



JUDICIARY OF  
ENGLAND AND WALES

**IN THE CROWN COURT AT CROYDON**

**THE KING**

**V**

**HARRY SINGH**

**PURSHOTAM DHILLON**

**BIKRAMJIT BRAH**

**LEANDREA LYNCH**

**Sentencing Remarks of Mr Justice Cavanagh**

**25 June 2026**

1. Harry Singh (also known as Hardeep Thind), Purshotam Dhillon, Bikramjit Brah, and Leandrea Lynch, you each come before the court for sentence on two counts of being concerned in the supply of Class A drugs, respectively diamorphine or heroin and cocaine, in the Southall area. Harry Singh, you are also to be sentenced for dangerous driving relating to an incident on 1 July 2025. Bikramjit Brah, you also fall to be sentenced for possession of Class A drugs with intent to supply on 1 July 2025.
2. The indictment period in relation to the drugs offences runs from 22 October 2024 to the beginning of July 2025.
3. Harry Singh, you pleaded guilty to these offences in the Crown Court on 26 September 2025 at a stage at which 25% credit for plea had been preserved. Bikramjit Brah, you pleaded guilty on the first opportunity at the Magistrates' court on 3 July 2025, and so are entitled to the maximum 1/3 credit for plea. There were no bases of plea. You were both remanded in custody until the conclusion of the trial of the other defendants. Purshotam Dhillon and Leandrea Lynch, you were each convicted of these offences on 8 May 2026, after a trial.

4. The appropriate victim's surcharge will apply in each of your cases.
5. You were all involved, in different roles, in the same organised crime network, involved in the supply of Class A drugs, namely heroin and crack cocaine. The network centred on a drugs line known as the Hadi drugs line. Your street name, Harry Singh, was Hadi. The Hadi network operated in the standard manner of such lines, with large quantities of bulk messages being sent out to end users, in order to sell drugs to them. The line was busy and lucrative, involving over 180 end users at its height. When an end user indicated a wish to buy drugs, a location would be identified, and a runner would be sent to that location to provide drugs in return for cash. Sometimes discounts would be offered for multiple purchases. The criminal enterprise also involved obtaining the drugs, storing them, cutting them, and maintaining and administering the Hadi line and some other telephone lines.
6. The four of you were not the only members of the criminal enterprise. Others who were involved, and who have already been sentenced for their involvement, were Gurpreet Dhillon, no relation to Purshotam Dhillon, Jatinder Singh, Jagwinder Randhawa and Ryan Dadwal.
7. Harry Singh, you had a leading role and were the main organiser of the organised crime network. On 13 June 2018, you were sentenced to 9 years and 8 months' imprisonment for two counts of conspiring to supply Class A drugs. Whilst you were in prison, the Hadi line and the drugs business were run by other members of the organised crime network, but it is clear that you were still in charge. It is likely that you continued to lead and to organise the enterprise from your prison cell and on numerous days when you were given day release or were allowed out of prison to attend medical appointments, though this is outside the indictment period. Purshotam Dhillon paid a total of about £520 into your girlfriend's account, in August and September 2024, before your release. On 5 October 2024, again before your release, you received a payment of £500 from Ryan Dadwal. In November 2024, not long after your release, Purshotam Dhillon made 3 payments into your account totalling £1275, with the reference "Hadi". There can be no doubt that these payments were connected with the operations of the drugs network. It is significant that Purshotam Dhillon made no further

payments into your account after that. From then on, it is clear that he was receiving drugs in return for services rendered.

8. On 22 October 2024, you were released on licence, and, from then on, you resumed your full-time role as leader and principal organiser of the criminal enterprise. You continued in this capacity until your arrest on 1 July 2025.
9. It is suggested on your behalf that there were others who also performed a leading role in this enterprise. There is no evidence of this but, in any event, it is clear that you had the main leading role on the ground, so to speak, during the indictment period.
10. The scale of the enterprise was large. This is indicated by the amounts of drugs that were seized on various occasions. These will not, of course, by any means be the total amounts of drugs that went through the hands of the criminal enterprise, but they are some indication of the scale of the operation.
11. On 3 December 2024, the police stopped a car in Nestles Avenue in Hayes. Gurpreet Dhillon and Jatinder Singh were inside, as was the phone connected to the Hadi line. The driver, Jatinder Singh, rammed multiple police cars in an unsuccessful attempt to escape. Police recovered over one kilogram of heroin and 64 grams of crack cocaine from addresses linked to Gurpreet Dhillon. The heroin was split into various packages, some in large cling-film wraps and some in sandwich bags with distinctive blue zip seals and red clips. Cell phone analysis showed that there were communications between Gurpreet Dhillon and phone numbers attributed to Harry Singh and Leandrea Lynch, amongst others. The total street value of the drugs seized following these arrests was over £100,000.
12. A new phone line was set up and the enterprise continued. On 22 May 2025, police arrested Jagwinder Rhandawa in Kingston on Thames. He had in his possession 19.2 grams of heroin, 3.65 grams of crack cocaine, and also key handsets associated with the drugs lines. Call data showed that there had been communications between Jagwinder Rhandawa, Harry Singh and Bikramjit Brah.

13. Next, on 11 June 2025, police arrested Ryan Dadwal at his home address. He was in possession of the drugs line, and he also had 17.2 g of heroin in his possession.
14. Finally, on 1 July 2025, the police arrested each of the four of you in a co-ordinated operation.
15. On the morning of 1 July 2025, the police attempted to stop you, Harry Singh, whilst you were driving your Audi RS car in Nestles Avenue, Hayes. You failed to stop and rammed two police vehicles in order to facilitate your escape from the officers. The vehicles were displaying blue lights so you were in no doubt what they were. You reversed into one of the vehicles at such a speed that you threw an officer who was getting out of his vehicle back into his seat. You were successful in escaping. This was the dangerous driving offence.
16. You then drove to a service road behind some houses in Bath Road. As it happens, there was CCTV there. You can be seen on the CCTV getting out of the car and making phone calls. Two accomplices arrived in a VW Golf and, at your instruction, took out a car cover and covered the Audi with it. You then drove off with them in the Golf. The Golf was then seen on the A312, going towards the M4. The vehicle was boxed in and stopped and you were arrested. You were in possession of a number of items. These included two iphones, over £1000 in cash, a drug dealing tick list, and the keys to the Audi and to a Silver Renault Traffic Van. The Audi was searched, and a very small amount, 3 mg, of crack cocaine was found inside it.
17. The police also executed a drugs warrant at your home, Purshotam Dhillon, in Lampton Avenue in Hounslow. They found a number of items in your bedroom. These included some drugs and drug paraphernalia on the bed, a tick list, three sets of digital scales, one of which had traces of heroin and cocaine on it, some Ziploc bags which were similar to the ones found at Gurpreet Dhillon's house, a friction lock baton and a baseball bat. There was also a sum of nearly £4,000 in cash which it is accepted had nothing to do with criminal activity. The total amount of Class A drugs found on your bed was just under 2g of heroin and 219 mg of crack cocaine. I accept that these were for your personal use.

18. The police also found in your bedroom the keys to a Citroen car, which had been rented by Harry Singh, and which was parked outside your house.
19. The Renault Traffic Van whose keys were in the possession of Harry Singh was also parked outside your house in Lampton Avenue, Purshotam Dhillon. The van had been rented by Harry Singh. It was searched and contained a large green Amazon bag which had within it a quantity of zip loc bags containing heroin. Once again, the bags were similar to those found at Gurpreet Dhillon and at Purshotam Dhillon's addresses. The total amount of heroin in the Amazon bag was approximately 414.6 grams. The drugs were not bagged up in £10 deals: this involved the storage of wholesale amounts. A police expert estimated the street value of the drugs in the Amazon bag at £38,300.
20. Your DNA was found, Harry Singh and Purshotam Dhillon, in the clingfilm that formed the inner packaging of one of the quantities of drugs. Your DNA was found, Harry Singh, on other Ziploc bags in the Amazon bag.
21. At about the same time as the attempt was made to stop the Audi, the police moved to arrest you, Bikramjit Brah, at your home address in Nestles Avenue, Hayes. As they did so, they saw you walking along the street, and you were arrested. You had 6.8 grams of heroin tucked into the turn up of your trousers, and you had a black nokia double-sim phone. Other phones were found at your home address, together with two tick lists, bags, and quantities of class A drugs, some of which were bagged up. The total amounts of drugs found at your home, in various quantities, were 73.93 g of heroin, and 57 mg of cocaine and heroin.
22. Finally, on the same morning, the police arrested you, Leandrea Lynch, at your home address, in Dawley Road, Hayes. You were in possession of a clear plastic bag containing white powder, which you admitted was heroin, which you said was for your personal use.
23. There is other evidence that indicates the scale of the operation and your respective roles within it.
24. Downloads were made from your phone, Harry Singh. This held images of large amounts of cash, and searches for magnetic hides and spy ware. There are

communications in which you talk about owning Class A drug lines and where they operate and you discuss the supply of large amount of Class A drugs.

25. As for you, Leandrea Lynch, material downloaded from your phone shows that third parties would pass on requests to you to be supplied with drugs and on one occasion a third party contacted you to tell you that another group was claiming to customers to be the Hadi line and was supplying inferior product. The third party told you where the others could be found and told you that they had been promoting your drugs line to others. You then got in touch with the other drug dealers and told them to stop. On another occasion, a drug user complained to you about the quality of drugs that he had been supplied with.

26. In the weeks leading up to the arrests on 1 July 2025, the police set up a surveillance operation at your home addresses, Purshotam Dhillon and Leandrea Lynch.

27. This showed that you, Harry Singh, drove to the vicinity of Purshotam Dhillon's home and spent time in or around the house on more or less a daily basis. Indeed, it is clear that on many days, you went to Purshotam Dhillon's home, or its vicinity, several times in a day. When you visited Purshotam Dhillon's home, you were greeted by him and went into the house and spent some time together. For much of this time, Purshotam Dhillon was on sick leave from work and so was at home all day. The police surveillance photographs show that you, Harry Singh, made many visits to and from the Renault Traffic Van which was parked up close to Purshotam Dhillon's house. It is clear that this was the main place, or at least one of the main places, where you stored the drugs. It suited you to keep the drugs some distance away from where you were living.

28. You can also be seen on numerous occasions going into Purshotam Dhillon's home with bags or packages. Sometimes you came out empty-handed and other times you went to the van and placed something in there. Purshotam Dhillon can be seen greeting you when you were at his front door, and staying around whilst you went to and from the van. You, Harry Singh, can be seen checking the van door to ensure that it is secure, and you can also be seen wearing a high vis jacket. This was plainly to give the impression that you had some legitimate reason for being where you were, when in fact you were going about your work in connection with the drugs business.

29. In light of the traces of drugs on the scales and the two weapons that were found in your bedroom, Purshotam Dhillon, and the amount of time that you, Harry Singh, spent in Purshotam Dhillon's home, I am fully satisfied that the two of you spent time together in the bedroom weighing and bagging up the drugs. There is no evidence that you, Purshotam Dhillon, engaged in street dealing; that was not your role in the enterprise.
30. The results of the police surveillance also show that you, Harry Singh, were a very frequent visitor to Leandrea Lynch's home in Dawley Road. You, Leandrea Lynch, were the former partner of Harry Singh. You shared a school-age daughter. I accept that most of the visits were to see your daughter and to take her to school or on shopping trips. But there was surveillance evidence which showed that on at least one occasion, the two of you, Harry Singh and Leandrea Lynch, made a journey to Purshotam Dhillon's home with a package and I have no doubt that this was to bring drugs to Mr Dhillon's home so that they could be weighed and bagged up and eventually stored in the van or taken elsewhere. There was a further occasion on which you, Ms Lynch made a journey to the vicinity of Bikramjit Brah's home. I am satisfied that this was to deliver something connected with the drugs enterprise to Bikramjit Brah house on the instructions of Harry Singh.
31. Having summarised the activities of the organised crime network during the indictment period, I will next deal with you individually. I will consider the relevant starting points and sentencing ranges for the purposes of the drugs sentencing guideline. Though the drugs guideline refers to the offences of supplying or offering to supply a controlled drug and possession of a controlled drug with intent to supply it to another, this guideline is also an appropriate guide for sentencing offenders for the offence of being concerned in the supply of drugs. All counsel agree with this approach.
32. I make clear that I am only sentencing you for your offending during the indictment period.

**Harry Singh**

33. I will start with you, Harry Singh.

34. The first issue that I have to decide is the appropriate harm category for the drugs offences. As I have said, a number of drugs seizures were made, during the indictment period, from various of the participants. The total amount seized was something over 1kg of heroin and a smaller amount of crack cocaine. However, as I have said, this is by no means the total amount of drugs that were handled by the organised crime group during the indictment period. I have no doubt that a much greater amount of drugs was sourced, handled, and sold to customers during this period.
35. It is impossible to make a completely accurate assessment of the amount of drugs handled and sold during the indictment period, but I bear in mind that the indictment period lasted over 9 months, and the drugs operation was already up and running at the start of the period. It did not begin at that point from a standing start. Also, there were a large number of customers for the bulk messages, reaching to more than 180 people by July 2025. Still further, a substantial team of people were involved in the operation of the organised crime network. In all the circumstances, I am sure, to the criminal standard, that the appropriate harm category for your offending as a leading member of the organised crime network is harm category 1, and that the amounts handled by the network during the indictment period reached or may even have exceeded the indicative amount of 5 kilograms of heroin and cocaine for that harm category. I do not accept the Defence submission that the amount fell at the bottom of category 1 or at the top of category 2.
36. The next matter I must decide is the culpability category into which you fall.
37. You, Harry Singh, had the leading role in this large and lucrative criminal organisation. Whilst not disputing that you had a leading role, the Defence contend that you were not by any means the only person with a leading role in the operation, and sought to emphasise that you were not the kingpin. Whatever the position in relation to that might be, the reality is that you were in charge on a day to day basis during the indictment period.
38. You were the boss, whether on your own or with others. You were directing and organising buying and selling on a commercial scale. You had substantial links to, and influence upon, others in the chain, and you had the expectation of a

substantial financial advantage. Indeed, you were able to trade up to an expensive Audi not long after coming out of prison. It was also said by the Defence that you were involved in this operation because you owed a substantial drug debt to a criminal. There is no evidence of this, however, and there was no basis of plea to this effect. In any event, as was acknowledged on your behalf, this is scant mitigation. The fact remains that you were dealing in drugs on a substantial scale in order to make money. This was your business and you were in it to make a profit.

39. This means that, for the two drugs offences, you are category 1, leading role. The relevant sentencing guideline states that the starting point is 14 years' custody, and the category range is 12-16 years' custody.

40. So far as the dangerous driving offence is concerned, this is in culpability category A. You rammed police cars in an attempt to get away and you took a deliberate decision to ignore the rules of the road and showed disregard for the risk of danger to others. As regards the harm category, there were, thankfully, no injuries as a result of your dangerous driving, apart from some minor injury to one police officer in the form of whiplash, though there might easily have been much more serious injury, but there was damage to a number of police cars. This places this offending in harm category 1. This means that, for the offence of dangerous driving, your offending is in category A1. This results in a starting point for this offence of 1 year and 6 months' imprisonment, and a category range of 1-2 years' custody.

41. You are entitled to 25% credit for plea.

42. You were born on 19 December 1977, and so you were 46/47 when you committed these offences. There are two very significant aggravating factors in your case.

43. The first is your previous offending. You have 31 convictions for 48 offences. 14 of these are for drugs offences. Most of these were possession offences. However, as I have said, on 13 June 2018 you were sentenced at Kingston Crown Court to 9 years and 8 months' imprisonment for two offences of conspiracy to supply crack cocaine and heroin. On the same occasion you were sentenced to 5

years and 4 months' imprisonment, consecutive, for possessing an automatic weapon and ammunition.

44. You have also been convicted of numerous driving offences. These include a conviction for dangerous driving and failing to stop on 28 October 2005, for which you were given a conditional discharge, further convictions for driving whilst disqualified and whilst uninsured in December 2005, and then again in January 2007, driving without due care and attention in December 2010, and drug driving in August 2016. These are aggravating factors for the dangerous driving offence, though I bear in mind that they are of some antiquity, and the sentence suggests that the dangerous driving offence was not of the greatest seriousness.
45. You have served many sentences of imprisonment or in young offenders' institutions for various offences, stretching back to 1996. Many of these were for violent offences.
46. The second major aggravating factor is that these offences were committed whilst you were on licence for the sentences that were imposed in June 2018. Indeed, it is clear that, as soon as you were released at the start of the indictment period, you immediately took up the reins of the leadership of the organised crime network and then dedicated your time to your drug dealing business. You were happy to induce Purshotam Dhillon, and no doubt others, into your network and so to lure them into criminality. However, I do not treat it as an aggravating feature that you brought Mr Dhillon into the enterprise. Nevertheless, it is clear that you have absolutely no concern about the harm that drug usage causes to people and to society, even though you have direct experience of it through seeing the effect that it has had on Leandrea Lynch.
47. It is also clear from your antecedent history that you have, over many years, been a drug user yourself, with a cocaine addiction, but this is not a case of a drug user getting involved in dealing to feed his habit. You were in this for the large profits that were on offer.
48. You have little or no mitigation, beyond the following: you have significant health problems, including urology and cardiac issues, and back pain. You are registered disabled. Your health problems are mainly consequences of long-

term drug use. These may make your time in prison somewhat more uncomfortable than it would otherwise have been, but there is no reason to think that the prison medical authorities will be unable to give you appropriate treatment for your conditions. Nevertheless, this is, to some small extent, a mitigating factor. You also have had a number of recent prison commendations for good behaviour, which is to your credit, and you have a supportive family.

49. I now come to your sentence. The sentences for the two drug offences will be concurrent with each other, but the sentence for the dangerous driving offence will be consecutive. If you had been convicted of the drugs offences at trial, the appropriate sentence for those offences would have been 16 years' imprisonment, concurrent. For the offence of dangerous driving, the appropriate sentence would have been two years, consecutive. That would have made a total of 18 years' imprisonment.

50. I make a reduction of one year to the drugs sentences for totality and for your health problems.

51. I must next take account of the fact that, as you were recalled to prison following your arrest on 1 July 2025, you are not entitled to any time off for time served on remand. As I have said, you pleaded guilty on 26 September 2025. It is likely that you would have been sentenced some time ago were it not for the fact that your sentence was postponed pending the outcome of the trial of Dhillon and Lynch, and so would have started serving the sentence for these offences at an earlier stage. However, if you choose to reoffend as soon as you are out on licence for another offence, you really have no one but yourself to blame for the loss of credit for time served. In the circumstances, and in order to do justice, I consider it appropriate to reduce your sentence for the drugs offences by a further 3 months to reflect the time spent on recall which would otherwise have been spent serving your sentence. For the avoidance of doubt, the sentences which I am about to impose will be concurrent with the sentence imposed in 2018 for which you were recalled.

52. This means that the total sentence without credit for plea would have been 16 years and 9 months' imprisonment, comprising 14 years and 9 months' imprisonment for the drugs offences and 2 years' imprisonment for the dangerous driving offence. You are entitled to credit for your plea of 25%.

Rounding it downwards very slightly, that results a in sentence of 11 years for the drugs offences and 18 months' consecutive for the dangerous driving offence. This is a total sentence of 12 years and 6 months.

53. Harry Singh, for each of the two offences of being concerned in the supply of Class A drugs, namely heroin and cocaine, I sentence you to 11 years' imprisonment, to be served concurrently to each other. For the offence of dangerous driving, I sentence you to a further 18 months' imprisonment, to be served consecutively. This is a total of 12 years and 6 months' imprisonment.
54. You will be released no later than 40% through the 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.
55. Finally, you will be disqualified from driving. The period of disqualification that I consider appropriate is 2 years, to be calculated from the point at which you will have served 40% of your sentence. The idea behind this is that you will be disqualified from driving after you have been released, rather than, pointlessly, whilst you are serving your sentence. The way in which this objective can be achieved has been made clear by the Court of Appeal in the cases of **Needham** [2016] EWCA Crim 455, **Ashman** [2025] EWCA Crim 1091; and **Jordan Lindsay** [2026] EWCA Crim 692, at paragraph 18.
56. This approach requires that the extension periods for the purposes of sections 35A and 35B of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988 and section 166 of the Sentencing Act 2020, should total 60 months, being 40% of 12 years and 6 months. The extension period for the offence of dangerous driving is fixed by statute at 50% of the total sentence for that offence. The 50% extension period for that offence is therefore 9 months. I have a discretion as regards the length of the extension period of disqualification for the purposes of the drugs offences, and I impose an extension period of 51 months, so as to make a total extension period of 60 months.
57. This results in a disqualification of two years, plus a total extension period of 60 months. After the two-year period has expired, your disqualification will continue until you have passed an extended driving test. That means that when

your disqualification of two years has expired you can apply for a driving licence but the licence you get will be provisional until you have passed the extended test. Your driving licence will also be endorsed.

### **Purshotam Dhillon**

58. As for you, Purshotam Dhillon, you performed an operational function within the chain that consisted of the drugs enterprise. Given your closeness to, and familiarity with, Harry Singh, there can be no doubt that you had a considerable awareness and understanding of the scale of the operation. The sheer number of visits that Harry Singh made to the vicinity of your home during the main surveillance period in the month or so before your arrest shows that you were an important and integral part of the business. It is clear that your home was, for a considerable time, the base for much of the network's operations. You permitted Harry Singh to store his van beside your home, where many of the drugs were kept, and you assisted Harry Singh in weighing and bagging up the drugs in your own home. The DNA evidence supports this conclusion, as does the number of empty self-seal bags in your bedroom, and the traces of drugs on the scales.
59. I cannot be sure that you made a significant financial gain from the operation. You are a habitual drug user yourself, of heroin and, in the latter stages, of crack cocaine. By the time of your arrest, you were using at least a gram of heroin a day. It may well be that your reward for the part that you played mainly or even entirely took the form of free or heavily discounted drugs, but, nevertheless, you were willing to give considerable assistance to a major drugs network and your case falls within the significant role category, albeit not near the top of it. I am unable to accept the Defence submission that you had a lesser role.
60. As I have said, the scale of the operations of the criminal network as a whole in which you were performing this significant role comes within category 1. The Prosecution have submitted, however, that I should sentence you on the basis that you are in harm category 2. Category 2 has an indicative quantity, of cocaine or heroin, for those supplying drugs or possessing drugs with intent to supply, of 1kg. I agree that this is the appropriate culpability category into which to place your offending. I will therefore sentence you on the basis that you come within Category 2, significant role, albeit perhaps at the lower end. The starting point

for this category is 8 years' custody, and the sentencing range is from 6 years 6 months' custody to 10 years' custody.

61. There is one aggravating factor in your case, which is that there were weapons present in your bedroom at home. You had pleaded guilty to the possession of the baton at the magistrates court, but were not separately charged with the possession of the baseball bat. At your trial you gave the court a frankly fatuous explanation for the presence of these weapons. I have no doubt that the real reason that you had a baton and a baseball bat in your room was because you knew that, as someone involved in drug dealing, and as someone who was involved in the storage of drugs, you were at risk of raid from other organised crime groups.
62. The most extraordinary aspect of this case is that you were, throughout the indictment period, serving as a magistrate in the criminal courts. Indeed, you had been a magistrate for over 20 years. It is disgraceful, to say the least, that someone who has sworn to uphold the law in this way, should end up on the wrong side of the law and should, at the same time as serving as a magistrate, take part enthusiastically in a major criminal enterprise. You, of all people, should know the harm that drug dealing does.
63. You knew that you had a duty to declare your relationship with Harry Singh, because he was a drug dealer, but you did not do so because it would have shed light on your own drug habit.
64. I have carefully considered whether I should treat your status as a magistrate as an aggravating feature. I have decided that I should not do so. There is no evidence that you made use of your status as a magistrate to assist the criminal enterprise in any way. It is true that your status as an apparently respectable member of society, leading a respectable life in a respectable area, must have been a feature which encouraged Harry Singh to use your home and its vicinity as a base for operations and for storing the drugs. But I do not think that your status as a magistrate played any part in this.
65. However, your status as a magistrate is relevant for the purposes of your sentencing. It means, that, in my view, I can give you far less credit for your previous good character than I otherwise could have done. You told the Court

that you started to use class A drugs many years ago and you became acquainted with Harry Singh because he was your supplier, or one of your suppliers. This means that you dealt as a magistrate with cases of possession or supply of drugs over many years when you were yourself committing similar offences, first as a drug user and then, latterly, as someone concerned in the supply of drugs. This is behaviour that is likely to bring the legal system into disrepute. Fortunately, it is vanishingly rare.

66. You were born on 1 February 1967 and are now 59 years old. I bear in mind that you worked for many years as a Council Housing Officer, that you have been caring for elderly parents in challenging circumstances, and that you suffer chronic back pain. I have also read your character references. All of this is some mitigation, but as I have said, your available mitigation is tempered by the fact that you committed your offences whilst you were a serving magistrate.

67. I have no doubt that your relationship with Harry Singh started when you were a customer of his. Over time, you were drawn in and gradually became a key member of his criminal team. However, you have no one to blame but yourself. You were not a naïve youngster, but a mature and worldly man, and you knew what you were getting yourself into. I bear in mind that you are yourself a drug user, and have been for many years, and that there is no evidence that you made significant financial profits from your offending. However, the fact remains that you willingly and enthusiastically engaged in serious and very harmful criminal activity. Moreover, you got what you wanted from it in the form of free drugs and over the 9 month period this will have been valuable to you.

68. I am told that you have serious health problems. I will take them into account, but there is no reason to think that you cannot properly be cared for in the prison system. The Prosecution accepts that your addiction to heroin was the result partly from a desire to alleviate your back pain, rather than entirely as a lifestyle choice. There are, however, lawful means of obtaining help with chronic pain. It does not excuse criminality. You are undergoing treatment in prison for your drug addiction.

69. Taking all of the circumstances into account, and bearing in mind the extent of your involvement in the criminal network, and the aggravating and mitigating

factors, I sentence you to 7 years' imprisonment, concurrent, for each of the two offences for which you were convicted.

70. The days which you have spent on remand in custody will automatically count towards your sentence. I am told that these amount to 357 days, but if this figure is wrong, it can be corrected administratively.

71. You will be released no later than 40% through the sentence and the remainder of the sentence will be served on licence in the community. You must comply with all of 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.

### **Bikramjit Brah**

72. I turn to you, Bikramjit Brah. You worked as a street dealer, but I am satisfied on the evidence, including the quantity of drugs found at your home on 1 July 2022, together with the tick lists and the telephone evidence of frequent contacts with Harry Singh, that your involvement did not stop there. I am satisfied that you were not simply a low-level foot-soldier and street dealer, and no more. The telephone evidence, in particular, suggests that you were not far from the heart of the operation, though you had a much lower rank than Mr Singh. As the Defence sentencing note acknowledges, you were a custodian as well as a street dealer, and you collected money on behalf of persons higher up the chain. You performed an operational function within a chain and you had some awareness or understanding of the scale of the operation. However, there is no direct evidence that you received or expected substantial financial rewards for your actions, and there is no evidence that the rewards you received went much further than enabling you to feed your own addiction.

73. You therefore had a significant role, although at the lower end.

74. It is not a straightforward matter to place your offending in the appropriate harm category. I agree with the Prosecution sentencing note that, even though the criminal network as a whole falls within harm category 1, it would not be appropriate to sentence you on the basis that your involvement comes within that harm category. In my judgment, on the basis of the available evidence, the appropriate course of action would be to sentence you on the basis that your

offending, being predominantly street dealing, comes within harm category 3, albeit at the upper end. This category has a starting point, for a significant role, of 4 and 1/2 years' custody and a range from 3 and 1/2 years' custody to 7 years' custody

75. You are a similar age to Harry Singh. You were born on 12 March 1979 and so were 51 years old when the offending began. You have 4 convictions for 10 offences. The most significant for present purposes is your conviction on 5 November 2013 for four offences of supplying Class A drugs, heroin, crack cocaine and cocaine, and one offence of possession of crack cocaine with intent to supply, for which you were sentenced to a total of 4 years' imprisonment. This is plainly an aggravating factor, though I bear in mind that the conviction is well over 10 years old and there has been no offending since.
76. There is limited mitigation in your case. You have struggled with substance misuse for over 25 years. You were still a heavy drug user during the indictment period. You underwent drug treatment in 2015 but relapsed. At the time of offending, you were consuming 1.7 grams of heroin, 1 gram of crack cocaine and 1 gram of cannabis daily. I do not accept, however, that you were involved through exploitation. You are not a young or naïve man: you have been involved in serious drug dealing before, and you went into this offending with your eyes open. I am told that you are remorseful. It is to your credit that you have been attempting to address your addiction whilst in prison. Your counsel said that you may have some ADHD or autistic traits, but there is no medical evidence to that effect.
77. The nature and circumstances of your offending, and the aggravating and mitigating factors mean, in my view, that the sentence after trial would have been 5 years' imprisonment.
78. You are entitled to 1/3 off for your guilty plea. I therefore sentence you to 40 months' imprisonment, that is 3 years and four months' imprisonment, concurrent, for each of the three offences for which you have pleaded guilty, that is the two offences of being concerned in the supply of class A drugs, plus the one offence of possession with intent to supply.

79. You will be released no later than 40% through the 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.

80. The days which you have spent on remand in custody will automatically count towards your sentence. I am told that these amount to 357 days, but if this figure is wrong, it can be corrected administratively.

### **Leandrea Lynch**

81. Finally, I come to you, Leandrea Lynch. The Prosecution and Defence both submit that you should be sentenced on the basis that you fall within category 3, lesser role. I agree.

82. It would not be right to sentence you on the basis that your offending fell into harm category 1, even though the criminal enterprise as a whole fell into this category. You were only involved in a minor part of it. I have come to the conclusion that you had a lesser role in the organised crime network. There can be little doubt, given your regular contact with Harry Singh, that you will have had a considerable awareness and understanding of the scale of the operation. It is also clear that you were regarded by drug users as a point of contact with the Hadi network, and, on some occasions, you facilitated the dealing by taking and passing on phone messages. You travelled to Mr Dhillon's home with Harry Singh on at least one occasion when, to your knowledge, a package of drugs was being transported there. You also delivered drugs to Bikramjit Brah on at least one occasion. However, I take the view that you performed a limited function under direction. You were at the bottom of the chain, with no influence over those above you. The people who contacted you to buy drugs were friends of yours. There were no drugs at your home address beyond some heroin for your personal use.

83. You are a habitual and addicted heroin user, and there is no evidence that you profited financially, or expected to profit financially, from your involvement in the network, beyond receiving a supply of Class A drugs for your personal use. There is no sign that Harry Singh was sharing his profits with you. I take the view that your role in the network was essentially a side effect of the fact that you

were involved in the world of drugs, and were Harry Singh's former partner, and were co-parenting your daughter together. This does not absolve you from culpability, by any means, but, in my view, it means that you had a lesser role, although towards the upper end of the lesser role category.

84. The starting point for Category 3, lesser role, is 3 years custody, with a range of 2 to 4 and 1/2 years custody.
85. There are no aggravating features in your case. You have 5 convictions for 18 offences, but the great majority of these were for low level fraud, handling stolen goods, or shoplifting. You have one conviction for possession of heroin in January 2021, for which you were fined.
86. There is, however, a considerable amount of mitigation. You have no previous convictions related to drug dealing and you have never been to prison. I have been provided with a pre-sentence report, and an assessment of your suitability for a Drug Rehabilitation Requirement.
87. You were born on 21 April 1977 and so are now 49 years old. You have had a chronic addiction to class A drugs since your late teens. You take heroin several times each day. You also use benzodiazepines, and, intermittently, take crack cocaine. You have been unemployed for a long time. You have two children, a son of about 21 and a daughter of 13, both of whom live with you in council accommodation. You are the sole carer for your daughter, whose father is Harry Singh. Your 84 year old mother lives with you. She has chronic lung issues and you are her primary carer. You are assessed in the Pre-Sentence Report as posing a low risk of reoffending over the next few years.
88. On the other hand, it is very concerning that, as is apparent from the Pre-Sentence Report, you continue to show no remorse. You continue to claim that you are innocent. It is even more concerning that for a considerable time after conviction, you did not tell your family that you were found guilty in the trial and are to be sentenced for these offences. You told them that you were found not guilty. You have made no contingency plans in case you are sentenced to prison today, even though this would have a major impact on your family. This is concerning because it suggests that you are unwilling to face up to your predicament and are unwilling to take steps to help yourself.

89. The seriousness of these offences is such that neither a fine alone nor a community order can be justified. In my judgment, the shortest sentence that can be imposed to meet the seriousness of your offending is 2 years and 6 months' imprisonment.
90. The next question for me is whether this sentence can or should be suspended. I take account of the guideline on imposition of community and custodial sentences.
91. There is no doubt that the custody threshold has been passed and that there are considerable potential obstacles to the suspension of your sentence. You have been assessed as being unsuitable for a Drug Rehabilitation Requirement because you do not demonstrate the stability or consistency required to engage with a DRR. Your long history of disengagement, alongside high-risk daily substance abuse and benzodiazepine dependence, indicates that you would be unable to meet the structured expectations of a DRR. You have a patchy record of compliance with community orders, though you have complied with the curfew that has been in place for nearly a year.
92. Nevertheless, after careful consideration, I have come to the conclusion that your sentence can and should be suspended. The seriousness of your offending is not such as to mean that appropriate punishment can only be achieved by immediate custody. You do not present a high risk of reoffending. Despite your poor history of dealing with your problems, I consider that there is a realistic prospect of rehabilitation in the community. There is some hope that you are willing to change. The DRR report said that you are now at the stage at which you identify several motivating factors for change. You have indicated a willingness to take part in voluntary drug treatment. You are worried about the impact of your lifestyle on your daughter and upon yourself. You are experiencing significant financial strain and cannot sustain your current pattern of drug use. The negative influence of Harry Singh will be removed from your life for a considerable time.
93. Most importantly, immediate custody would result in a significant harmful impact upon others, including in particular your 13-year-old daughter. Neither your mother nor your son is able to look after her and so, if you were sent to

prison, it is very likely that your daughter would be taken into care, at a particularly vulnerable age. It would also have a significant harmful impact upon your elderly mother, who depends upon you. You hold the tenancy for the council property in which the family lives.

94. As for the conditions to be attached to the suspended sentence, you have been assessed as unsuitable for an unpaid work requirement and, as I have said, you are not suitable for a Drug Rehabilitation Requirement, though you may be eligible for voluntary drug addiction support. The Pre-Sentence Report proposes a Rehabilitation Activity Requirement of up to 20 days, GPS Trail Monitoring, of up to 12 months, and a Prohibited Activity Requirement, consistent of not contacting the co-defendants. The Defence point out that there is a difficulty with this latter requirement, so far as Harry Singh is concerned, because he is the father of your daughter.

95. Leandrea Lynch, I sentence you to a suspended sentence order for each of the two offences, of 2 years and 6 months' duration. There will be a custodial term of 2 years and 6 months which will be suspended for 2 years and 6 months. The sentences are concurrent.

96. If in the next 2 years 6 months you commit any offence, whether or not it is of the same type for which I am sentencing you today, you will be brought back to court and it is likely that this sentence will be brought into operation either in full or in part. The Pre-Sentence Report says that you are a habitual shoplifter. This has got to stop. I make clear that if you are caught shoplifting in the future, you will be brought back to court and consideration will be given to activating the sentence, in whole or in part.

97. Also, during the next two years, you will be subject to – and must co-operate with – a rehabilitation activity requirement of 20 days. That means that you must meet your supervisor as and when you are told to, and you must co-operate fully with any instructions your supervisor gives you.

98. You will also be subject to a curfew requirement from 10 pm to 6 am for a further period of 6 months from today. You must comply with an electronic monitoring requirement to ensure compliance with the curfew. I do not make the curfew

any longer than this because you have already been subject to a curfew for a substantial period.

99. There will also be a Prohibited Activity requirement, requiring that, for the period of the suspended sentence order, you do not contact Bikramjit Brah or Purshotam Dhillon. I do not make a Prohibited Activity requirement in respect of contact with Harry Singh, in light of your co-parenting arrangement.

100. If you fail to cooperate with the rehabilitation activity requirement, the curfew, the electronic monitoring requirement, or the prohibited activity requirement you will be in breach of the suspended sentence order: that means you will be brought back to court and may be given further requirements, or the custodial part of the suspended sentence order may be activated, in whole or in part.

101. I appreciate, Ms Lynch, that this is a lot to take in. The headline is that you will not go to prison today. You have been given a suspended sentence of 2 and 1/2 years imprisonment, suspended for 2 and 1/2 years. There are a number of requirements attached to this which I have specified and which your counsel, Mr Davies, will explain to you.

102. I want to make clear to you that you have avoided prison by the skin of your teeth. You have one last chance to turn your life around. Please make sure that you take it.

103. Finally, I make an order for Deprivation, Forfeiture and Destruction of all drugs and drug related paraphernalia and Deprivation and Forfeiture of cash seized during the course of the arrests on 1st July 2025 (save, for the avoidance of doubt, the cash found in Purshotam Dhillon's bedroom, which was not the proceeds of drug dealing).