

**REX V. JULIAN VALENTE PEREIRA**

**SENTENCING REMARKS**

1. On 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026, following a trial before the Chief Magistrate, you were convicted of placing an article with the intention of inducing in another the belief that the article was likely to explode, thereby causing personal injury or damage to property, contrary to section 51(1)(a) and (4) of the Criminal Law Act 1977. You were committed to this Court for sentence, and I must now sentence you.

The facts.

2. You are a Brazilian National. There appears to have been a long history with the Home Office and applications by you for asylum so that you could remain in the United Kingdom. On 31<sup>st</sup> December 2025, you were notified that the First-tier Immigration Tribunal had rejected an appeal by you against a refusal of asylum.
3. The following day, 1<sup>st</sup> January 2026, you went to Thames House, the headquarters building of the Security Service, MI5. CCTV footage shows you approaching the doors to the building, trying to enter the building and when you found the doors were locked, pushing paper through the gap between the main doors. You can be seen then to retrieve a cylindrical object from your backpack. This object was designed to look like a stick of dynamite. This item was thrown to the floor where it rolled. You then picked it back up and placed it together with a lighter, up against the main door to the building.
4. As a result of your actions a bomb threat was reported to the emergency services. The call to the emergency services was made at 3:19pm. A specialist Explosives Officer from counter-terrorism police was deployed. The officer was provided with a description of the device and assessed that it could potentially be an igniferously initiated device: meaning it could be fire bearing or containing fire. The explosives officer undertook a procedure to render the device safe. Having done so, the device was discovered to consist of A4 paper rolled into a tube with brown parcel tape. A length of string was protruding from one end. The explosives officer declared the incident as a hoax and handed the scene over at 4:10pm.

5. On 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2026, police attended your address on Uxbridge Road, London W5, a hotel for those seeking asylum, so as to carry out an arrest. They made their way to the room you occupied. They found you sitting on the bed. On seeing the police at your bedroom door, you offered yourself to be handcuffed before any words were exchanged. You were arrested. As the officers were in the process of setting out the caution and reasons for your arrest, you said: *“I’m so sorry.”* Immediately after the caution had been given you said: *“let me ask you something first.”* You then said: *“First, I’m hearing around 2, 3, 4 voices in my head, so my first question is which article I’m being arrested for?”* When the allegation of placing a stick of dynamite by Thames House was repeated you responded: *“ah the papers.”* To the officers it seemed as if you knew the police would be coming. You also said: *“It’s complicated. I knew what I did yesterday I had a notion of this, but I can’t control myself.”* You indicated medical conditions of schizophrenia, depression and anxiety and that you had been – in your words - ‘tortured’ by 5 years in the asylum system. When interviewed at the police station a prepared statement was provided. In that statement you denied the offence and claimed that *“All that I wanted to do is to bring to attention of MI5 that I have evidence for them proving corruption in the asylum system. I provided my laptop proving this.”*
6. In the interview you said the stick of dynamite was supposed to be a powerful metaphor in that the news inside was dynamite. Five clips of the interview were played at your trial in which you came very close to admitting the offence. You said that if you don’t get enough attention MI5 would not look into the problems with the asylum system that you wanted to bring to their attention. You said you had to catch attention and that the item was designed to look dangerous. You expressed dismay at those you perceived to be less deserving than you having been granted asylum, and yet when it is your turn, you are turned away on the interests of justice. You said there are: *‘... one million Muslims granted asylum here after the world trade centre and the Iraq war, no one cares. But when Julian goes to seek asylum it’s the interests of the public.’* You also stated that there was no harm in a third party thinking that the item might explode as they can just run away because it only looked like a dynamite or a firework and not a C-4 military style bomb.
7. The mobile phone seized on your arrest was examined. Numerous messages were found between you and others about your mental health and the asylum system. You express a desire to join the police service and MI5. You purport to be a supporter of MI5 and say you want them to investigate the wrongdoing you claim to have identified through investigations.

8. There is a conversation with a contact saved on your phone as ‘Ahmad City Barbican Thistle Hotel’ which takes place on the morning of 1<sup>st</sup> January 2026. Messages show you telling Ahmad that your appeal was rejected and that you were going to go to Buckingham Palace with a knife and a pen drive and demand to speak to the King. In the messages Ahmad tried to reason with you that hurting yourself or others is not the solution. You talk about throwing a bag inside Buckingham Palace and then state: *‘this is just the beginning’* in a thread of messages that are timed about 3 hours before you went to Thames House. In the ‘notes’ section of the device there are fields relating to plans ‘in case of rejection.’ Both notes were created in August 2025. The plans involve standing in front of Buckingham Palace, giving information to, as you put it ‘the Bishop of Canterbury’ and kneeling in prayer in Templar clothes Costume.

Sentencing guidelines.

9. There are currently no offence specific guidelines and so the General Guideline applies. The maximum sentence for this offence is one of 7 years’ imprisonment. I have been referred to a number of cases relating to cases on deterrent sentencing and the harm or community impact that can be caused by hoaxes. Deterrence is a purpose of sentencing and clearly a key consideration in a case such as this. As the helpful prosecution note on sentencing sets out, each case will turn on its own particular facts and so care is needed in looking at decisions in other cases.
10. There is a statement from Detective Chief Inspector Dean Purvis in relation to the community impact as a result of what happened in this case. As he observes this incident coincided with a New Years Day Parade in Central London. Secondly, the incident became the dominant matter for the police at the time when the police were informed that there may be an explosive. This diverted resources away from other business for the day. Thirdly, you were seen to walk towards Parliament Square after placing the stick of dynamite on the floor. Fourthly, there was a concern that the item was a genuine explosive. Fifthly, when noted that it did not look real, there was a concern that the incident was a diversion tactic in preparation for a more serious incident elsewhere. In my judgment these are all significant factors for sentence – particularly the factor that this might be a diversion away from other activity.
11. On factors pointing away from seriousness I note that the incident was very quickly declared a hoax after the attendance of the explosives officer. The article was placed on the steps at about 3pm and the incident was declared a hoax at 3:48pm. The item was not sophisticated and so did not require any specialist or technical teams to decipher that it was not genuine.

Reports.

12. I have seen and read a Pre-Sentence Report dated 30<sup>th</sup> March 2026. In the report it is said that you came to the UK in July 2018. You are aged 33 (date of birth 10<sup>th</sup> March 1993). It is said that there are no previous convictions recorded against you here, nor in Brazil. You have worked, despite claims for asylum being denied. It is also said that you are effectively homeless and that if permitted to remain in the UK would get help from friends.
13. I have also seen and read a psychiatric report dated 31<sup>st</sup> March 2026. Dr Hannah Williams, a Consultant Forensic Psychiatrist and Forensic Psychotherapist working at HMP Wandsworth, has prepared a detailed report on you based on a review of available records and interviews with you between mid-January and the end of March 2026. Dr Williams is of the opinion that you were significantly mentally unwell at the time of this offence. The diagnosis is of schizoaffective disorder and bipolar disorder. I note that she says your illness was not however to an extent that would provide any defence and that your condition should be factored into account as an important mitigating factor in sentencing. I have considered the contents of the Sentencing Council guideline on sentencing those with mental disorders.

Mitigation.

14. Mr Khan has uploaded a helpful mitigation note. As he identifies you of good character and have now demonstrated some remorse for what you did. Through Mr Khan you express your regret and sorrow for your actions that day. You accept that what you did was foolish and in an area of London of great sensitivity. It is said to be out of character and lacking thought to other potential legal routes you could have taken to challenge the decision of the Tribunal.
15. Mr Khan invites some credit be given that you did not elect trial by jury here but kept the matter in the magistrates' court. Whilst I note that feature of the case, I do not give any credit for that.

Sentence

16. In my judgment this offence is so serious that only a sentence of immediate custody can be imposed. In light of the features of the case I have identified, and making allowance for your mental health at the time, the minimum sentence that can be imposed is one of 2 years' 6 months' imprisonment. You are likely to serve just under one half of that sentence and then be released and subject to licence for the remainder of the term.

17. As it would appear that all legitimate routes to seeking asylum have been exhausted in this case it may well be the case that you will be deported from the UK either at this stage or at the conclusion of the sentence I have imposed on you.
  
18. I order the forfeiture and destruction of the items PEL/01 and PEL/02, forfeiture of your mobile phone and laptop. As the statutory surcharge applies the appropriate order will be drawn up. I make no order as to costs.

Recorder of London  
His Honour Judge Mark Lucraft KC  
Central Criminal Court,  
Old Bailey, London EC4M 7EH

May 15<sup>th</sup> 2026.