



Courts and Tribunals Judiciary

Rex

-v-

AMARDEEP SINGH

Woolwich Crown Court

Sentencing Remarks of The Hon. Mr Justice Bryan

26 June 2026

1. Amardeep Singh, at the end of a two-week trial on a charge of the murder of your older brother Gary Singh on 23 July 2025 at the family home at 38 Felbrigge Road, Ilford, the jury found you not guilty of murder but guilty of manslaughter. I must now sentence you for such offence.
2. In these sentencing remarks, and where I make findings of fact, I am satisfied so that I am sure of such facts having regard to the evidence before the Court both factual and expert.
3. An unusual feature of this case is that much audio and sounds of events leading up to Gary's death, the fatal incident itself, and the immediate aftermath thereof, were captured on the audio of the door camera system of the neighbouring flat. That may be because it was a warm July night and people had their windows open. The audio includes speech, evidence of arguments, and the immediate aftermath of your actions, when Gary's breathing and distress can be heard, as he was dying. Almost all of the evidence in the case, aside from your own evidence, came from a variety of CCTV footage and the sequence of events document that was before the jury, almost all of which was agreed, subject to it always being a matter for the jury as to what they could hear.
4. This is a tragic case, in circumstances where all the evidence before me, both at trial and in the many victim impact statements, is that you and Gary had an incredibly close and loving bond. You were best friends together through good times and bad, looking out for each other and for your mother. Your actions on the fateful night of 23 July 2025, culminating in you stabbing Gary five times (including inflicting the fatal wound that severed Gary's femoral artery in his left leg) have led to two losses to your extended family (Gary in death and you to prison), which is how your family see the consequences of your actions on the night in question. For your part you will have to live with the consequences of your actions for the rest of your life. Such consequences having also had a life changing and permanent impact on many members of your family as reflected in the moving victim impact statements.
5. So how was it that you came to stab your much-loved brother, literally to death? Sadly, the answer is an all too predictable, and all too familiar combination. Namely the fact that you had had far too much alcohol to drink that night, and the ready presence of a knife, when you had an altercation with your brother. To understand properly what occurred, all too quickly, on that fateful evening, it is necessary to say something of your shared life experience as well as events on the night in question.

6. In July last year you and Gary were living together at 38 Felbrigge Road, which was the upstairs flat in a terraced house. You lived there with your mother Rajni Kaur ('Rajni') and your wife Sandeep ('Sandy'), whom you were in fact only recently married to. There was a three-year age gap between Gary, who was 30, and you were 27 (now 28). As the elder brother, following your father's death, Gary stepped up to be something of a father figure to you, and your sister Jyoti (who had married).
7. Your family had faced tragedy before, during your childhood, and it is clear that this had a lasting and continuing impact on you, Gary and your mother. In this regard, many years ago your father had dived into the shallow end of a swimming pool whilst on holiday and as a result had become paralysed from the neck down. Thereafter the whole family lived with the consequences of such paralysis, as you and your siblings grew up. Your parents subsequently separated, although you and Gary both remained close to your father right up to his passing in 2010.
8. The evidence before me is that the loss of your father had a major impact on the family. Gary suffered from depression over many years leading to bouts of self-harm by cutting his arms and wrists, as well as resorting to drinking alcohol to excess and to recreational cocaine use. Drink has not been kind to your family, and both you and Gary were also having to cope with caring for your mother who could not move on from your father's death, as she began drinking heavily and became alcohol dependent, and she also suffered with her mental health.
9. However, notwithstanding such challenges, both you and Gary held down responsible jobs; Gary as a security guard and you as a bus driver on the 128 route out of Romford garage. It is clear that you are, yourself, a heavy drinker, and as you yourself said in your police interview you could "overdo it with drink", and indeed you had called in sick on Monday 20 July (two days before the fatal stabbing) as you were hungover and had a bad stomach. You had also taken cocaine in recent days (as was shown from your blood sample on arrest), but I consider this was from the weekend and so I do not sentence you on the basis that you were under the influence of cocaine on the night in question, though, as will appear, you were very much under the influence of alcohol.
10. There was a history of arguments between Gary and you over the years, some including calls to the police, but it is clear that there was no long-standing animosity between you, and you soon made up after such arguments. Indeed, I am sure that you were, as everyone describes you both, best friends who had a loving bond between you. However, the burden you were both carrying in terms of the death of your father, looking after your mother and a number of adults living in a small flat, coupled with heavy alcohol consumption on everyone's part, was a volatile mix which was often accompanied by loud music, singing and shouting.
11. Turning to the fateful night of 22 July 2025 into the early morning of 23 July 2025. Gary had been out drinking heavily that night, returning shortly before 11:30pm and as is clear from the toxicology he had also taken a recreational amount of cocaine. His blood alcohol

level as found at the postmortem was right on the drink-drive limit which, for a heavy drinker, may not have led to any significant symptoms given the effect of tolerance. It is possible, however, that he had a higher blood alcohol level at the time of the incident given that he received saline and blood in the course of the medical intervention and the unsuccessful attempts to resuscitate him. Even if that is so, from his interaction with passers-by before the incident (as caught on CCTV outside the house), he did not appear to be very drunk and he can be seen speaking normally and reasonably to passers-by. It is possible, of course, that the drink and cocaine use may have affected his mood and attitude (and there is certainly a time when he was going in and out of the property arguing with you). However, what evidence there is suggests that overall, he was moody, and ultimately suicidal, rather than aggressive and belligerent. His conduct is also to be seen in the light of your own conduct and your state of intoxication at the time, as addressed below.

12. For your part, the evening started happily enough, and you had been out to the cinema earlier in the evening with your wife and mother. However, you had then stopped en-route home at a supermarket to buy gin (buying a larger bottle than you had intended as there was a loyalty card discount). You made, and I have no doubt consumed, numerous cocktails on your return home, and you were to lie to the police as to the amount of alcohol you had consumed seeking to give the impression that you were less drunk than you were. I am satisfied, so that I am sure, that you were very drunk by the time Gary returned to the flat, and onwards to the time of the fatal incident. This is shown not only by the evidence of your drinking, but also from your behaviour and what can be heard on the audio footage.
13. You were playing music loudly, and you were aggressively telling others to dance and to have a good time. You were also arguing with your mother (who it appears was also drunk) and your wife Sandy. You were clearly very drunk saying drunken things like “lovely, lovely jubbly” and then at 12:15am you say to Sandy, “Course I’m buzzing, I don’t drink to stay sober, I drink to get buzzing”. In your own words to the jury, you described yourself as behaving like “a prat...[and]...it was embarrassing to watch”.
14. At 12:34am you take the bins out, and words were exchanged between you and Gary, though you made clear in your evidence that, notwithstanding the words used, this was only banter, it was light-hearted and this was normal between you and Gary. At one point you and Gary appear to be arguing about drugs.
15. Between 12:43am and 12:53am there was a long and rambling argument between you and Sandy. You were singing and playing your music loudly and Sandy wanted you to quieten down and go to bed but you were not having it.
16. From 12:54am Gary got involved. It is clear that he was trying to get you to turn off the music, as was Sandy as she was telling you to stop, but you wouldn’t do so. It is clear that you were behaving in such a manner that it was scaring your own wife as she said, “Amar you are scaring me”. Indeed, she said that no less than three times in quick succession, and then soon thereafter, “Amar you're scaring the fuck out of me” and then again “Amar you are scaring me”. This was repeated too many times, and in too emphatic terms, for this simply to have been an attempt to get you to snap out of things.

17. Your own evidence before the jury (which I accept) was that you saw Gary go into the kitchen, get a large single bladed knife and then try to cut himself, and that you said, “you can’t do that, give me the knife bro”, repeating this a number of times. There was then a scuffle with Gary as you tried to get the knife, as you were concerned that he was trying to harm himself.
18. I reject the suggestion that you were acting in defence of yourself. You did not believe that it was necessary to use force to defend yourself from an attack from Gary. On the contrary, your own evidence in cross-examination was that at no time did you think that Gary was going to harm you with the knife. I am also satisfied (as indeed you also said in cross-examination) that as Gary was waving the knife in front of himself he caught your right index finger. I am also satisfied that it was in the scuffle that followed that Gary grabbed your neck causing the strangulation marks to your neck.
19. The time came when Gary expressly said that he was, “dropping it”, that is dropping the knife, which he did. I am satisfied, so that I am sure, that it was at this point that, in drink, the red mist descended upon you, and you became enraged with Gary, and (as the aggressor) shouted, “ fuck you up’, the ordinary meaning of such words being “I’m going to fuck you up”, as you accepted in cross-examination, and that was precisely what you then did. You picked up the knife that Gary had dropped, in your right hand (as you would, being right handed), and you knowingly stabbed Gary, whilst you were both standing up (consistent with the location of the wounds), no less than five times to his body.
20. Those stab wounds were as follows. Two stab wounds to the right side of the middle back close together (and so possibly inflicted by you in quick succession), one of which had penetrated through the skin, muscle, and the right scapula, completely amputating the inferior angle of the bone before continuing into the muscle, which the forensic pathologist Dr Michael Parsons confirmed would have required severe force on your part. You also stabbed Gary to the left upper arm (penetrating to a depth of 2cm) and to his left buttock to a depth of 4cm.
21. The fatal stab wound was a stab wound to Gary’s left thigh, 7.5cm long on the surface which penetrated to a depth of 12cm. In doing so it completely severed the major artery to the leg, the femoral artery as the knife passed behind the middle of the shaft of the femur which was undamaged. Rapid blood loss would have followed, leading to death within minutes, but as the defence led in evidence, Gary could sadly have remained conscious and capable of movements for a number of minutes, and so I have no doubt that he would have suffered fear and distress as the realisation came upon him that he was dying. Dr Parsons’ evidence, which I accept, is that you would have had to use at least moderate force to inflict the fatal leg wound, force equivalent to a forceful punch.
22. I am satisfied so that I am sure, that when you inflicted these wounds, your intention was to cause harm falling just short of grievous bodily harm (being true to the jury’s verdict on the murder count). It is just not credible to suggest that you had any lesser intent, given the force with which you inflicted such wounds with what you knew was a large sharp bladed kitchen knife, and the number and location of such stab wounds. It was also fortuitous that

none of the other wounds damaged a major blood vessel or organ. They could also so easily have been fatal.

23. I am also satisfied so that I am sure that Gary's death was caused in the course of an unlawful act which carried a high risk of death or grievous bodily harm that was (and in any event ought to have been) obvious to you.
24. I reject as a "cock and bull story" your account that Gary had taken you to the floor and was holding you down with his right leg on your chest whilst strangling you, and that you picked up the knife with your left hand, and, with skills that would have been worthy of a contortionist, you somehow managed (with your non-dominant hand) to reach over Gary's leg and across to inflict multiple stab injuries requiring at least moderate, or in one case severe, force. This is a simply incredible account that defies belief.
25. Ranji was shouting out, "stop it, stop it", and Sandy was shouting, "Alright stop, stop, Amar stop", before Ranji said, "What the fuck. Call the police, call the police, call the police". It is perfectly plain that you are stabbing Gary, and both your mother and your wife are telling you to stop stabbing him. There was only one aggressor performing the stabbing and that was you.
26. It is equally clear that there is no suggestion whatsoever of self-defence. Not only do you not mention any such suggestion then, or in the long time before your arrest when you are wandering the streets with Sandy (with your words, unbeknown to you, being caught on various CCTV cameras), your immediate reaction whilst still in the flat was, "I'm gonna go, I'm going to prison. I'm going to prison" and "[c]all 999, I stabbed him". You knew perfectly well that you had stabbed Gary, and not in self-defence. This was further evidenced when you were later heard to be saying to Sandy in a street nearby at 1:47am, "I fucking jooked him up you know" (a slang term for to stab someone with a knife), and you also demonstrated with a deliberate stabbing motion as you said those words reflecting, I am sure, what you had done.
27. Whilst you had indeed asked for 999 to be called for police and ambulance you had not stayed to see if there was anything you could do to save Gary. You fled the flat, and although it is true you stayed in the area, you appeared at certain points in time to be seeking out a friend, Pierre, and his car with a possible view to you being taken away, albeit that you remained in the area, and were still in the area sitting in Pierre's car when you were arrested.
28. Upon arrest, and far from telling the truth to the police, you lied saying, "he's done suicide... he hurt himself... he hurt himself", and whilst this had no effect on the police investigation, and I do not consider it to be an aggravating factor in such circumstances, it is an unedifying spectacle for you to be suggesting that your brother killed himself when you knew perfectly well that you had stabbed him to death.
29. I have no doubt whatsoever that your actions on that fateful night have had a devastating and lifelong effect on your whole family, as is clear from the moving victim impact statements that have been read. In a very real sense they feel the loss of you, as well as the loss of your

brother. But you, and you alone, bear responsibility for that, and you must bear the consequences of your actions.

30. The harm caused in all manslaughter cases is, however, of the utmost seriousness and I must sentence you for such serious offending.
31. You were born on 3 February 1998, and you are now 28 years old having been, at the time of the events in question, 27 years old. Aside from irrelevant cautions as a juvenile, you have no previous convictions, and I treat you as a man of previous good character. More than that I bear in mind the character references that are before me, and indeed the contents of the victim impact statements which also speak of your positive good character. I have no doubt that you acted out of character on the night in question, but you did so whilst drunk, and quite apart from that being an aggravating factor I have no doubt that was part of the reason that you “lost it” and that the red mist had descended.
32. It has not been suggested by anyone, not least the defence, that it was necessary to obtain a Pre-Sentence Report, nor did I consider it necessary either. I have all the information I need to sentence you. In this regard the prosecution do not suggest that you meet the requirements for dangerousness, and as addressed below, nor do I.
33. The maximum sentence for an offence of unlawful act manslaughter, such as the present is life imprisonment. The offence is a schedule 19 offence for the purposes of section 285 of the Sentencing Act 2020, which provides for the imposition of a life sentence if the Court forms the opinion that the dangerousness test is met. The offence is a specified offence for the purposes of section 279 of the 2020 Act (extended sentence for certain violent, sexual or terrorism offences). The appropriate term of any extended sentence is dealt with in section 281 of the Act.
34. The test for dangerousness is set out in section 308 of the Sentencing Act 2020, namely whether there is a significant risk that you will commit further specified offences; and by so doing, you will cause to one or more people serious harm. I do not consider that you are dangerous. I am satisfied that notwithstanding its seriousness, this was a one-off episode where, in drink, you allowed your temper to boil over and behaved in a violent manner to your own brother, in circumstances where you are of previous good character, and there is not a significant risk of you offending again in the future.
35. I turn then to consider the appropriate determinate sentence of imprisonment. There are Sentencing Council Guidelines for Unlawful Act Manslaughter to which I have had regard. I must first assess your culpability. I remind myself that the characteristics set out in the Guidelines are indications of the level of culpability that may attach to the offender’s conduct, and that the Court should weigh those factors in order to decide which category most resembles the case in the context of the circumstances of the offence, avoiding a mechanistic application of these factors.
36. There is a stark difference between the prosecution and the defence as to the appropriate categorisation of culpability. The prosecution submit that your culpability is best regarded as “B- High Culpability” for two separate reasons, each of which they say applies, namely

(1) that death was caused in the course of an unlawful act which involved an intention by you to cause harm falling just short of GBH (a subjective factor) and (2) death was caused in the course of an unlawful act which carried a high risk of death or GBH which was, or ought to have been, obvious to you (an objective factor). Culpability B has a starting point of 12 years' imprisonment and a range of 8 to 16 years' imprisonment.

37. It is noted by the prosecution that the Court might consider that the extreme nature, in the context of the offence, of the Culpability B factors, or the combination of the Culpability B factors pointed out, that I may wish to consider whether your offending is Culpability A. Culpability A has a starting point of 18 years' imprisonment and a range of 11 to 24 years' imprisonment.
38. In contrast, the defence submit that there is evidence to support placing this incident within Culpability D "given that the deceased was first to pick up the weapon and given the evidence of injury to the defendant and so there is evidence of self defence albeit not amounting to a defence". Culpability D has a starting point of 2 years' imprisonment and a range of 1 to 4 years' imprisonment.
39. This defence submission is, with the greatest of respect, a wholly unrealistic submission even before considering the findings of fact I have made. It completely ignores the fact that Gary picked up the knife to harm himself not you (as was your own evidence) and that at no time did you think that Gary was going to harm you with the knife (on your own evidence), and also that there was no evidence of self defence (as addressed above). On the contrary, and on the findings of fact that I have made, you were most certainly not acting in self defence when you stabbed Gary no less than five times with moderate, and in one case severe, force.
40. Your offending cannot properly be characterised as Culpability D. I have also carefully considered whether it could properly be said to fall between higher and lower culpability (Culpability C), but it cannot, not least given the multiple Culpability B factors. In this regard, and on the basis of my findings of fact as already set out above, I am satisfied, so that I am sure, that when you inflicted the wounds, your intention was to cause harm falling just short of grievous bodily harm, and that Gary's death was caused in the course of an unlawful act which carried a high risk of death or grievous bodily harm which was (and in any event ought to have been) obvious to you, and so no less than two Culpability B factors apply.
41. Indeed, it is in this regard that I have considered whether your offending is properly to be categorised as Culpability A. Ultimately, however, I have stepped back, and agree with the prosecution's respectful submission that this is not a Culpability A case in the context of the particular facts that I have identified in the course of these Sentencing Remarks, but it is undoubtably properly to be characterised as Category B offending being, as it is, very close to Culpability A offending.
42. As the Sentencing Guideline expressly recognises, in all cases the harm caused will inevitably be of the utmost seriousness. I have already noted that the starting point for

Category B is 12 years' imprisonment with a range of 8 to 16 years' imprisonment. That range shows that there is an infinite range of circumstances that can fall within Culpability B.

43. I turn then to the aggravating factors in relation to your offending. You committed the offence whilst under the influence of alcohol and I am in no doubt that this was an aggravating factor. This requires a modest increase from the 12 years starting point before considering mitigating factors. That the offence involved the use of a weapon is also an aggravating factor unless it is otherwise taken into account in reaching the starting point. I do not consider it is an aggravating factor in the present case, as I have already taken into the account the use of a knife in the context of my findings as to intent in the context of use of a knife, when identifying culpability, and I am alive to avoiding the danger of double-counting. Nor do I consider your actions after the event in lying and seeking to place blame elsewhere as an aggravating factor give that it did not, in reality, impede the investigation or cause anyone else to be investigated.
44. Turning then to the mitigating factors. You have no previous convictions and the statements before me (both the many defence character statements and, indeed, the victim impact statements), speak to your positive good character and your kindness, loyalty and care to those around you, family members, friends and children alike. These show a very different side to you than was apparent on the night of the incident, and I bear well in mind all that is stated in those statements about you, especially the contents of your wife's statement that speaks so eloquently of you and also about the situation she faces. Nevertheless, such positive good character mitigation inevitably has to be viewed in the context of the very serious nature of your offending and the loss of a life as a result of your actions.
45. I accept that there was no pre-meditation. I also accept that you called for the attendance of the emergency services, though this is somewhat tempered by you leaving the scene and not staying to see if anything could be done for your brother. You have shown remorse for your actions, for the loss of a life and for the impact on your whole family, and you have used your time in prison well. I bear in mind all that you say in your letter to me. I also bear in mind the difficulties that you and your siblings faced in childhood, and that you have overcome those difficulties. You also have a mother who is vulnerable, albeit I have no doubt that your extended family will assist your mother and indeed your wife during your time in prison. I am also all too well aware that you are recently married, and I bear well in mind the impact that the sentence that I am going to pass will inevitably have upon your wife, but ultimately it is you who must bear responsibility for the consequences of your actions.
46. Taken as a whole, I consider that these mitigating factors outweigh the aggravating factor that I have identified above and require a downward reduction from the sentence arrived at after consideration of such aggravating factor, which I have done.
47. Having considered the aggravating factor and the mitigating factors that apply in this case, I consider that the least sentence I can pass, and the one that is appropriate for the seriousness of your offending, is one of 9 years' imprisonment, and that is the sentence that I pass.

48. Under current rules you must serve two-thirds of that period in custody. You will then be released on licence. Whilst on licence you must comply with the terms of it. If you commit another offence whilst on licence or in some other way breach the terms of your licence, you could be recalled to serve up to the remainder of the custodial term. The time you have spent on remand will automatically count towards the time you must serve. I am told that you have spent 336 days on remand, but if that is not correct the actual figure will in any event apply.

49. As the statutory surcharge applies, the appropriate order will be drawn up.

50. Finally, I would like to commend Detective Constable Thomas May for his exceptional work in this case in relation to the CCTV and audio evidence which was collated from very many sources. Through his considerable skill and devotion to duty, and many hours of hard work it was possible to present such evidence in a readily understandable form for the jury. It was a hallmark of the quality of his work that almost all entries were capable of agreement without qualification, and many hours of Court and witness time was no doubt saved

51. That concludes my sentencing remarks.

52. Take the Defendant down.

.