

REX V. SIMON LEVY

SENTENCING REMARKS

1. The provisions of the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1992 apply to the offences concerning one of the victim here, who I will refer to as ED. Under those provisions where an allegation has been made that a sexual offence has been committed against a person, no matter relating to that person shall during that person's lifetime be included in any publication if it is likely to lead members of the public to identify that person as a victim of that offence. This prohibition applies unless waived or lifted in accordance with s.3 of the Act. For the avoidance of any doubt, there has been no waiver or lifting of the prohibition.
2. Last Friday, 7th August 2026, you were convicted of two counts of rape, causing grievous bodily harm with intent, intentional suffocation and two murders and I must now sentence you.
3. The offences reflect a series of attacks by you upon vulnerable women who either undertook sex work, or who by reason of drug addiction, would sometimes perform sexual services for money or drugs. In 2025 you embarked on this series of attacks on these women each in a similar way. You are clearly someone who ruthlessly exploits others for your own personal sexual satisfaction.
4. In January 2025, you attacked and raped ED. In the course of attacking and raping her vaginally and anally, you fractured her right shoulder and strangled her to such an extent that she became unconscious.
5. On 25th January 2025, ED was arrested for breaching a community protection notice. At the time she was on Fore Street, Edmonton. She told the police officers she was on her way to hospital because she had sustained an injury to her shoulder during an attack. She showed police her shoulder and it appeared to be red and swollen and that she was in visible pain.

Whilst speaking to the police she told them she had been raped earlier in the week. She was tearful as she sought to explain what had happened. She said it had happened in the B&M car park on Fore Street, and told them her attacker was a black African male who lived in White Hart Lane. She knew where her attacker lived, but did not know their name. The description she provided as to where the male who assaulted her lived, was recorded on body worn video. It is obvious she was referring to you.

6. At hospital it was noted that ED had a fractured clavicle. As ED was withdrawing from heroin she was not well enough to speak to the police in more detail as to what had happened. The police made efforts to trace her over the coming months. Despite making contact with her on a number of occasions, ED did not wish to talk about what had happened to her. She gave a full account of the attack on 6th September 2025. From the account she gave it is clear the attack on her was a violent one, and one she feared that she may not survive. Dr Offiah explained the injury to the clavicle was a displaced fracture and that such an injury would have necessitated a severe degree of force.
7. On 16th March 2025, you met with Carmenza Valencia-Trujillo. Carmenza left her home address just before 6am that morning. There is CCTV footage of her relatively close to Wendover or Wendover House on Thurlow Street, SE17. In the afternoon of 16th March you are seen on CCTV walking alongside Wendover. At 3.07pm Carmenza is seen on CCTV walking on the Old Kent Road and then again at 3.18pm and 3.20pm. That is the last sighting of Carmenza alive. Where she was seen is relatively close to Wendover and where she must have gone. Just 10 minutes later you are seen on the Old Kent Road albeit walking in the opposite direction to Carmenza. However, at 3.44pm you are seen again on the Old Kent Road coming back the other way and in the same direction as Carmenza. At 6:23pm you can be seen again on CCTV on Thurlow Street. At 6.52pm you go into Elephant and Castle underground station and return to North London. To make that journey you used an Oyster card in the name of a bus operator and exited Seven Sisters station at 7.27pm.
8. About 24 hours later, just before 7pm on 17th March 2025, a '999' call was made and the police alerted to an unresponsive female who had been found in a stairwell at Wendover House. Carmenza was found lying face down on the flat landing area in the middle of a flight of stairs, 90 degrees from the direction of the last step. From a short distance away there were signs of injuries to her face with a small amount of blood on her face and on the concrete floor next to her face. Her legs were straight and close together, not obviously splayed or flexed at the hip or knee joint. She was wearing a jacket and several layers of clothing. Her trouser bottoms were not fully pulled 'up'.

9. Whilst the postmortem examination could not give a cause of death for Carmenza, the pathologist noted numerous injuries, some of which were recent and were to the head, neck and torso, upper and lower limbs. The face and upper neck were red and congested and the neck, eyes and mouth had petechiae haemorrhage. There was also bruising to the neck. The toxicology revealed that Carmenza had taken cocaine.
10. During the scene examination of the staircase, an area of dry, red bloodlike substance was seen on the silver pipe in the far right hand corner of the landing area between floor eight and floor seven. Examination confirmed DNA from the blood matched your DNA. Something had caused you to bleed where Carmenza was killed. Forensic examinations revealed DNA from semen matching yours was present on swabs taken from Carmenza's lower buttocks and rectum.
11. On 1st April 2025, you were arrested and interviewed about the murder of Carmenza. When spoken to you made 'no comment' responses to all questions asked.
12. On 24th August 2025, just after midnight you met with Sheryl Wilkins. This was on the High Street in Tottenham. The two of you are seen on CCTV to cross the High Road and go to the area where the attacks in January had taken place: the area of the carpark of the B&M store. You go with Sheryl behind a wall and so are away from direct CCTV coverage. Some 50 minutes later you emerge and leave the area where Sheryl's body is found by police some hours later. The position in which Sheryl's body was left is strikingly similar to that in which Carmenza's was left at Wendover back in March.
13. Sheryl's body had no fewer than 83 areas of injury or marks. There were a number of marks and injuries to the face and head, front and back of the upper body and the arms and legs. All of those marks, from a pathological perspective are minor and, as with Carmenza, the pathologist was not able to give a cause of death. Some of the injuries were not caused on the evening in question but some plainly were. The toxicology revealed that Sheryl had taken some controlled drugs before death. She had a past medical history that included abusing cocaine, heroin and cannabis. She had been prescribed methadone. Sheryl was only 39 years of age and despite having a history of drug use she was found dead lying face down just as Carmenza was.
14. As I have mentioned there is a striking similarity between the deaths of Carmenza and Sheryl. You had sexual interaction with them and both are then found dead in an almost identical position. This is deeply troubling when seen alongside the account ED gave as to the attack

on her. This troubling concern is even more stark when all three attacks are seen together with the material found on your phone and computers that displays a clear interest in sex and in particular sexual intercourse from behind, rape and crime. You kept files of material which included the following: “*My sex records*”, “*Sex positions – My favourite*”, “*My sex drive advice*”, “*Sex*” and “*Submission.*”

15. You are someone who appears to have a morbid fascination with sex, rape and crime. In addition to what was found on your mobile telephone and other electronic devices, at your home the Police recovered an array of press cuttings which reveal a long-standing fascination with sex, sexual offences and particularly rape.
16. You have significant convictions for sexual offences upon women. On 30th September 2021, you were convicted, following a trial, of sexual assault committed on 29th July 2018 and sexual assault by penetration committed on 26th August 2018. Even closer in time to the offences here you were convicted on 5th February 2026, of a series of sexual assaults on different women. There were some 11 sexual assaults between April 2022 and May 2025. Six of those offences occurring in first five months of 2025 and so overlapping with the offences in the indictment here.
17. When arrested in 4th September 2025, you claimed you had done nothing. In an interview on 5th September you gave a prepared statement denying the offences in January and August 2025. You claimed that Sheryl Wilkins had injuries on her body before you and she had sex and yet a viewing of images of her body shows that was not the case. When ED gave evidence it was suggested to her that all sexual contact was consensual. As ED made clear you simply took advantage of her and were violent in doing so. You chose not to give evidence at trial and so have proffered no real explanation for what happened to Carmenza or to Sheryl.
18. You are now aged 40 [date of birth 14th August 1985]. In terms of other previous convictions, in April 2012, you were fined for handling stolen goods and in September 2021, received a total sentence of 36 months for the offences of sexual assault by penetration and sexual assault I have just referred to. In June of this year you were sentenced in the Crown Court at Inner London for the eleven sexual offences carried out by you between April 2022 and May 2025. The sentence imposed was an extended sentence of 9 years with a custodial term of 6 years and an extended licence of 3 years. As the sentencing judge noted in dealing with you then your conduct revealed “*.. a deliberate, persistent and carefully orchestrated campaign of targeted assaults on women by you over a three year period. Your attack on women on this indictment beginning with a sexual assault upon a prison officer*

after you were sentenced for the offences in 2018.” I have read the Pre-Sentence Report that was prepared for the proceedings before the Crown Court at Inner London.

Victim impact.

19. I have seen and read a statement from ED. It, and various other statements have been read in court as part of the sentencing hearing. With ED it takes considerable courage to come to court and to give evidence as she did and I thank her for doing so. I know it was far from easy but she should be commended for doing so. She is a classical pianist and loves music – music makes her feel alive. She speaks about you taking away her soul and her dignity. I also note that she says she is stronger today than before and that she will play music again and smile: I sincerely hope so.
20. Carmenza’s daughter speaks of the devastating impact on her, her brother and the whole family of Carmenza’s murder. She speaks of the mental, psychological, physical, emotional and financial impact there has been. Nazly says that her mother came to the UK to give her children a better life and for safety and yet her life was taken so cruelly by you. Carmenza had recently become a grandmother and was planning for her grandson’s future.
21. There are also moving statements from Sheryl Wilkins’ family. Sheryl was killed the day before what would have been her 40th birthday. Sheryl had four children and so they have all lost their mother. The statements speak of the emotional pain of Sheryl’s death – the shattering impact on the family of what you subjected Sheryl to. Her sister speaks of the destruction to their lives as a result of your actions: the mental and physical torment they have all felt. Alongside the grief caused by losing Sheryl, as he mother says they will keep her alive through their memories and the stories they will tell her children.

Sentencing provisions.

22. The sentence for murder is fixed by law: it must be imprisonment for life. The first issue for me is to decide on whether there should a minimum term set or whether this is a case where there should be a whole life order.
23. In considering schedule 21 of the Sentencing Act 2020, paragraph 2(1) makes clear that if:

“(a) the court considers that the circumstances of the offence (or the combination of the offence and one or more offences associated with it) is exceptionally high, and (b) the offender was aged 21 or over when the offence was committed the appropriate starting point is a whole life order.”

As paragraph 2(2) sets out, cases that would normally fall within sub-paragraph 2(1) include murder of two or more persons, where each murder involves sexual conduct.

24. In considering whether this is a case that is within that category of ‘exceptionally high’ I have considered the decisions of the Court of Appeal in *Stewart* [2022] EWCA Crim 1063; 4 WLR 86 and *March* [2026] EWCA Crim 481; 2 Cr.App.R.(S.) 16. I am acutely aware that whole life terms are sentences that should be considered for rare cases.
25. On your behalf it is submitted that this case is not one that should be met with a whole life term. Ms Grey seeks to distinguish the fact of sexual contact from any pathological evidence of sexual injury or sexual depravity. She has referred to the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Walker* [2007] EWCA Crim 2631. It is submitted that the case should be considered as coming within paragraph 3 of schedule 21 and a start point of 30 years. Ms Grey concedes that it I am with her on that start point it, a minimum period substantially above the 30 year starting point would be appropriate. On this issue I have also been referred to the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Attorney General’s References Nos 25 and 26 of 2008 (George and Walters)* [2008] EWCA Crim 2665.
26. In my judgment both murders were committed by you during or after you had had sexual intercourse with each woman. I note that no money was found in the possessions of either Carmenza or Sheryl. Counts 1 and 2 are two rapes on a third woman who not only sustained grievous bodily harm, but was strangled and made unconscious as a result in the course of the rapes. Equally, I am satisfied on the evidence that compression of the neck or impeding the breathing of breath of Carmenza and Sheryl is very likely to have taken place in the course of your attacks on each of them. In my judgment this case is one that comes within paragraph 2 of schedule 21 and the starting point has to be a whole life order.
27. Turning next to assess the aggravating and mitigating factors, and being mindful of matters taken into account in the choice of starting point, firstly I note that the murders occurred on separate occasions. Secondly, both murders involved a degree of premeditation or planning. On this point I also note what happened to ED. With Carmenza you travelled to South East London and to an area where you must have known you would encounter someone willing to

have sex with you on the promise of money before then murdering Carmenza. You then sought out Sheryl in an area known to be one where sex workers operated and where you had found and attacked ED in January. Thirdly, the murder of Sheryl Wilkins was committed whilst you were on Court bail in respect of sexual offences committed on public transport. Fourthly, the murder of Sheryl was committed at a time when you had been interviewed in respect of the murder of Carmenza and released under investigation in respect of that offence. Fifthly, the seriousness of all of the offending in relation to ED. Sixthly, your previous convictions from September 2021, for sexual offending before any of the offences I am dealing with.

28. As for mitigating factors, I do not find this to be a case in which there was an intention falling short of an intention to kill and even if that was the position in my judgment it makes no material difference here. There do not appear to be any other mitigating factors present. Although you had the assistance of an intermediary at trial on a few occasions, there is nothing I have seen on which it can be said that your culpability has been reduced in respect of any of the offences here. I have seen and read reports on you dealing with a language development disorder. Whilst I accept that condition, along with the sight loss you have had since May 2024, will impact on your daily life in prison, they have little if any impact on the sentence to be imposed.

Sentence.

29. Simon Levy, you violently raped and attacked ED in January 2025 and then in March 2025 murdered Carmenza Valencia-Trujillo, and then in September 2025, murdered Sheryl Wilkins. You ruthlessly exploited and took advantage of each of those three women for your own personal sexual satisfaction. When you left ED she was clearly unconscious. She survived your physical and sexual attack, sadly Carmenza and Sheryl lost their lives to your actions. In my judgment the aggravating features significantly outweigh any mitigating features. This cannot be described in anyway as a borderline case and the appropriate order is a whole life order and that is the order I impose in respect of counts 5 and 6: you will be imprisoned for life and there will be a whole life order.

Counts 1 to 4.

30. In light of the seriousness of the offending the appropriate sentences on counts 1 and 2 will be life sentences with a minimum term based on two thirds of the notional determinate sentence

for those offences. Those sentences will be concurrent to the whole life orders on counts 5 and 6.

31. In terms of the relevant Sentencing Council Guidelines for rape, in my view both offences are Category 1A offences. Dealing first with harm, there was violence in terms of the s.18 offence that went well beyond that inherent to the offence, as well as the strangulation or suffocation causing ED to lose consciousness. The cumulative nature of the violence was extreme in the context of a rape offence. In addition the victim was particularly vulnerable by reason of being a sex worker and then being unconscious. There has also been psychological harm. Whilst the guidelines refer to severe psychological harm, the nature of the harm caused cannot be ignored even if it does not necessarily alone merit the classification as being 'severe.' The cumulative basis of those Category 2 matters justifies this being a Category 1 harm case on both counts 1 and 2.
32. Turning to culpability, whilst this may not be a normal situation in relation to 'abuse of trust', in my view the facts and circumstances of this case merit that conclusion and classification. As identified in the prosecution sentencing note, the facts here make this case similar to the position of a lone passenger and a taxi driver as identified in the relevant guidelines: ED went behind the wall in the B&M car park having been shown and promised money by you. She trusted that you were not going to attack her and that were not going to have non-consensual sexual intercourse with her. On that basis I am satisfied that there was abuse of trust and each rape offence a Category 1A offence. I note too that there had been a previous assault some years before the rape.
33. In terms of aggravating and mitigating factors as identified in the rape guidelines, the location and timing of the offence are catered for already by virtue of the vulnerability. However, there were two distinct rape offences and that needs to be reflected in the sentence to ensure that it is just and proportionate. I have also referred to the s.18 offence and considered that as part of the categorisation. Even on its own it would be a category 1C offence. ED was obviously vulnerable by reason of being a sex worker. In addition there was strangulation and suffocation. So this falls into the highest level of culpability. On counts 1 and 2 there will be sentences of life imprisonment on each count with a minimum term on each count of 12 years. That sentence is based on a calculation of two-thirds of a notional determinate sentence of 18 years' imprisonment.
34. In the context of a section 18 offence (count 3) on its own it would come into the lowest level of harm and so merit a sentence of the order of 4 years' imprisonment. Turning to strangulation/suffocation (count 4), this was a sustained incident causing ED to lose

consciousness and with the impact that also had on her bodily functions and therefore is category 1 as to culpability. Whilst it is difficult to separate out the harm from the other offending, I place this into level B in terms of harm. On its own a sentence of 2 years' 6 months' imprisonment.

35. On counts 5 and 6 the sentence is one of life imprisonment with a whole life order on each count. On counts 1 and 2 life imprisonment on each count with a minimum term on each count of 12 years. Those sentences are concurrent to each other and concurrent to the sentences on count 5 and 6. As I have taken into account the offences of causing grievous bodily harm with intent, and intentional suffocation in reaching the decision on counts 1 and 2, on counts 3 and 4 I impose no separate penalty.
36. If the statutory surcharge applies in this case, the appropriate order can be drawn up.

Recorder of London
His Honour Judge Mark Lucraft KC
Central Criminal Court,
Old Bailey, London EC4 7EH
August 12th 2026