was “...blood, blood, blood, red” – she had never seen a redder face, she saw froth coming out of your mouth and you were screaming and gesturing with your arms. It was anger, she said – you were “...revving...” the situation up. As she put it, “*At the end of the day, if someone keeps filling your head with shit, you’re gonna explode... He stirred it up more. Made it worse*”.
15. Let me turn now to the consequences of what you did. Soon after you came across the other vehicle on the A2/M2, Hayley Maughan began taking video clips of your driving, which she sent to her mother. She did so because she was scared for her life. One can only imagine what Peter, aged 4 and seated in the back, was feeling. The collision itself must have been terrifying for all four occupants. For Peter – a popular, happy little boy with his life ahead of him – it proved fatal. For Lovell Mahon – a husband and father much-loved by, and central to, his family unit – it proved catastrophic. Suffice it to say, he is paralysed from the waist down, has significant cognitive communication deficits and impairment and is in need of constant care. Annarica escaped unscathed physically but she will grow up without her brother, with a father unable to fulfil his role as he would like and with the shadow of this dreadful event always hanging over her. No doubt, this will have a scarring effect on her, emotionally. And then there is Hayley Maughan: A mother who has witnessed her son dying. A wife who has witnessed her husband sustaining life-changing injuries. Who has to cope with all of this, and its consequences. She is to be respected for the straightforward manner she gave her evidence and for her dignity throughout these proceedings. Her Victim Personal Statement, those of her parents Erica and Patrick Maughan and Lovell Mahon’s Victim Personal Statement, speak for themselves: Lives irretrievably shattered by what you both did, by your drunken, selfish, senseless anger. No sentence can begin to place a value on the consequences of your actions and that is not my task. Instead, it is to apply the relevant law and pass a sentence that is just and proportionate to your offending as a whole.

16. Saying which, I turn now to the offence of manslaughter, Count 2, and the relevant Sentencing Council Guideline. Lovell Mahon's vehicle was travelling at just short of 60mph. Travelling at a faster speed, you rammed it at an angle, on a blind bend, on a relatively narrow road. As I have said, you also knew that those in the front seats, at least, were not wearing seat belts. Seeing the other vehicle yaw and tumble – and no doubt conscious of objects being ejected from the vehicle (you must have seen the pushchair to have driven over it) – you drove on. As I have observed, ramming the other vehicle was not simply about getting it to stop. Nor is the reason you failed to stop because you were scared at what you had seen happen. Instead, you realised Lovell Mahon was not going to stop and, in anger, you rammed his vehicle and having done so, with no care for the chaos you knew you had caused, you drove on.

17. For which reasons, I am sure that Peter's death was caused in the course of an unlawful act which involved an intention by you both to cause harm falling just short of grievous bodily harm – a High Culpability, Category B factor. This is a determination I am entitled to make – that, ultimately, you accepted an appreciation that ramming the other vehicle carried the risk of some physical harm being caused to its occupants, Owen Maughan, that your plea was articulated in those terms to the jury and that there was no second Count of manslaughter alleging an intent to cause some harm, does not preclude me from making a finding about your or your father's intent. Indeed, the Guideline requires that I do.

18. For the same reasons and in any event, I am also satisfied that death was caused in the course of an unlawful act which carried a high risk of death or grievous bodily harm which was or ought to have been obvious to you both – a second High Culpability Category B factor. There is however a considerable overlap between these two factors, I agree with the Prosecution that the 'Very High Culpability, Category A' threshold is not met on the basis of these two factors alone, this is therefore a Culpability B offence – on any analysis, the Starting Point is 12 years' custody with a Range of 8 to 16 years' custody and in the circumstances I apply no upwards adjustment for the presence of two Culpability B factors.

19. There are the following eleven aggravating factors: One, you were both drunk, something which contributed to what you did. Patrick Maughan, you submit that your alcoholism negates this factor. I disagree. This was a day out with your son and friends. You did not have to go. And once there, you were not compelled to drink – a finding I will return to shortly. I should add this: That, sober, you would have appreciated the risk inherent in ramming which, drunk, you did not is no mitigation at all. Two, prior to ramming the other vehicle, you had chased it for some minutes along the M2/A2 – to which extent, there was a degree of premeditation and ramming was a culmination of a persistent course of bad driving. Three, by driving in this manner on the M2/A2, for some minutes, you had endangered the safety of other users of that road – Lovell Mahon and his family aside. Four, in ramming Lovell Mahon’s vehicle, you were using your vehicle as a weapon. Five, in ramming Lovell Mahon’s vehicle, you were endangering not just one person but instead four people. Six, in ramming Lovell Mahon’s vehicle, you were also endangering other road users: To get an angle to ram the other vehicle, you crossed over to the other side. On a blind bend. Had there been oncoming traffic, it would have stood not chance. Seven, Peter was particularly vulnerable due to his age. Eight, no doubt, you have caused psychological harm to a second child, Annarica.

20. Just pausing here, whilst the ‘Totality’ Guideline identifies as the ‘general approach’ in such cases my first considering the sentence for each offence by reference to the relevant Sentencing Guideline, my then deciding whether the sentences should be concurrent or consecutive and my then arriving at a total sentence, in this case, Count 5 and the injuries caused to Lovell Mahon are better reflected as a further aggravating feature given how linked they are to the risks to others in the vehicle and also the consequences to Annarica which I have just identified. Noting that the maximum sentence for Count 5 would be 5 years, judging that a sentence towards the maximum would be appropriate bearing in mind the culpability and harm factors involved and bearing in mind the need to avoid double-counting, I regard this ninth factor, the injuries caused to Lovell Mahon, as a particularly significant one.

21. And then the two final aggravating factors: Ten, you did not stop and seek assistance. And eleven, you tried to avoid responsibility, for instance changing number plates, leaving the area and, Patrick Maughan, refusing assistance in relation to your phone.
22. These eleven aggravating factors justify a substantial uplift from the starting point of 12 years' custody, to well outside the range.
23. For both of you, your mitigation is limited. Owen Maughan, you are aged 27 and have no previous convictions. I note the references from your partner Caroline and from Mr Chadwick. For the reasons I have given, although I note the contents of the letter uploaded today, I do not accept that you yet have genuine remorse.
24. Patrick Maughan, you are aged 54. I make no discount for the fact you were not the driver. By their verdicts, the jury were satisfied that you encouraged Owen Maughan to ram the other vehicle and I am satisfied that you played a full part in the offences I must sentence you for. In 2001 you were convicted of dangerous driving and, in 2004, you were convicted of driving whilst disqualified and without insurance. These are relevant convictions, but they are old; and you have been in no trouble since, to which extent I ignore them. I note the reference from your daughter. Otherwise, I recognise that your various mental disorders and physical issues will make your time in custody potentially the harder. Applying the relevant Guideline, however, I do not find that they reduce your culpability – regardless of what is said for instance at paras 107 and 108 of the psychiatric report. The psychiatrist seems to be making two points: First, that the symptoms of your depression and anxiety would have impaired your ability to exercise judgment. Second, that your consumption of alcohol that day was compulsive. As the history shows, you are on occasions able to regulate your drinking but, on this day, you chose not to. Indeed, you travelled to Rochester for the very purpose of seeing friends and drinking – that was your plan. You knew full well what you were doing, in drinking. You knew full well that it might lead to you making poor decisions. But you continued to drink. And it

was that drink, combined with your indignation that Lovell Mahon was not stopping and your temper, that led to you doing as you did.

25. As to remorse, the psychiatric report, for instance paras 77 and 78, is full of your concerns – about your health, about being in prison, about how others in prison perceive you, about how you might be treated in prison. There are also references to flashbacks, and to you being haunted by images of Peter. But lacking from that report, and obviously lacking from that report, are two things: One, any expression by you of sympathy for Peter's parents – let alone insight into their agony. And, two, any expression of remorse at what you and your son did. The extent of it is you saying you can remember very little about what happened that day (para 89). Sorry for the situation you are in. Sorry for the loss of life. But not one word of regret.

26. Taking all of which into account, the shortest sentence I regard as just and proportionate to your offending is as follows: Owen Maughan, 19 years' custody. Patrick Maughan, 18 years' custody. The difference of one year is down to your mental and physical health issues, Patrick Maughan.

27. Pausing there, I note that a 'Very High Culpability, Category A' offence of manslaughter has a starting point of 18 years' custody and a range of 11 to 24 years' custody. I note, too, that a 'Culpability A' offence of causing death by dangerous driving has a starting point of 12 years' custody and range of 8 to 18 years' custody and that your driving involved a number of Culpability A factors, the added Harm factor of the consequences to Lovell Mahon and Annarica Mahon and a great number of aggravating factors. By cross-reference to which, I am satisfied that the sentences I have identified are appropriate.

28. As to credit for your pleas, Owen Maughan, I have considered section 73 of the Sentencing Code and the relevant Guideline. From the outset, you accepted being the driver, made plain that 'intent' was the issue and offered a plea of guilty to the lesser alternative offence of causing death by dangerous driving. An 'offer' of a plea is usually insufficient to afford full credit. But the plea you were offering was not one you were facing, you accepted being the driver and

you identified simply 'intent' as the issue in the case. In the light of which, standing back, I am persuaded that – in reality – you were from the outset accepting offences the equivalent of which you were convicted; and so full credit is merited. Making for a sentence of 12 years' and 8 months' custody.

29. I remain of the view that neither of you is 'dangerous' within the meaning of the Sentencing Act. Hence why I did not adjourn sentence for a Pre-Sentence Report, a course your counsel agreed was unnecessary.

30. Owen Maughan, you accept that there must be a period of disqualification from driving. Patrick Maughan, you point out that you were not the driver. In both your cases, I am satisfied that there should be disqualifications. Applying the relevant Guideline, noting that the minimum term for an offence of causing death by dangerous driving is 5 years, with an obligatory retest and having regard to section 57 of the Sentencing Code and the purposes of a disqualification, I regard the period that is proportionate to what you did, to the risk you pose and to the need to permit rehabilitation – in the case of each of you – a period of 10 years. There will also be an extended re-test in both your cases.

31. These disqualification periods will not serve their purpose when you are in custody so they will be extended to take this into account. Because you will serve two-thirds of the custodial sentences I have imposed in custody – namely 8 years' and 6 months', and 12 years' respectively – the periods of disqualification would therefore be of 18 years and 6 months and 22 years duration, comprising 8 years and 6 months and 12 years, plus extension periods of 10 years imposed pursuant to section 35A of RTOA 1988. However, you have spent a period of 10 months or so on remand, and that means the period which remains to be served is reduced. Since your disqualification cannot be backdated and considering paragraphs 36 and onwards of Needham [2016] EWCA Crim 455, I will reduce the period of discretionary disqualification by 10 months. That produces a total disqualification periods as follows: Owen Maughan – 18 years and 6 months less 10 months making 17 years and 8 months. Patrick Maughan – 22 years less 10 months making 21 years and 2

months. This is not intended to be a precise mathematical calculation but it should ensure that upon your release, you will be subject to disqualification for a period of around 10 years.

32. The Prosecution apply for deprivation of your vehicle, LS74 TKX. Considering the relevant Guideline and sections 153 and 155 of the Sentencing Act, I am satisfied that an order is appropriate and make it, under section 152: The offence of manslaughter is a qualifying offence, LS74 TKX was used in the commission of the offence, there is no objection to it and I regard such an order as proportionate.

33. The Prosecution invite me to support Commendations for DI Rachel Elmore, DS Dean Sycamore, DC Ian Mather, DC Helen Cole and DC Martin Stephens. I do so. I should add my particular thanks to Mr Dennis for his assistance with the CCTV evidence; and to all counsel for their assistance, patience and sensitivity in this tragic case.

34. Stand up, both of you. The sentences I impose are as follows:

Owen Maughan

Count 2: 12 years' and 8 months' custody

Count 5: 3 years' and 6 months' custody, concurrent

Disqualification from driving: 8 years 6 months plus extension period of 9 years 2 months

LS74: Deprivation Order

Costs: No order

Surcharge: Appropriate amount

Patrick Maughan

Count 2: 18 years' custody

Count 5: 4 years' custody, concurrent

Disqualification from driving: 12 years plus extension period of 9 years 2 months

Costs: No order

Surcharge: Appropriate amount

Each of you will serve two-thirds of your sentence in custody. The time you have served on remand will count towards that period. You will serve the remainder on licence. Once released, you must keep to the terms of your licence and commit no further offence or else you will be liable to be recalled and may then serve the rest of your sentence in custody.

HHJ Oliver Saxby, 25 March 2026