



In the Crown Court at Birmingham
Case No. 20BE1964824

The King

V

Peter WINDSOR

His Honour Judge Rochford

Sentencing Remarks

19th March 2026

1. These remarks will be comprehensive because I want them to provide assistance to those who will make decisions about your release. They will be available in writing.
2. Peter Windsor, you are now 61 years old. Before these proceedings, you had no previous convictions or cautions recorded against you.
3. You were convicted by the jury after a trial of two counts of causing serious alarm or distress by stalking. Your victims were Katie Breathwick and Myleene Klass. Both are radio presenters on Classic FM, a national radio station. Miss Klass in particular has a high public profile from other work she has carried out.
4. In or around March 2020 you begin sending letters and items to these two women at the address of Classic FM, a national radio station where the women worked as radio presenters. Unfortunately, and perhaps because this was at the start of the Covid

pandemic, there was no consistency or plan on the part of Classic FM as to how to deal with this. What was decided was that items sent to Ms Klass would not be forwarded to her, and she remained in ignorance of what was happening until 19th August 2024 when she received an email from a manager at Classic FM telling her that concerning items had been sent to her.

5. Items had, however, been forwarded by the internal post system to Mrs Breathwick, but often they were held back and went to her with several together. Other items were destroyed, perhaps because there was nowhere to store them. For example, a policeman's uniform and handcuffs were not kept, but whether they were an obvious child's costume or something that might have seemed more authentic is not known.
6. It appears that Classic FM treated the women differently because Miss Klass had a higher public profile.
7. The items were sent with your name (using the style "Sir Peter Windsor") and your address. An attempt was made by someone at Classic FM to find out if the address was genuine, and they were apparently led to believe that it was not. So for some time it was thought that these came from someone who could not readily be identified. With minimal work, you could have been traced.
8. What you did caused both women considerable alarm, distress and fear. For Mrs Breathwick, that went on for a considerable period. For Miss Klass, the period was shorter but the effect no less. Both were visibly and obviously distressed when they gave their evidence. The contents of the Victim Personal Statement have been summarised and I need not repeat them.
9. Because items were not kept or catalogued, I only know some of what you sent. I sentence you on the basis of what is proved to have been sent.
10. I have read reports from two experienced psychiatrists, Dr Furtado and Dr Kennedy. Both are approved for the purposes of s12 of the Mental Health Act 1983. Both were instructed by the Defence and gave oral evidence at trial. Dr Furtado took the lead, and there was no real difference between them. I accept that you suffer from paranoid

schizophrenia and have very serious issues with your mental health. Those are without doubt at the heart of your offending.

11. In addition, there are reports from Dr Maganty, also a psychiatrist approved under s.12. He was instructed by the prosecution but not called to give oral evidence. There was no significant difference in opinion between him and his colleagues.
12. Based on the medical evidence, I have no doubt that you have suffered from significant mental illness over a number of years. You suffer from paranoid schizophrenia and have been admitted to hospital on several occasions with psychotic episodes. But you have no previous convictions. Dr Maganty stresses that your previous periods of treatment have not been in secure hospitals.
13. Dr Furtado and Dr Kennedy were both of the opinion that you suffer from a high level of thought disorder. A feature of that is that you do not lay down memories accurately and are therefore not a reliable historian.
14. Both doctors agree that you knew that what you were doing was sending parcels or letters to the women at Classic FM. But they both gave it as their professional opinion that it is likely that you did not know that what you were doing was wrong.
15. Mrs Breathwick identified in her evidence what she saw as a deliberate and sinister escalation and pattern in messages and items sent. It does not seem to me that anyone had identified that before, in any event, not with the clarity with which she identified and expressed it.
16. I summarise the messages and items, and inferences as follows:

.1 You began writing to your two victims in about March 2020, sending a note in which you asked them to obtain from Harley Street a powder or supplement to give him a super boost to do 10,000 to 20,000 pull ups, and suggested you may in any event try to do 10,000 pulls up. I consider, assessing the evidence as a whole, that

this was a deliberate attempt to make sure that the women were aware that you were very fit and active, and thereby to alarm.

.2 You wrote again in March 2021 (Mrs Breathwick alone) stating you had completed 5,000 pull ups in 19 hours with super strength glucosamine. This was a deliberate attempt to emphasise your levels of fitness.

.3 You indicated you would have carried out more pull ups, but wrote “Witchcraft stopped play”. Reference to witchcraft was a deliberate attempt to cause alarm.

.4 At about that time you forwarded to Mrs Breathwick a letter that had been sent to you at your request by a company that enclosed a Do it Yourself Will kit. The kit was not sent to Mrs Breathwick, but the forwarding to her of a letter referring to the making of a will was meant to refer to the risk of death and the need to prepare for it.

.5 At about the same time you forwarded a letter head addressed to you from the European Court of Human Rights (there was no further content in the letter) and a letter from a coin dealer in London. I consider this was attempt by you to give yourself an air of sophistication or influence. You referred in evidence to having purchased the title “Sir” so that you were taken seriously.

.6 At about the same time you wrote to Mrs Breathwick stating “You and Myleene have eyes of a feat of alien like engineering (well I say that to all the girls)”. You said in evidence this was intended as compliment, but I consider it was an attempt to let them know that you were aware of what they looked like, to contrast with the fact that they did not know what you looked like. It was designed to alarm them with the possibility that he could be close to them and watching them in the street or elsewhere and they would not know.

.7 With that letter, you enclosed a copy of a legal document recording two changes of name on you part. That was an attempt by you to further emphasise that

they would not know if you were near them because it emphasised that you were capable of changing your name and, therefore, identity.

.8 In about January 2023 you sent a scribbled note stating that you “Nearly got drunk with the SAS. My gaffer Jim Wilmot (man unity) drank with them he says they are quiet bunch.” That was written on an invoice from a coach company for a trip to Hereford which, as is well known, is where the SAS are based. That was a deliberate attempt to suggest that you mixed with and were at ease with highly trained soldiers.

.9 In September 2023 you sent two bottles of champagne, one addressed to each woman. A note said “try to imagine how good you look.”

.10 On 5th October 2023 you sent a parcel to Mrs Breathwick enclosing spiked running shoes. This was you telling her that she would need to run fast to keep away from you (either because she would need to wear running spikes, or because you would be wearing them to run faster).

.11 At some point you sent a pair of binoculars to Mrs Breathwick. This was to alarm her either by telling her that he was watching her through binoculars, at such a distance that she would not detect you but close enough that he could rapidly approach her, or by telling her that she needed binoculars to watch out for you.

.12 On or about 6th November 2023 you posted a gun (an air pistol) to Miss Klass with a note saying “If things get scary for you (deterrent).”

.13 On 8th December 2023 you sent a stamp collection to Mrs Breathwick, with a note to the effect that it was for her son. I consider this was to alarm her by telling or reminding her that you knew she has a son.

.14 In March 2024 you sent a silver ring to Miss Klass with a note saying “Just a silver for holy protection ring for a worthy high priestess.”

.15 On or about 19th August 2024 you sent a note to Miss Klass enclosing a letter from Coventry Building Society stating that you had withdrawn £1,250 in cash. This note referred to her as a naughty vixen and said “[£]1250 gone you’re not giving me correction on you it will be whip and the cane.” This was intended to be threatening and sexual and intended to alarm.

.16 REDACTED DUE TO REPORTING RESTRICTION.

.17 On the same day you sent the box for a bottle of men’s Eau de Parfum, with a reference to James Bond written in hand on it, and a note referring to somebody being “sucked off in a London cell holding at the same time a bible”. It concluded “Just to clue you in !!!”.

.18 In September 2024 you wrote to Mrs Breathwick stating you were into the latest body builder nutrition and saying “Bet you have super mean sexy eyes like a vixen” . This was an attempt to emphasise your physical fitness and sexual attraction towards her.

17. Most of the items that were logged or recorded are set out in Agreed Facts.
18. The last item was sent on 10th September 2024, a week before your arrest. Had you not been arrested, I have no doubt you would have continued to stalk and harass these women.
19. Even if I am wrong about the intentions behind some of those individual messages, I am sure that the overall pattern indicated planning and a deliberate intention to alarm and distress, coupled with an element of sexual attraction.
20. Indeed, you said in your evidence that at least a part of the reason why you sent these items was to attract publicity and to appear in the newspaper, and you said that it was

with that aim in mind that you escalated his actions. Escalation was, I consider, deliberate.

21. The jury had open to them verdicts of Guilty, Not Guilty, or Not Guilty by reason of insanity. That latter verdict would have been returned had they accepted, on the balance of probability, that you suffered from a disease of the mind and did not know that what you were doing was wrong (against the law or morally wrong). Plainly you were suffering from a disease of the mind. It follows that the jury did not consider that you did not realise that what you were doing was wrong. That means that the jury rejected the evidence of the doctors to the effect that you did not know that what you were doing was wrong. I must respect that verdict.
22. Indeed, for the purposes of sentencing, I make clear that I consider you did know that what you were doing was wrong. My view coincides with that of the jury.
23. I do not, with respect to them, think that the doctors had properly appreciated that there was what I find to be an escalating pattern of conduct. That was not coincidence, and must have been deliberate and calculating. It is consistent with a sick mind, but not with a mind as disordered as the doctors suggested.
24. I draw further support for this view from the evidence to the effect that you sent unsettling messages to Nicola Sturgeon, the prominent Scottish politician. You desisted when spoken to by the police. In my judgment, that indicates an ability to reflect upon and control your actions.
25. For that reason I conclude that each message or item you sent was deliberate. You deliberately made sure that messages or packages became more serious in nature and content. How the action would have developed I do not know, but you were on an upward or worsening trajectory and it is likely that that would have continued. I consider it is very possible you would have progressed to direct contact with them.

26. I cannot rule out the possibility that you did indeed travel to London and watch or spy upon one or both of the women. A London travel map was found in your home in Birmingham.
27. If I were to pass a determinate sentence upon you, that would be in accordance with the Sentencing Council Guidelines for Stalking (Fear of Violence or Serious Alarm or Distress.)
28. I consider the case has factors within culpability B, High Culpability. There was persistent action over a prolonged period and I consider it demonstrated hostility based on the victims' sex. Both these victims are women, as is Nicola Sturgeon. There is no evidence of such conduct towards any man. I consider that the messages indicate an element of hostility as well as sexual attraction. I am not sure that the intention was to maximise fear or distress, although I have no doubt you intended to cause fear or distress. But there is a factor within Culpability D, namely that your culpability was substantially reduced by mental disorder. The medical evidence is clear that your culpability was reduced in that way. And I remind myself of the Guidelines on dealing with offenders with mental disorders. I place culpability in category C, Medium Culpability.
29. I consider harm is in Category 1. You caused very serious alarm or distress, especially when the effect on your two victims is taken together. Each has suffered considerable psychological harm, and each has made what I consider to be significant changes to lifestyle.
30. A C1 offence has a starting point of 36 weeks imprisonment. I would pass concurrent sentences, each reflecting the totality of your offending against these two women. So I would move up from 36 weeks to reflect that, but down to reflect your previous good character. Taking all these factors into account, the sentence would have been 40 weeks.
31. But I must also consider whether a hospital order is the more appropriate disposal in your case.

32. I am satisfied that you are suffering from a mental condition, namely paranoid schizophrenia. I am satisfied that that is in a very large measure what has caused you to commit these offences.
33. I reach that view on the basis of the medical reports from the three doctors I have already mentioned, and the oral evidence of the two of them who gave evidence in the trial, and the oral evidence given today by Dr Kennedy.
34. I am satisfied that that disorder is such that it is appropriate that you be detained in hospital for treatment.
35. Treatment is available or will be available within 28 days of today for you at Meadowcroft PICU at Mary Seacole House.
36. I consider the most appropriate way of dealing with you is to make a Hospital Order under s.37 of the Mental Health Act 1983 and that is the order I make.
37. I reach that view based on the fact of the case, the evidence of the doctors, and my observation of you during the trial, including your own evidence.
38. I bear in mind that you have not offended in the past. Whether this offending is simply a one off “blip” or marks the start of a new pattern of conduct I cannot say with complete confidence. The fact that it went on for some time and that you were also contacting Ms Sturgeon suggests it might well mark the start of a new and worrying pattern of conduct. But the doctors note a general pattern of improvement.
39. I therefore make an order that you be detained at the hospital mentioned above. I am satisfied that arrangements have been made for your admission there within the next 28 days. You will remain in custody in the meantime.
40. You have already been in custody since 18th September 2024. You have therefore served a sentence that is more than the custodial element of the sentence I would have considered appropriate. I therefore do not consider any further punitive sanction is required.

41. I have considered carefully whether you should be subject to the special restrictions provided for in s.41 of the Mental Health Act 1983. I have considered the nature of your offending behaviour, your antecedents and the medical reports and the expert medical evidence I heard at trial and today. I note that no doctor recommends such restriction; that is an important but not decisive factor. I note the view expressed by Mrs Breathwick that your conduct demonstrated an escalating pattern of offending, and indicated insight and planning. I consider that she is absolutely right about that. I am bound to say that I do not consider that particular aspect of the offending was fully reflected in the analysis by the medical experts. But I consider the diagnoses they have given and the views expressed are not undermined to any real extent by that. I note the improvement there has been in your condition. And I bear in mind that the nature of your condition means that the risk of relapse is always present, especially if you stop taking your medication. The doctors rightly emphasise that you are not somebody whose illness has caused them to offend in the past nor has this offending, serious and distressing as it was, involved physical violence or the threat of imminent or immediate physical violence. In the circumstances I do not consider a s41 restriction to be required.
42. The effect of the sentence is that you will be detained in hospital until you are judged by a Tribunal as safe to be released. You may well be subject to a Community Treatment Plan on release, and must comply with that.
43. Given the order I make, there is no Statutory Surcharge.
44. I make a restraining order to protect each of your victims. It is in terms that have already been addressed. And will last until further order. I am satisfied that you are capable of understanding those terms and of complying with the orders. If you break the order you commit an imprisonable offence.
45. I will upload a copy of these sentencing remarks to the digital case system so that they are available for consideration of those who will determine your release. They will also be available to the press through the Press Officer at the Judicial Office.