

OFFICIAL



IN THE CROWN COURT AT OXFORD

R

V

ADINA MIHAI

-AND-

MADALIN DUMITRU

SENTENCING REMARKS OF MRS JUSTICE BRUNNER ON 13 AUGUST 2026

1. Ms Mihai, Mr Dumitru, you may stay seated for now. You are to be sentenced for the manslaughter of Malcolm King, the manslaughter of Gary Mouat, and two counts of administering poison under s24 of the Offences Against the Person Act. I have previously made a reporting restriction which remains in place, and the victims of the administering poison counts will be referred to as Victim 3 and Victim 4. I have already made some ancillary orders.

THE IMPACT OF THE DEATHS

2. At the centre of this case is the unlawful killing of two people, which has had far-reaching effects on their loved ones.
3. I have read and heard moving statements from family members of Malcolm King, who was 80 when he died. It is clear that Malcolm King was a kind and generous man who was supportive of others in difficult times. Family members have set out the devastation and shock that his death has caused to many people, and how the pain of losing him will be felt for the rest of their lives.
4. I have read and heard touching descriptions of Gary Mouat who was aged 36 when he died, including a remarkable tribute from his son. Gary Mouat was a friendly, funny and kind man with a huge personality. His death has had a profound effect on his family and his friends, many hearts have been broken. His family felt unsafe in their own home for some time.
5. I am grateful to all of you who wrote and spoke in your own words about these two men who were so much loved and will be greatly missed. Your testimonies have assisted me in this sentencing process.

OFFICIAL



THE FACTS

6. Where I have made factual findings, I have done so on the basis of all of the evidence in the case, and so that I am sure. When you pleaded guilty, there were no bases of plea. Charges of conspiracy to steal were not pursued, but it was explicitly accepted that each of the four offences which you pleaded guilty to was committed against the backdrop of an agreement between the pair of you. That was an agreement to trick men into letting Ms Mihai into their homes on the pretext that she would provide sexual services to them, spiking their drink with a drug and, once they were unconscious, stealing from them. Of the four men who you left unconscious and alone, two men died.
7. You two had been in a relationship since 2023 and lived together. You, Ms Mihai had been a sex worker and escort for some time.
8. The way in which you operated together to commit these crimes was as follows. A profile was set up on a platform Vivastreet offering escort and sexual services, with Ms Mihai's contact details. Both of you accessed that platform. Each of the four victims made contact with you, Ms Mihai through that website and arranged for you to come to their home to provide sexual services for payment. Mr Dumitru, you drove Ms Mihai to the men's homes, which were in Gloucestershire, Oxfordshire, Essex and Hertfordshire. Ms Mihai went into the property alone, while Mr Dumitru stayed in a car outside. You, Mr Dumitru, were ready to provide back-up if needed, including by way of using threats or violence. That much is clear from the baseball bat which was found when you were arrested, in the car which you both travelled around in, soon after the last poisoning.
9. While Ms Mihai was in the house, Mr Dumitru would remain nearby and would at times give Ms Mihai instructions or check on the progress of the plan. You were in or around your victims' homes for one or two hours. In that time, you, Ms Mihai kept up the pretence that you were going to provide sexual services, and sometimes you partially undressed, or your victims undressed. It does not seem that any sexual activity actually took place with your victims. You plied each man with alcohol which had been spiked with a drug. It is unclear whether the drug was added to the alcohol while you were both together, or added by Ms Mihai alone once in the house, but in any event it was a joint plan to covertly drug the men.
10. Once the men were drugged and unconscious, you, Ms Mihai looked for things to steal, and in most cases took high value items such as jewellery or a watch. On each occasion you then left the victim unconscious and alone, returned to Mr Dumitru who was in the car, and the pair of you drove off.
11. The drug used to poison the four victims was a liquid, gamma-butyrolactone, or GBL, which rapidly converts into another substance, GHB, in the body. Both GBL and GHB are commonly referred to as date rape drugs as they are among a group of drugs which can be used to spike drinks to incapacitate people, and are hard to detect as



they have no strong colour or odour. Both are controlled Class B drugs. Recreational abuse can lead to relaxation and euphoria. Higher doses can cause drowsiness, amnesia and confusion. Toxic effects include depression of the central nervous system leading to a loss of consciousness or coma, slowed heart-rate, seizures, and respiratory depression which is where breathing becomes dangerously slow. If there is loss of consciousness the person often comes round spontaneously some hours later, but there have been many reported deaths.

12. GBL's toxicity is extremely unpredictable. The effects vary between individuals. There is a narrow margin between a recreational dose and one that leads to a life-threatening overdose, as very small increases in dosage can result in a significant change of symptoms from mild effects to potentially fatal effects. The drug interacts with alcohol and other drugs. As both alcohol and GBL cause respiratory depression, using both together is a particularly dangerous combination.
13. Against that general background, I turn to the poisoning of each of your victims.
14. Malcolm King was the first victim in August 2024. He suffered from various heart conditions but was well and stable. Through Vivastreet, he arranged for you, Ms Mihai, to provide sexual services in his home, and you both carried out the operation as I have described. At around 7:15pm Ms Mihai you went in alone, with Mr Dumitru nearby. He would have paid you Ms Mihai in cash for sexual services although there was no sexual activity. You drugged him into unconsciousness by adding GBL to his wine, without his knowledge. Once he was unconscious, you stole a Rolex watch which he had been wearing that day. You both then drove off, around 9:30pm.
15. Data recorded by Mr King's heart implant device shows that sadly he died about an hour after you left his house. He was found the next day by a housekeeper. He had GHB in his blood within the range of concentrations associated both with death and with non-fatal intoxication. The cause of death was respiratory arrest with secondary cardiac arrest due to toxic sedation with GHB in combination with alcohol consumption. By your pleas to manslaughter you both accept that the administration of the drug was a more than minimal cause of his death.
16. Gary Mouat was your second victim, almost a year later. On 12 July 2025 he arranged for you, Ms Mihai, to visit him at his home to provide sexual services. Mr Dumitru bought a bottle of wine on the way. Ms Mihai, you went in alone around 9.45pm, with Mr Dumitru staying nearby. Mr Mouat had been drinking and had taken cocaine. There had been discussion about Mr Mouat paying in cash and I find that he did so although no sexual services were provided. Mr Dumitru, you told Ms Mihai by text to put him to sleep and Ms Mihai drugged Gary Mouat into unconsciousness by giving him wine laced with GBL. Mr Dumitru, you sent further texts saying 'you see if he has a watch, something else, jewellery'. Ms Mihai must have searched for valuable items, but it is unclear whether anything was, in fact, taken. You left him around 10:50pm, alone and unconscious. Tragically, he never came round and his body was found by friends who had gone to check on him.



17. A pathologist found GHB and alcohol in his blood. He had drunk enough to be noticeably intoxicated. The concentration of GHB detected was high, within the range reported in previous fatalities, although also reported in cases where people recovered. Such a high level of GHB could in isolation account for the death by inducing fatal respiratory depression. The interaction with alcohol increased the level of sedation and the risk of death. The after-effects of cocaine may have enhanced the sedative effect. The cause of death was GHB, alcohol and cocaine intoxication. You both accept by your pleas to manslaughter that the administration of GBL contributed to Mr Mouat's death in a more than minimal way.
18. Having left Mr Mouat late at night on 12 July, you arrived back in the area of your home address in Ilford at half past midnight. Just over an hour later, in the early hours of 13 July 2025 you arranged to see Victim 3, a 40 yr old man who lived in Essex. He had made contact with you Ms Mihai via the web profile a few weeks earlier, and you exchanged details then, but did not meet. In the early hours of 13 July he made contact with you again. An arrangement was made, and you both drove to Victim 3's home, arriving a little before 3am. He had been drinking heavily at a party. Mr Dumitru you waited nearby and communicated with Ms Mihai when she was inside the house. Victim 3 transferred £450 to a bank account as Ms Mihai directed. No sexual activity took place. As before you, Ms Mihai, gave him wine laced with GBL, and he recalls taking a couple of sips before falling unconscious. You took a Rolex watch from a drawer before leaving Victim 3 alone and unconscious. Unlike your first two victims, thankfully he survived. He came round at about 4 or 5am. He felt dazed and he vomited repeatedly, he could not move properly, and could not get up. He felt groggy and anxious for days afterwards. You have both pleaded guilty to administering poison to him.
19. Soon after, on 22 July 2025 Victim 4 made contact with Ms Mihai via the Vivastreet platform, and an arrangement was made to go to his home. He is a 31 year old who lived in Hertfordshire. You both drove to Victim 4's home, arriving around 6am. He had been drinking and taking cocaine and felt intoxicated. Mr Dumitru you remained nearby in the car and messaged to check that Ms Mihai had got in, and to check what was happening. Victim 4 paid Ms Mihai in cash for sexual services although none were provided. Ms Mihai, you poured shot glasses of vodka which you had brought, and were insistent that Victim 4 drank it. After he had one shot you told him to lie down, and encouraged him to drink a second and perhaps a third. You had laced the vodka with GBL and Victim 4 lost consciousness. You then took jewellery which belonged to his late mother, aftershave and documents, before you both drove off at around 7am. Victim 4 was unconscious for four or five hours but also survived. He felt confused and hung over when he came round. You have both pleaded guilty to administering poison to him.



20. You were arrested nine days after that last attack, on 31 July 2025. You were both in the car. There was a baseball bat on the back seat and a small dropper bottle containing GBL. The aftershave and documents stolen from Victim 4 were in the car, but none of the other stolen property was recovered.

21. I make the following findings about your intention, and the risks you created.

- a. Your joint intention was to incapacitate each victim by making them deeply unconscious. That is not the same as a state of sleep, from which a person could easily awake. Deep unconsciousness was necessary for the theft operation to succeed, so that your victims would not be roused by noise or touch, leaving you free to search their homes and steal from them. I accept that neither of you intended to cause physical harm other than temporary deep unconsciousness.
- b. The amount of the drug given was haphazard, and depended on many things including the strength of the particular batch of GBL, how much of the drug you put into each bottle or glass of alcohol, and the amount of poisoned liquid that each victim drank. These offences did not involve the careful administration of a fixed dose, and so the levels of the drug found in each victim's blood is of little relevance.
- c. You were not aware of the death of any victim before administering the drug to any others. I accept that you both did not in fact know the risks of GBL, as you had seen others take it recreationally without harm, and as you are relatively unsophisticated and gave little thought to the consequences of your actions.
- d. However, if you had stopped for a moment to consider the risks, as you should have done, you would have realised that you were creating a high risk of serious injury or death every time you administered that drug. If you had done the most cursory research you would know that GBL can be extremely toxic. Although you have a low IQ Ms Mihai, you were able to use a profile on a web platform and set up arrangements for sexual services. You both could, and should, have researched open sources. No specialist knowledge is necessary to understand that a drug which is potent enough to cause deep unconsciousness may be extremely dangerous. No specialist knowledge is necessary to understand that such a drug may affect individuals differently, depending on how much they take, their age, medical history, and what other substances they had taken. It ought to have been obvious to you that administering a covert, uncontrolled dose of such a drug to strangers who you knew nothing about was a risk to their lives. You left each victim alone in a state of deep unconsciousness, and a moment's thought could and should have led to the realisation that they might never come round.

SENTENCING GUIDELINES

22. In determining sentences, judges follow guidelines set down by the Sentencing Council. I have taken account of relevant Sentencing Council publications,



particularly the Manslaughter guideline, the Overarching Guideline, the Totality Guideline, the Mental Disorders Guideline and the Guilty Plea Guideline.

DETERMINING THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE MANSLAUGHTER OFFENCES

23. I must determine the level of seriousness of the manslaughter offences.
24. The harm caused by manslaughter is always of the highest degree, being death. The culpability of a manslaughter offence is determined with reference to the Manslaughter Guideline. That sets out brackets of culpability, stating that the descriptions within each bracket are “indications of the level of culpability that may attach to the offender's conduct” and reminding the court to “avoid an overly mechanistic application of these factors”.
25. I have no hesitation in finding that you both acted with high culpability in relation to both deaths. Although you played different parts, your roles were equally significant and I do not distinguish between you in terms of your culpability.
26. The factors which lead me to conclude that your culpability was high are as follows:
 - a. Firstly, you intended to render your victims deeply unconscious. It has been established by the courts that unconsciousness is capable of being grievous bodily harm. You have not been convicted of murder, and I do not make any finding that you intended to cause grievous bodily harm. Intending to put a person into a state where they cannot move or use their senses is an intention which sits within high culpability. Your low IQ, Ms Mihai, does not affect that assessment. You intended the harm to be temporary, but despite that I am satisfied that the intended harm falls just short of grievous bodily harm.
 - b. Secondly, there was a high risk of serious injury or death which ought to have been obvious to you, for the reasons I have set out.
 - c. Thirdly, death was caused in the context of commission of a serious criminal offence. It appears to me that this factor within the Manslaughter Guidelines relates to the background offence, if any, rather than to the unlawful act itself, which was the administration of poison. The background offence here on each occasion was a conspiracy to steal. The seriousness arises from premeditation and planning, the fact that the plan was to steal from inside people's homes, the trickery used to enter each victim's home under the pretence of providing sexual services, and the targeting of high value items such as watches and jewellery.
27. The bracket of high culpability, referred to in the Guidelines as Culpability B, has a starting point of 12 years, with a range of 8-16 years. I have considered whether the presence of multiple Culpability B factors means that I should move into the top bracket of very high culpability in relation to each offence of manslaughter. I have decided that it does not, in part because I find you did not intend lasting harm, and



did not actually know about the high risk of death. However, upward adjustment from the Culpability B starting point is necessary to reflect those multiple factors, before consideration of aggravating and mitigating features.

AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING FACTORS

28. I do not find there to be any aggravating features.
29. I do not accept that there was targeting of vulnerable individuals. The victims contacted you via the website, not the other way around. You did not know that they had vulnerabilities because of medical conditions or because of taking alcohol or other drugs.
30. There are a number of other potentially aggravating features, such as death occurring in the context of a premeditated offence for gain, and in the victims' homes. I have taken those factors into account when determining that the underlying offence was serious, and so I do not double-count by treating those as aggravating factors.
31. I turn to mitigating factors, having considered the various reports and documents provided to me.
32. Ms Mihai: you are now aged 31. You have the following mitigation:
- a. You have no previous convictions for violence or indeed any serious offence. You have a previous conviction for handling stolen goods in August 2023.
 - b. I accept that you are genuinely remorseful from information I have read and from watching you in court today.
 - c. You had significant trauma in your childhood including being abandoned as a child, becoming a carer for your young brother when you yourself were still a child, and being abused. Your adult life has not been easy either in the ways set out in the documents I have read.
 - d. You have symptoms of depression, generalised anxiety disorder and post traumatic stress disorder, which predate these offences. I do not, however, find that your culpability is lessened because of those conditions. Although the result of your childhood trauma and conditions made you more dependent and suggestible and affected your judgment, there is no clear link between those characteristics and your repeated offending behaviour. Following the Mental Disorder Guideline, the mental health symptoms are relevant in a different way, in that custody will have an additional impact on you.
 - e. You have taken advantage of all education and therapeutic support in custody.
33. Mr Dumitru: You are now aged 30. You have the following mitigation:
- a. You have no previous convictions for violence. You have three convictions, including for theft.



- b. I accept that you are genuinely remorseful as you have explained in your letter to me.
 - c. Your childhood was also traumatic, being marred by the death of your mother in childbirth, abuse, instability, and homelessness.
 - d. You suffer from depression and are receiving medication. It is not suggested that any mental health issues affected your culpability, but I bear in mind that custody will have an additional impact on you.
 - e. You have worked hard to better yourself in prison including addressing your drug use, training as a Samaritan listener, and providing significant support to others in custody. Taking on that role is very much to your credit.
34. For each of you, the mitigating factors require a downward adjustment from the figure which would otherwise be appropriate. The details of each of the mitigating features are different between you, but overall I consider that the same adjustment for mitigation is appropriate for you both.

DETERMINING THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE ADMINISTERING POISON OFFENCES

35. I turn to consider the two offences of administering poison. There is no guideline for this offence, and so I assess seriousness by applying the Overarching Principles Guideline.
36. I find you both to have high culpability in relation to both Victims 3 and 4. These were intentional acts which required some planning, and you both had leading roles. The harm caused was also high, being a prolonged state of unconsciousness.
37. Each offence was aggravated by the fact that the poison was administered for a further criminal purpose, namely theft from each man in their own home, and you did in fact steal from both men.
38. The mitigation that I have identified applies equally to these poisoning offences. The aggravating and mitigating features are balanced and offset each other, in relation to you both.

DANGEROUSNESS

39. I must decide whether you are each a dangerous offender which has a particular legal meaning- whether you pose a significant risk of serious harm by committing further specified offences.
40. Despite the gravity of these offences, I do not find either of you to be a dangerous offender. In reaching that view I have particularly borne in mind your limited previous criminal records, my findings about your intentions, and your remorse. I bear in mind that you did not know that anyone had died as a result of your activities before committing further offences. In your case, Ms Mihai, I also bear in mind the



steps you have already taken to address the risk factors identified in the presentence report and psychological report. In your case, Mr Dumitru, I also bear in mind your progress since being in custody which I also find will lower the risk factors which include substance abuse.

CREDIT FOR PLEA

41. In determining the level of credit for your guilty pleas, I have borne the full chronology in mind.
42. In August 2025 you were both interviewed in relation to Mr Mouat's death. Ms Mihai you lied, saying you had not given him any substances. Mr Dumitru you also lied saying you had no knowledge of any substance being administered to anyone. In later interviews you both made no comment.
43. In May 2026 you submitted Defence Statements, which are formal documents setting out the matters which you admit, and which you dispute. You did not admit any offending. Ms Mihai, you admitted covert administration of GBL only in relation to Victim 4, but said it was to help with sexual performance. Mr Dumitru, you said you had no involvement in any covert administration of GBL.
44. You both pleaded not guilty to all offences, which included the offences which you now accept you are guilty of.
45. Homicide charges in relation to Mr King were brought by the prosecution only in April 2026, following receipt of a further expert pathology report. In early June 2026 a joint cardiology report in relation to Mr King's death was completed. I accept that it was reasonable for the defendants to await that report before entering guilty pleas in relation to the death of Mr King, as there was conflicting and inconclusive expert evidence about the role of his cardiac conditions in the cause of death.
46. On the first day of trial, 23 June 2026, you both offered guilty pleas to four offences and on 24 June entered those pleas. There had been some discussion before the first day of trial about guilty pleas, the court had been alerted to those discussions, and I accept that it was difficult to resolve the situation without all parties being together, with the defendants present.
47. In relation to Mr King I am satisfied that there were particular circumstances which made it unreasonable to expect the defendants to indicate a guilty plea sooner than was done. The exception at F1 of the Sentencing Guideline applies in relation to the manslaughter of Mr King, and I am prepared to give full credit for the guilty pleas to manslaughter of Mr King.
48. In relation to the other three offences, the position is different. I do not accept that it would have been unreasonable to indicate guilty pleas to those offences much earlier in the proceedings, and the F1 exception does not apply. I note that you did



not even accept in your Defence Statements that you had unlawfully administered GBL to those three victims in order to render them unconscious. That is relevant because this was not a case where the only remaining issue was linked to defence expert evidence which was awaited. The usual rule is that the discount is limited to 10% when pleas are entered on the first day of trial. However, given that discussions were underway before the trial, I make a 15% reduction.

THE SENTENCES

49. I have considered the totality guideline and the appropriate sentence to reflect all of the criminality. Plainly only a lengthy custodial sentence can meet the seriousness of this case. No sentence can ever compensate the families and friends of those who you unlawfully killed.
50. In line with the totality guideline, I have considered what the sentence would be for each individual offence if it stood alone.
51. For each of the offences of manslaughter, the starting point is 12 years. I increase that to 15 years because of the multiplicity of Culpability B factors. I adjust it to 12 years because of mitigation. That means that the sentence before credit for plea for each of the manslaughters if they stood alone would be 12 years. With credit for plea, the sentences would be 8 years in relation to the manslaughter of Mr King and a little over 10 years in relation to the manslaughter of Mr Mouat.
52. For each of the offences of poisoning, the sentence would be 2 ½ years after a trial. With 15% credit for plea, that would result in a sentence a little over 2 years for each.
53. The approach of the courts is not simply to add up sentences for individual offences. I must apply the totality guideline, and pass the least sentence which is just and proportionate to reflect your overall criminality. That sentence must properly reflect the tragedy that not one, but two lives have been lost. I bear in mind that these were not, as is sometimes the case, two deaths arising from one unlawful act. The deaths arose from separate unlawful acts a year apart, and were followed by a further two separate poisonings.
54. As this was a series of offences of a similar kind, I will pass concurrent sentences, and I take the first manslaughter, of Mr King, as the lead offence.
55. Will the defendants please stand up.
56. Ms Mihai, Mr Dumitru, the total sentence imposed on both of you is 17 years imprisonment.
57. I take the manslaughter of Mr King as the lead offence and impose the sentence of 17 years in relation to that count. For the manslaughter of Mr Mouat a sentence of



10 years imprisonment will run concurrently. For each of the poisoning counts, a sentence of 2 years will also run concurrently.

58. The effect of the sentence is as follows. You will be released from custody part of the way through the sentence and the remainder of the sentence will be served on licence in the community. At today's date that release point is no less than two thirds of the term, but the Sentencing Act 2026 would change that to no less than half. 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. The days which you have spent on remand in custody which I understand to be 371 days will automatically count towards your sentence.

59. The defendants will be taken down now.

60. It remains for me to thank counsel and court staff for the assistance which they have given to the court. I pay tribute to the complex police operation across various forces which brought these offenders to justice.