

IN THE CROWN COURT SITTING AT WOOLWICH

BETWEEN

THE CROWN

-v-

**(1) TEVIN NZITA
(2) ANTHONY DASOUSA
(3) CHRISTOPHER DASOUSA**

SENTENCING REMARKS

OF

HIS HONOUR JUDGE GROUT

Introduction

1. Tevin Nzita, Anthony Dasousa and Christopher Dasousa, I must sentence the three of you for serious offences which you were convicted of following a trial before me and a jury in June of this year.
2. Tevin Nzita, you had previously pleaded guilty to offences of wounding with intent and possession of a prohibited firearm. The jury, however, convicted you of offences of attempted murder, possessing a firearm with intent to endanger life and possessing ammunition with intent to endanger life. Anthony Dasousa, the jury found you not guilty of attempted murder but found you guilty of wounding with intent, possessing a firearm with intent to endanger life and possessing ammunition with intent to endanger life. Christopher Dasousa, the jury found you not guilty of attempted murder and

wounding with intent, but guilty of encouraging or assisting the commission of an offence.

The Facts

3. The facts of the offending are as follows. These facts are consistent with the evidence at trial and the verdicts of the jury. Where I am unsure about a particular matter, I will say so.
4. The three of you are friends. Anthony and Christopher, you are brothers. There was a pre-trial application, made by the Crown, to allow evidence which suggested that the three of you were or are members of the same gang. For the reasons I gave at the time, I excluded that evidence and so nothing about alleged gang-affiliation was put before the jury. I say no more about gangs.
5. On 21 May 2025 the three of you were all in Croydon. You were not together although you were not far away from each other. At about 7:15pm the victim, Meldin Adeleye, was travelling along King Henry's Drive in a Volkswagen Polo. He had a passenger. As part of the police investigation into what happened, mobile phone footage was recovered which showed you, Tevin Nzita, running towards your home address. Those in the VW Polo appear to be mocking you. They laugh and can be heard calling you T Squeeze and Squeezy, names which you accept are associated with you. It follows, therefore, that the occupants of that vehicle appeared to know who you are. At trial, you explained that, whilst on the phone to Christopher Dasousa, and whilst walking down King Henry's Drive, you had just passed the entrance to Rowdan Crescent when the VW Polo passed you. You could see the passenger looking at you. The speed of the vehicle was normal and was travelling in the same direction as you. You were concerned, you said, because the person was looking at you as if he knew who you were. You said that you did not mention this to Christopher. You explained that you carried on walking and as you were close to the junction with Redstart Close, you saw the VW Polo travelling back in the opposite direction. You said that you were now no longer on the phone to Christopher. The VW Polo stopped alongside you and the driver shouted wagwan and you said the same. You said that you could see the driver's face

through the open window but did not recognise him. You stepped across the grass to get a clearer view of him. You said that the driver looked forward and then to the left, he reached to his left and jumped out of his car. You told the jury that you saw something silver in the man's hand- maybe a knife. You then started running towards your house. The next time you were aware of the VW Polo was when you got to your front door. Whilst running, you heard the occupants shout out your nickname.

6. I do not accept that you did not know the occupants of the VW Polo, in particular Mr Adeleye. Quite apart from the fact that they appeared to know who you were, what was to happen in this case demonstrates to me so that I am sure that you knew very well who Mr Adeleye was and then set about looking to find him in order to kill him. I am, however, prepared to accept that there was some interaction between you and Mr Adeleye just prior to the moment captured by the mobile phone footage to which I have referred. That makes sense not least because the period of the filming strongly suggests that the occupants of the VW Polo were following you and were ready to capture you on film whilst calling out your name. Whether they had behaved threateningly towards you, as you suggest, I do not know. I am prepared to accept that that is possible.
7. Whether that is what happened or not, does not begin to justify or excuse what happened next. The evidence put together by the police- comprising call records between the three of you, cell site data and CCTV and other video recordings- reveals that within moments of this incident having happened, the three of you worked together to find Mr Adeleye. Anthony Dasousa, you arrived at Mr Nzita's house within three or so minutes of the filming incident having occurred and ring doorbell footage shows Mr Nzita getting into your car. Mr Nzita says that he had, in the intervening period, retrieved a shotgun and ammunition from his wardrobe and had concealed it within his trousers. It is not clear from the ring-door bell footage whether the gun was so concealed. It is possible that Mr Nzita did have the gun so concealed. It is also possible that the gun was already in the vehicle or that it was picked up from elsewhere. Whatever the answer, the jury was sure, by its verdicts, that both you, Tevin Nzita, and you, Anthony Dasousa, were in joint possession of both the firearm and the ammunition with intent to endanger life. The rather peculiar account given by you, Mr Nzita, as to why you had taken the shotgun and ammunition with you, was plainly not accepted by the jury.

8. It is clear from the collection of evidence to which I have referred that once the two of you are together in Anthony Dasousa's car, the three of you remain in contact as Christopher you are on a telephone call to Anthony during this time. Christopher Dasousa you were also in the area at this time driving a White Ford Puma. I am sure that by the time Mr Nzita and Anthony were together, you were actively looking for the VW Polo containing Mr Adeleye. And you found it. A mixture of CCTV footage taken from various buses, as well as ring doorbell footage taken from a residential property, provided overwhelming evidence that you spotted the VW Polo and followed it. It turned into Walsh Crescent which you knew very well was a cul-de-sac, not least because you had driven down it not long before. On this occasion, however, whilst the VW Polo came to a stop in Walsh Crescent, you stopped at the junction of Walsh Crescent and Holmstead Way.
9. At about 7:26pm, Anthony's vehicle is seen entering Walsh Crescent. At trial, it was suggested that you, Anthony, and your brother did not know that you were both at the junction with Walsh Crescent and that the reason you turned into that particular road was because you had spotted an ice cream van. That, I am sure, is not true. It is clear from the jury's verdict that you, Christopher Dasousa, had provided your brother and Mr Nzita with the location of the VW Polo and that you, Anthony, were driving to that location with Mr Nzita, knowing that he had a gun and knowing that he intended to shoot Mr Adeleye- albeit that, on the jury's verdict, they were not sure that you knew that Mr Nzita intended to kill him. Your suggestion, however, that it came as a complete surprise to you when Mr Nzita jumped out of your car and started shooting was evidently not accepted by the jury.
10. The shooting is caught by a resident's ring doorbell camera. Mr Adeleye having jumped back into the driver's side of his vehicle, you, Tevin Nzita, exit Anthony Dasousa's car and fire two shots at close range. The first shot was through the front windscreen of the vehicle. It did not hit Mr Adeleye. The second shot, however, was fired through the driver's side window. It shattered the glass and hit Mr Adeleye in the chest. Your explanation at trial, that you were aiming for Mr Adeleye's legs and only intended to cause him really serious harm, was not accepted by the jury. Having shot Mr Adeleye, you get back into Anthony Dasousa's vehicle and the two of you drive off.

11. Mr Adeleye makes his way to a nearby medical centre where he was assisted and provided with emergency care before being transferred to King's College Hospital. His injuries included:

- Gunshot wounds to the front right side of the chest wall
- A circular wound to the right side of the chest wall
- Multiple gunshot bullets to a layer underneath the skin
- A fracture to the seventh rib to the front of the right side of the rib cage, and
- A partial collapse of the bases to both lungs.

The reason why there were multiple injury sites is because you had used a shotgun and that is the nature of how the constituent parts of the cartridge disperse and enter the body when someone is shot at close range. Fortunately, however, having undergone surgery, Mr Adeleye survived and is not expected to suffer any life-changing injuries.

12. At trial, the prosecution also relied on various pieces of evidence in relation to what happened after the shooting. I will not set those out save to note that Anthony you did arrange for your car to be fitted with false numberplates in order, I am satisfied, to try and avoid it being located by the police.

13. You were all in due course arrested and interviewed. Tevin Nzita, you advanced a prepared statement in which you denied being the shooter and said that the police had arrested the wrong person. By the time of the trial, of course, you accepted that you were the shooter and so the account you had given to the police was false. Anthony and Christopher Dasousa, you chose not to give any prepared statements, and you then answered no comment to questions asked of you.

Approach to Sentencing

14. In sentencing you all, I have had regard to the relevant offence-specific guidelines, as well as the guidelines on the imposition of community and custodial sentences, credit for guilty pleas (where such pleas were entered) and totality. Totality is particularly important in your case, Tevin Nzita, and your case, Anthony Dasousa. Although you have been convicted of multiple offences, I must pass an overall sentence which is just and proportionate and which reflects all of the offending behaviour with reference to overall harm and culpability, together with the aggravating and mitigating factors relating to the offences as well as those personal to you. I intend to achieve that in your respective cases by passing a sentence on one lead offence which takes all relevant matters into account and then passing concurrent sentences on the remaining offences.
15. In all three of your cases, I have read the pre-sentence reports prepared by the probation service and I have listened with care to all that has been said on your behalf by your counsel.

The Sentences

Tevin Nzita

16. Mr Nzita, I shall deal with your first. You are 31 years' old. The most serious offence I must sentence you for is the offence of attempted murder. I will treat that as the lead offence. The maximum sentence for attempted murder is life imprisonment. By reference to the offence guideline, your culpability is very high. That is because the offence involved the use of a firearm. Insofar as harm is concerned, there is no victim personal statement from Mr Adeleye. Indeed, he did not provide a witness statement at all as he was not interested in assisting police with their investigation over and above the brief encounter he had with them whilst at hospital. Based upon the medical evidence adduced at trial (which I have briefly summarised as part of these sentencing remarks), there is no evidence of category 1 harm, but I am satisfied that the gunshot

wounds, the rib fracture and the partial collapse of the bases of both lungs amounts to “serious physical harm” within the meaning of the guideline and so harm falls into category 2. That having been said, both your counsel, and counsel for the prosecution, submitted that, given the range of harm which can properly be described as “serious” for the purpose of this particular guideline, the harm arguably falls towards the lower end of the relevant range within the category. I am prepared to acknowledge that those submissions have some force, and I will make some adjustment to the sentence as a result.

17. An A2 offence has a starting point of 30 years’ custody with a range of 25 – 35 years’ custody. To reflect the observations I have just made about harm, I shall make a downward adjustment from the starting point, arriving at a sentence of 27 years before considering further features of the offending.
18. Insofar as factors which increase the seriousness of the offending are concerned, you do have previous convictions, albeit nothing since 2017. Your convictions do include, however, offences relating to weapons (although not firearms) and offences of violence. Your PNC suggests that you received a sentence of 7 years in 2016 for assault occasioning actual bodily harm. In fact, that sentence was for an offence of attempted wounding with intent which arose as a result of what is described as a “knife fight” with a rival group at a tram stop in Croydon.
19. Insofar as factors which reduce the seriousness of the offending are concerned, along with your personal mitigation, I have listened very carefully to everything that your advocate has said. I take into account, in particular, all that has been said about your family and personal circumstances and I have taken on board everything that has been said about you in the many references which have been provided to me on your behalf all of which, it must be said, speak about you in overwhelmingly positive terms. It is evident to me that there is a side to you other than the one that was shown at trial. You are clearly a much-loved member of your family who has supported your siblings in a commendable way. Your partner also clearly loves you very much. In addition, I have read the education references which sets out the progress you have made whilst at HMP Belmarsh which again speaks about you and your contributions whilst in prison in overwhelmingly positive terms. Based on my observations of you at trial and, indeed,

your own evidence, I was initially reluctant to accept the suggestion that you are remorseful for what you have done. However, having read with care the letter you have written to me, I am prepared to accept that you have reflected on your offending behaviour and recognise that what you did was wrong and, more significantly, the impact it has had not only on Mr Adeleye but also on others, including members of your own family. If the content of your letter is genuine, and I am prepared to accept that it is, it appears that you have begun a journey of self-reflection and I very much hope that you continue to progress positively whilst in prison and, in due course, whilst in the community following your release.

20. It seems to me that your available mitigation outweighs the aggravation occasioned by your previous convictions such that the appropriate sentence for the offence of attempted murder is one of 25 years' custody.
21. I must go on to consider the issue of dangerousness. Notwithstanding the very many positive things that have been said about you, I have reached the conclusion that there is a significant risk to members of the public of serious harm occasioned by the commission by you of further specified offences. Such a conclusion, it seems to me, is inevitable in light of your previous convictions and the seriousness and circumstances of the present offending. It is unsurprising, in my view, that you were assessed by the probation service as being someone who poses a high risk of serious harm. You do, therefore, meet the statutory definition of someone who is dangerous. However, just because that is so, it does not automatically follow that I must impose a life sentence or an extended sentence. If I am satisfied that, notwithstanding the assessment I have made of you, a determinate sentence meets the risk you pose, then I can leave the sentence as a determinate one.
22. There can be no doubt that the sentence I have imposed upon you is, as it has to be, a very long one. Bearing in mind the length of the sentence, the release provisions which apply, as well as the post-release licence regime, I am satisfied that the long determinate sentence I will impose meets the risk that you pose. There is, therefore, no need to pass a life sentence or an extended sentence in your case.
23. Accordingly, Mr Nzita, the sentences in your case are as follows:

- (a) Count 1- Attempted Murder- 25 years' custody.
- (b) Count 2- Wounding with intent- at the invitation of both counsel, I order this to lie on the Court File on the usual terms.
- (c) Count 3- Possession of a firearm with intent to endanger life- 14 years' custody (concurrent).
- (d) Count 4- Possession of a prohibited firearm- I order this to lie on the Court File on the usual terms.
- (e) Count 5- Possession of ammunition with intent to endanger life- 14 years' custody (concurrent).

24. The overall sentence therefore remains one of 25 years' custody. Subject to any alternative release provisions which might apply, you will be released from custody no later than two-thirds of the way 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 sentence in custody. Any period you have already spent in custody in relation to these matters will automatically count towards the sentence I have imposed.

25. Finally, I impose the statutory surcharge in the sum of £228.

Anthony Dasousa

26. Anthony Dasousa, I shall deal with you next. You are 31 years' old. Having been found not guilty of attempted murder, I consider that the most serious offence that you have been convicted of is possession of a firearm with intent to endanger life. I will take that as the lead offence. The maximum sentence is life imprisonment. There are features of both high and medium culpability in your case. High culpability because a firearm was discharged albeit, I accept, that it was not discharged by you. Medium culpability

because you did play a significant role in the offending. On the jury's verdicts, you and Mr Nzita were jointly in possession of that firearm and ammunition with intent to endanger life. Moreover, you intended that Mr Adeleye should be seriously injured. You were instrumental in driving Mr Nzita to the relevant location so that he could shoot Mr Adeleye. The jury did not accept that you ended up in that location for an innocent and unrelated reason. I consider that medium culpability most resembles your case. Harm falls into category 2 as serious physical harm was caused to Mr Adeleye and there was a high risk of death or severe physical harm.

27. A B2 offence has a starting point of 10 years' custody with a range of 8 – 12 years; custody. Because a firearm was discharged, albeit not by you, I do consider that it is appropriate to make an upward adjustment from the starting point to 12 years.
28. Insofar as factors which increase the seriousness of the offending are concerned, you do have previous convictions from 2010 to 2023. Most of your offending is comparatively low-level (for example, possession of drugs) but you also have convictions for violent disorder and possession of a bladed article, although I note the ages of these convictions. In addition, I consider the steps taken after the incident, namely arranging for your vehicle to be fitted with cloned number plates in an attempt to conceal it from the police, to be an aggravating feature.
29. Insofar as factors which reduce the seriousness of the offending are concerned, along with your personal mitigation, I have listened very carefully to everything that your advocate has said. I take into account, in particular, all that has been said about your family and personal circumstances, including your caring responsibilities towards your partner and young son. I have read a number of character references, including one from your partner who makes clear that you are a devoted and present father who supports his family. I acknowledge the very real impact that your continued imprisonment will have on your family, in particular your son but also the added considerable strain that it has caused, and will continue to cause, your partner. I have also seen evidence, in the form of letters and certificates, which evidences your very positive progress and contributions whilst in prison across a variety of fields. Insofar as your expressed remorse is concerned, you do not accept responsibility for what the jury has determined

you have done, but I do acknowledge that, at the very least, you appear to be remorseful for what happened and for the injuries that Mr Adeleye sustained.

30. It seems to me that your available mitigation outweighs such aggravation that there is such that the appropriate sentence in your case is one of 10 years' custody.
31. As with Mr Nzita, I must go on to consider the issue of dangerousness. Notwithstanding the very many positive things that have been said about you, I have reached the conclusion that there is a significant risk to members of the public of serious harm occasioned by the commission by you of further specified offences. Although your previous convictions, taking into account their nature as well as their age, would not, by themselves, have led me to that conclusion, those convictions, coupled with the seriousness and circumstances of the present offending, do lead me to such a conclusion. Again, it is unsurprising, in my view, that you were assessed by the probation service as being someone who poses a high risk of serious harm. You do, therefore, meet the statutory definition of someone who is dangerous.
32. As I have already explained, it does not automatically follow that I must impose a life sentence or an extended sentence. If I am satisfied that, notwithstanding the assessment I have made of you, a determinate sentence meets the risk you pose, then I can leave the sentence as a determinate one.
33. Your sentence, though a substantial one, is nowhere near as long as the sentence imposed on Mr Nzita. That is, of course, because he was convicted of attempted murder and you were not. However, a consequence of that, in this particular case, is that I am not satisfied that a determinate sentence properly meets the risk that you pose. Whilst I do not consider that a life sentence is appropriate, I do consider that an extended sentence is required in order to meet the risk.
34. Accordingly, the sentences I impose in your case are as follows:
 - (a) Count 3- Possessing a Firearm with Intent to Endanger Life- an extended determinate sentence of 15 years comprising a custodial element of 10 years and an extended licence period of 5 years.

(b) Count 5- Possessing Ammunition with Intent to Endanger Life- an extended determinate sentence of 15 years comprising a custodial element of 10 years and an extended licence period of 5 years (to run concurrently).

(c) Count 2- Wounding with Intent- 5 years' custody (to run concurrently).

35. Subject to any alternative release provisions which might apply, you will be entitled to release as of right at the conclusion of the custodial element of 10 years, but the Parole Board may release you earlier if they decide it is appropriate to do so. The earliest date the Parole Board will consider your case will be two-thirds of the way through the custodial term, and their decision is likely to take into account your progress on this sentence. It will be for the Parole Board to consider whether, when, and on what terms, you may be released, but whenever you are released, you will be subject to a licence that continues until the end of the sentence as a whole, namely 15 years. It follows that once you are released you must comply with all the conditions on your licence, failing which you will be at risk of recall to prison to serve the remainder of the entire 15-year sentence in custody. Any period you have already spent in custody in relation to these matters will automatically count towards the sentence I have imposed.

36. Finally, I impose the statutory surcharge in the sum of £228.

Christopher Dasousa

37. Christopher Dasousa, I turn finally to deal with you. You are 27 years' old. You were convicted of a single offence, namely encouraging or assisting the commission of one or more offences, believing one or more would be committed. The gravamen of the offending is that you provided Mr Nzita and your brother Anthony with the location of the vehicle containing Mr Adeleye which was an act capable of assisting the commission of either the offence of attempted murder or the offence of causing grievous bodily harm with intent, believing that one or both of those offences would be committed and that your act of providing the location of the vehicle would encourage or assist the commission of one or both of those offences.

38. There is no specific sentencing guideline for this offence, but it is clear from the legislation, and the authorities interpreting it, that the maximum sentence is determined by reference to the maximum term available for the offences specified in the particulars—here, attempted murder and causing grievous bodily harm with intent. In both instances, the maximum sentence is life imprisonment.

39. Whilst the Overarching Principles guideline is helpful, the Court of Appeal, in *Hall* [2013] EWCA Crim 2499, observed, at para. 31, that,

“It is important to emphasise what was involved in the offences of which these appellants were convicted: the doing of an act which was capable of assisting in the supply of Class A drugs, and the belief that one or more such offences would be committed and that the act would assist in its commission. When those ingredients of the section 46 offence are proved or admitted, it seems to us that the appropriate sentence generally will not differ significantly, and may perhaps not differ at all, from the sentence which would have been appropriate for the anticipated offence or for conspiracy to commit the anticipated offence.”

40. Bearing those observations in mind, it seems to me that the appropriate course is to have regard to the sentencing guidelines which relate to the offence or offences which were contemplated by you, making appropriate adjustments in light of the particular factual matrix which is found to exist. In the present case, both the prosecution and the defence agree that the fairest approach is to have regard to the causing grievous bodily harm with intent guidelines on the basis that I cannot be sure that you believed that Mr Nzita might actually try to kill Mr Adeleye. I am prepared to adopt that course.

41. As I have said, the maximum sentence for causing grievous bodily harm with intent is life imprisonment. Insofar as your culpability is concerned, there is a dispute between the advocates as to whether you should be sentenced on the basis that you knew that Mr Nzita was armed with a loaded shotgun. I have considered the representations that have been made on this point but, having had the advantage of presiding over the trial, I can safely say that I am sure that you did know that Mr Nzita was so armed and that he intended to shoot Mr Adeleye, albeit that I am prepared to accept that you did not believe that he necessarily intended to kill him. I have reached that conclusion, in short,

because the combination of the carefully put together CCTV footage and mobile phone records satisfies me that once you spotted Mr Adeleye's vehicle, you followed it, stopping at the junction with the aforementioned cul-de-sac. All the while you were on the phone to your brother and you waited for him and Mr Nzita to arrive before you made your departure. It is inconceivable that, going to the lengths you did in order to find Mr Adeleye, whilst simultaneously speaking to your brother and Mr Nzita, who the jury found were in joint possession of the firearm with intent to endanger life, one or both of them did not tell you that they were armed. I am sure that you knew that they were armed and that is why, by providing them with the location of Mr Adeleye, you believed, at the very least, that an offence of causing grievous bodily harm with intent would be committed.

42. There is, therefore, a high culpability factor in your case, namely that a firearm was used, albeit I accept, that you did not use it, nor were you in possession of it. There may properly be said to be a medium culpability factor in your case, namely that you performed a lesser role in group activity. You were not the shooter, nor were you the driver. Rather, you provided information which led Mr Nzita and your brother to find Mr Adeleye. Your role was therefore not insignificant, but nor can it properly be characterised as "leading". I also take into account that you were acquitted of the offence of wounding with intent (which had been put on a joint enterprise basis) and that I am sentencing you for a crime which has "belief" as its *mens rea* although I re-emphasise that those who assist others to commit serious crimes nevertheless play an important role in the anticipated offending, albeit that they do not personally commit it. All things considered, and particularly given the fact that you provided key assistance to the others in locating Mr Adeleye and, on my analysis, you knew that a firearm was to be used, your culpability best falls into category A although I will, in due course, make allowance for the other features I have mentioned.

43. As to harm, there is again a dispute between the advocates as to how this should be categorised. In relation to the attempted murder guideline, it was accepted that the injury sustained by Mr Adeleye was "serious" and so fell within category 2 albeit with some downward adjustment required. In relation to an offence of causing grievous bodily harm with intent, the offence itself recognises that really serious injury was caused (which is to be contrasted with the offence of attempted murder where it is

possible to be guilty of such an offence without causing any injury at all). By reference to the causing grievous bodily harm with intent guideline, the Crown submits that the injury sustained by Mr Adeleye was “grave” and so falls within category 2. Your counsel submits that it was “all other cases of really serious harm” and so falls within category 3. The distinction between these two categories of harm is not always easy. Although there is medical evidence in this case, there is no victim personal statement. I do note that the other category 2 descriptor is that the “offence results in a permanent, irreversible injury or condition not falling within category 1”. There is no suggestion that such was the case here. There is, of course, an inevitable overlap between the categories when it comes to describing harm which cannot always neatly fit into one box rather than another. It seems to me that the injury in this case which was, after all, a gunshot wound to the chest, falls between categories 2 and 3 but can properly be described as a “grave injury”. I will therefore place it into category 2 but will make a downward adjustment from the starting point in due course to reflect the observations I have made.

44. An A2 offence has a starting point of 7 years’ custody with a range of 6 – 10 years’ custody. I will make a downward adjustment from the starting point to reflect the observations I have made which reduces the sentence to 5 years which falls just outside the category range.
45. Insofar as factors which increase the seriousness of the offending are concerned, you do have previous convictions which, in the main, are for drug-related offences although you do have a conviction for assault occasioning actual bodily harm dating back to 2018. You were on licence at the time of the present offending as you had received a sentence of 65 months’ custody for Class A drug trafficking offences on 5 December 2022. Moreover, your activities as part of this offending put you in breach of a Criminal Behaviour Order although, sensibly, the prosecution has chosen not to proceed with that allegation, and I order that that offence lies on the Court File on the usual terms.
46. Insofar as factors which reduce the seriousness of the offending are concerned, along with your personal mitigation, I have listened very carefully to everything that your advocate has said. I take into account, in particular, all that has been said about your family and personal circumstances, the tragedies you have suffered in your life, as well

as your responsibilities towards others. I also take into account the positive progress you appear to have been making whilst in custody.

47. It seems to me that your available mitigation just about outweighs the aggravating features such that the appropriate sentence in your case is one of 4 years' custody.

48. I have considered the issue of dangerousness. Notwithstanding the nature and seriousness of the present offending, as well as the opinions that have been expressed about risk in the pre-sentence report, taking into account everything that I have heard and read about you and this offending, I am not satisfied that you meet the statutory test for a finding of dangerousness. Though it is nothing to be proud of, your offending history to date predominantly relates to drugs. Although your role in the present offending was an important one, you were found not guilty of the more serious offences and what you did was limited to providing others with the location of Mr Adeleye's vehicle. You were not directly involved in any violence, nor were you at any time in possession of the firearm or ammunition. I am just about persuaded that you do not meet the statutory criteria for a finding of dangerousness and so your sentence for the offence reflected by Count 6 on the indictment remains one of 4 years' custody which I consider to be the shortest sentence commensurate with the seriousness of the offending in this case.

49. Subject to any alternative release provisions which might apply, you will be released no later than half-way 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.

50. I impose the statutory surcharge in the sum of £228.

51. I make a deprivation order in relation to the two mobile telephones seized as part of this investigation.

Concluding Remarks

52. Finally, it would be wrong to leave this case without, first, recognising the excellent way the case was conducted at trial by all advocates and, secondly, acknowledging the work of Detective Constable John Davies who I understand personally dealt with every aspect of the investigation: CCTV analysis, the timeline, the graphics pack and all associated evidential preparation. He was also the prosecution's principal witness and demonstrated a detailed and confident command of the case. He was incredibly fair and even-handed when asked questions by all advocates. For his endeavours, I award a judicial commendation

HHJ Grout

23 July 2026