

IN THE CROWN COURT AT SOUTHWARK

1 English Grounds, London, SE1 2HU

Date: 9 April 2026

BEFORE:

MISS RECORDER KATE LIVESEY

BETWEEN:

REX

- v -

ENZO CONTICELLO

SENTENCING REMARKS

Julian Winship counsel for the **Prosecution**

Katie Porter-Windley counsel for the **Defendant**

Introduction

1. Enzo Conticello, I am sentencing you for 4 offences committed on 7 November 2024:
 - (1) 1 count of Theft contrary to s1(1) of the Theft Act 1968; and
 - (2) 3 counts of Fraud contrary to s1 of the Fraud Act 2006
2. You were aged 28 at the date of these offences and are 29 now.
3. You were charged and first appeared in the Magistrates' Court in relation to these offences on 27 January 2026. You pleaded guilty at the Pre-Trial Preparation Hearing in this court on 26 February 2026, offering a basis of plea that the Crown has accepted.

Facts

4. The facts of the offence are that on Thursday 7 November 2024 at around 9:50pm, you stole a Givenchy bag (itself worth £1600) belonging to Rosemary Dawson. This was a large leather zipped bag of sufficient size to hold a laptop, note book and a range of personal items.
5. The contents included items of significant value:
 - (1) a Faberge egg and a Faberge watch belonging to Ms Dawson's employer, the Craft Irish Whiskey company;
 - (2) a Mulberry card holder worth £150, and 3 bank cards;
 - (3) an apple MacBook Air laptop worth £1500;
 - (4) a store voucher card worth £350;
 - (5) £20 in cash;
 - (6) a makeup bag containing make-up worth around £200; and
 - (7) car and house keys, apple airpods and a work notebook.
6. Ms Dawson had put down the bag between her feet whilst standing in the smoking area outside the Dog and Duck public house on Bateman Street with friends. A few minutes after putting the bag down she noticed that it was missing and reported the theft to the police.
7. The Faberge egg and Faberge watch were items in the bag, wrapped in bubble-wrap, having been taken for display to clients and potential purchasers at a work event held earlier in the evening.
8. After reporting loss of the bag to the police, Ms Dawson saw that she had received a fraud alert from HSBC Bank at 10:12pm asking her to approve a transaction of £33.48 whereupon between 10:19pm and 10:23pm she cancelled all three stolen bank cards.
9. Ms Dawson found that the following transactions (relating to Counts 2, 3 and 4, the Fraud Act offences) had been made or attempted on her stolen bank cards:
 - (1) at 10:06pm, her Starling Bank Credit Card was used in the Co-Op Supermarket in Berwick Street, London to make purchases valued at £33.48 (giving rise to Count 2);
 - (2) at 10:06pm, her HSBC Card was used in the Co-Op Supermarket in Berwick Street, London for an attempted purchase of £33.48 (the card was declined) (giving rise to Count 3); and

- (3) at 00:28, her Starling Bank Card was used in a Nisa Local store in Hoe Street, London for an attempted purchase of £18.57 (the card was declined) (giving rise to Count 4).
10. The theft of a bag containing personal items, regardless of value, is invariably experienced by victims as a highly intrusive event causing inconvenience and distress. In a statement made on 19 November 2024 (12 days after the theft), Ms Dawson refers to her particular shock and panic upon realising that a bag containing items of such particular value owned by the company had been stolen and the incredible stress that this incident then caused her. She had called the police almost every day since the incident.
11. You were arrested in Belfast on 9 November 2025 when apprehended for other matters, arrested and brought back to London. When interviewed on 26 January 2026 you answered “no comment” to all questions asked.
12. Bar one discarded bank card found by a member of the public on the ground in Soho and returned to Ms Dawson, none of the items in the bag has been returned. Until today you had given no information about their whereabouts and your basis of plea did not identify what you had done with them. In court today, you have said via counsel that you handed the items to a drug dealer in exchange for cocaine.

Value of Faberge items

13. On any view, the Faberge egg and Faberge watch were items of significant value.
14. I have the following information about their value:
- (1) I am told that, as a matter of fact, insurers have paid out £106,700 in settlement of the company’s insurance claim for these items. In a statement of the insurance loss adjuster, the insurance payment is said to have been made “*on a without prejudice to liability basis*” and net of a deductible (the deductible being an uninsured loss borne by the company) of £2500. There are many reasons why an insurance payment of this sort might not reflect the value, let alone the open market value, of these items (including, for example, the limits and terms of the company’s insurance cover). The loss adjusters’ statement dated 6 March 2026 does not suggest that the items were valued by loss adjusters at only £109,200 and no explanation of the sum paid out by insurers is given. This evidence therefore indicates to me only that these two items were assessed by insurers to be worth at least this sum.
- (2) In a signed statement dated 18 February 2026, the managing director of the company explained that seven bespoke “Emerald Isle Sets” had been

commissioned by the company, comprising presentation boxes, each of which included a Faberge egg and Faberge watch comparable to those stolen, together with a hand-crafted whiskey bottle and a cigar humidor containing cigars. The company had sold three of these sets to clients for payments of USD 2 million, USD 3 million and USD 2.8 million respectively and had been holding events globally with the intention of selling the remaining four sets.

15. I therefore sentence you on the basis that the items stolen, inclusive of the bag itself and the contents belonging to Ms Dawson, were worth at least £113,029 and very likely considerably in excess of that sum and potentially, having regard to the company's evidence as to the sale price received for sets including comparable items, worth a 7 figure sum of in the region of USD 2 million. This evidence of financial loss is something that I must factor into your sentence, as I shall explain. Though I am also urged, and do, take account of the fact that the degree of loss associated with the value of these items was something wholly unexpected by you when you stole the bag.

Basis of plea

16. The accepted basis of your guilty plea in respect of Count 1 is that you:

- (1) Acted opportunistically when you stole the handbag;
- (2) You were unaware of the contents of the bag; and
- (3) You were not aware of the value of the items in the bag.

I sentence you on this basis.

17. It is accepted on your behalf that you would plainly have known that it was a "*highly valuable handbag*" when you took it, and you do not dispute the Crown's position that your intention in stealing it, although not extending to an intention to steal its particular contents (as these were not known to you at the point of stealing it), was to obtain realisable property of significant value. As part of my assessment of your culpability in respect of this offence, I will take account of your knowledge and intention.

Previous convictions

18. You have 2 previous convictions for 7 offences. These include convictions in Northern Ireland on 9 January 2026 for 2 counts of theft, 1 count of attempted theft, and one count of going equipped for theft. These are all offences committed on 8 November 2025, a year after the date you committed the offences for which I now sentence you.

Count 1: Theft

19. I start by addressing your sentence for Count 1 (Theft) as the lead offence.

20. The maximum sentence for an offence of this type is a custodial sentence of 7 years.
21. A specific sentencing guideline applies to this offence which I am obliged to consider in sentencing you. It requires me to assess the degree of your culpability (or responsibility) for this offence and the level of harm caused.
22. The Prosecution and Defence agree, as do I, that this is a Category B (medium culpability) offence as your culpability falls between the factors described in Categories A and C. Some degree of planning is involved even in the opportunistic theft of bags from public places.
23. In terms of the categorisation of harm:-
- (1) The guideline requires expressly that I assess this by reference to (i) firstly, the financial loss resulting from the theft, and (ii) secondly, any significant additional harm suffered by the victim or others – which may include but is not limited to factors such as *“Items stolen of substantial value to the loser – regardless of monetary worth”, “emotional distress”, “high level of inconvenience caused to the victims and others”* , *“impact of theft on business”, “consequential financial harm to victim or others”* and *“Damage to heritage assets”*.
 - (2) In terms of “Financial Loss”, I am satisfied and Prosecution and Defence counsel agree that for the purposes of the guidelines *“very high value”* goods were stolen (defined in the guideline as exceeding £100,000 in value) comprising items worth £3829 belonging to Ms Dawson herself and items exceeding £100,000 belonging to the company.
 - (3) I also note the *“significant additional harm”* to Ms Dawson in terms of the emotional distress and inconvenience suffered as a consequence of the loss when under her care of items of particularly substantial value owned by her company (as described in her statement) together with the apparently uninsured consequential financial loss suffered by the company.
 - (4) Accordingly, I agree that the appropriate sentencing category is Category B1.
24. The sentencing starting point for a Category B1 offence is a sentence of 2 years custody and the guideline sentencing range is from 1 year to 3 years and 6 months custody. Adjustment up from the starting point is appropriate on account of the additional harm factors that I have described. Your barrister accepts that adjustment upwards from the 2 year starting point is required but urges me to take into account, when making that adjustment, as I do, that the value of the items stolen far exceeded your expectations.

Aggravating factors

25. In terms of factors making your offence more serious, I do not adjust your sentence upwards on account of your recent theft convictions because those convictions and the offences to which they relate post-date the commission of the offences for which I am now sentencing you.
26. Nor do I take account of prevalence: that is because there is no Compelling Impact Statement or evidence before the court, as required by the Sentencing Guidelines, justifying adjustment of sentence on the grounds of prevalence in this specific case.
27. There is the question of attempts to conceal or dispose of evidence: it is accepted on your behalf that "*bank cards were clearly disposed of*" albeit not in a sophisticated manner. It seems to me that all of the items have been disposed of and, until today, you have given no information shedding light on how this was done. I take account of this as a feature making your offending more serious whilst also acknowledging that there is no evidence of any sophisticated concealment strategy.

Submissions in mitigation:

28. It is said on your behalf, by way of explanation but not excuse, that you were at a difficult time in your life and using cocaine at the time of the offending and exchanged the contents of the bag to fund your cocaine habit, that you are remorseful and that your first experience of custody has caused you to reflect on your behaviour.
29. Taking account of the nature and circumstances of this offending, the adjustment for additional harm factors and other aggravating features that I have identified and the mitigating explanation given, the shortest sentence after a contested trial that I could impose reflecting the seriousness of your offending, taking Count 1 as the lead offence, would be a custodial sentence of 3 years; that is, 36 months.
30. Applying the relevant Fraud sentencing guideline, I find Counts 2, 3 and 4, the three Fraud Act offences, to be Category B5 (lesser impact) offences with a guideline sentencing starting point of a Medium Level Community Order and a sentencing range of a Band B fine to 26 weeks' custody. The shortest sentences that I could impose after contested trial reflecting the cumulative seriousness of Counts 2 to 4 are concurrent sentences of 8 days' imprisonment for each offence.

Credit for guilty plea

31. Credit for guilty plea is required. According to the applicable guideline a 25% reduction in sentence is appropriate.
32. It follows that after credit for guilty plea, the sentence I impose for the lead offence Count 1 is reduced by 9 months to 27 months.
33. After credit for guilty plea, the sentences I pass for each of Counts 2 to 4 are concurrent sentences of 6 days' imprisonment.

Totality

34. In order to arrive at a just and proportionate sentence reflecting the overall seriousness of the offences for which I sentence you, the sentences I pass on Counts 2, 3 and 4 are to run concurrently with the sentence I impose in respect of lead Count 1.

Compensation

35. Had you been a person of means, I would have ordered that you compensate Ms Dawson £3000 in respect of the bag and its contents. However, I am told that you have insufficient means to pay compensation and I do not order it on the grounds of your likely inability to pay it owing to the imposition of a long custodial sentence.

Summary

36. In summary:
 - (1) The sentence I impose for the offence of Theft (Count 1) is a custodial sentence of 27 months immediate imprisonment.
 - (2) The sentence I impose for each of the offences of Fraud (Counts 2, 3 and 4) is a sentence of 6 days' immediate imprisonment – to be served concurrently.
 - (3) You will be released no later than half-way through the sentence period, that is after you have served up to 13 months and 2 weeks of your sentence, and the remainder of the sentence will be served on licence in the community. You must comply with all the conditions of your licence, failing which you will be at risk of recall to prison to serve the remainder of the term in custody.
 - (4) Finally, there will be a statutory surcharge to be paid and the amount will be determined administratively.