

REX V. BEYTULLAH GUNDUZ.

SENTENCING REMARKS

1. On 5th June 2026, you were convicted of conspiracy to murder, and I must now sentence you. You were due to be produced at Court today for sentence. You have refused to leave HMP Thameside. Yesterday your solicitors asked that you be produced for this hearing on a link. No clear reason was then given. It was simply said that it would mean you going to HMP Belmarsh. I have considered adjourning sentence so that you could be present by link but am of the view that it is in the clear interests of justice to proceed with this hearing today. I direct that a copy of these remarks are provided to you.

The facts.

2. On 20th June 2025, Onur Guzel was shot outside the restaurant, Umut 2000. The restaurant is located on Crossway in Hackney. Mr Guzel was taking a break from his work in the kitchen and was in the doorway of the next-door premises speaking to his wife on the phone when a shot was fired from a car as it drove past the restaurant. The time of the shooting was at about 10:50pm. The driver of the car, and the person who fired the gun, was Dogan Over. The car was then driven to a spot by Hackney Downs where it was set alight. Dogan Over then fled the UK for Turkey.
3. The emergency services quickly responded to calls made to them after the shooting and Onur Guzel was rushed to hospital where he underwent emergency surgery. He had wounds to the left lower abdomen, left side of the back, a ‘through and through’ destructive injury to the small bowel as well as injuries to the large bowel.
4. Before this shooting there had been earlier incidents targeting the Guzel family. On 5th April 2025, shots were fired at an address in Hoe Lane close to where Mr Guzel’s brother was living and on the night of 7th April, shots were fired at Umut 2000: the Guzel family restaurant. I note that there was no evidence before the court of any involvement of you in those earlier incidents.

5. The area in Hackney where this shooting took place is caught up with two rival gangs: the so called 'Tottenham Turks' and the 'Hackney Turks'. You are part of the 'Hackney Turks'. The Guzel family were accused of giving money to your rival gang, the 'Tottenham Turks'.
6. In 2025, I presided over the trial of Javon Riley. Riley was convicted of three counts of attempted murder and one count of causing grievous bodily harm with intent. The events he was involved in concerned a shooting at the 'Evin' restaurant on Kingsland High Street. Three men sat at a table in 'Evin', and all three affiliated to the 'Hackney Turks', were shot at, and injured. Until 15 minutes before that shooting, you had been sat at the same table as those three men. The fourth person shot and seriously injured in that incident was a 9 year old girl who happened to be in the restaurant with her family. The incident here where Mr Guzel sustained serious injury is another of this long-running round of retaliatory attacks, murders and attempted murders between your gang, the 'Hackney Turks', and the 'Tottenham Turks'. It is also, sadly, yet another example of someone outside the feuding groups caught up in violence, who sustained life changing injury.
7. The attack on Mr Guzel was one that involved a firearm and one which was motivated by financial gain: to ensure that those your gang perceived as rivals, and those who ran business on what you thought of as your 'patch', paid up.

Antecedents.

8. You are now aged 40. In 2008 you received a community order for an offence of possession of an offensive weapon. You breached that order in 2009 and were made subject to a suspended sentence order with a sentence of 28 days imprisonment suspended for 6 months. In 2016 for public order matters and 2017 for criminal damage, you were fined. In 2019, for dangerous driving and public order offences, you were sentenced to 3 months' imprisonment. There were further offences of criminal damage in 2020. In 2022 and 2025 driving offences and drugs offences when community orders were made.

Sentencing guidelines.

9. In terms of sentencing guidelines I have before me the Sentencing Council guidelines on attempted murder as well the provisions of schedule 21 of the Sentencing Act 2020. In the absence of offence-specific guidelines, the attempted murder guidelines provide the best means of assessing seriousness.

10. Looking first at culpability, this offence involved the use of a firearm and so brings the case within very high culpability. It may also come within that category as a result of being an offence committed for financial gain. Having considered all of the features of this case very high culpability is the appropriate category here. On harm, the injury caused to Mr Guzel has resulted in permanent, irreversible injury which has a substantial and long-term effect on his ability to carry out his normal day to day activities and his ability to work.
11. I have seen and read two victim personal statements. Mr Guzel sets out the devastating physical, psychological and financial consequences of your actions. As he says. *“The attack did far more than injure me physically. It has altered the course of my life. It has taken my sense of safety, deeply affected my mental health, disputed my future, and changed my identity at its core. I am trying, every day, to put the pieces back together, but the truth is I am no longer the person I was before this happened.”* The most recent statement provides an update on his current symptoms and ongoing concerns.
12. As I have stated, you were not the man who fired the gun, but were clearly involved in both the planning and implementation of the shooting. The plans involved using a stolen and then cloned car, and after the event making efforts to then destroy evidence by setting fire to the car used.
13. The starting point provided for in the guidelines is one of 35 years’ custody with a range of between 30 and 40 years’ custody. I note that for harm level 2, the start point is 30 years’ custody and a range of 25 to 35 years’ custody.
14. Turning next to factors increasing seriousness, you have some convictions for violence albeit of a different nature to this. Secondly, the events of the shooting clearly put others at risk. Thirdly, there are the actions after the event to cover up what had happened and to conceal evidence.
15. In mitigation Ms Moore invites caution on assessing categorisation as to whether this was for gain and level of harm. It is suggested this is level 2 as to harm in the light of the materials that have been produced.
16. I have seen and read a number of character references about you and people speak of your positive qualities. I am told that your record whilst in prison is a good one.

17. I am required to consider the issue of dangerousness. The test is this: *is there a significant risk to members of the public of serious harm occasioned by the commission by you of further specified offences?* In making that assessment, as well as taking into account all the information available about the nature and circumstances of the offences here, I may take into account any other information about you that is available.
18. On conviction I considered whether a Pre-Sentence Report [PSR] should be ordered. The Sentencing Act 2020 makes provision for those aged 18 or over, that the court must obtain and consider a pre-sentence report before forming the opinion on dangerousness unless, in the circumstances of the case, it considers it is unnecessary to do so. In my judgement a report is unnecessary due to the extensive account you gave in the trial as to your background, attitudes, associations and offending. I also had the benefit of considering all the evidence at trial as to your role in this specific offence and what you said about your role, as well as all of the other material before the Court. Counsel at trial did not seek to persuade me such a report was required. In a sentencing note uploaded to the DCS on Monday this week it is submitted that this is not one of those cases where the court could justifiably conclude that the defendant is dangerous without a PSR. I do not agree. As I have stated you gave evidence at trial and that long with all with all the other material before the Court is sufficient to make an assessment as to the risks and whether the statutory test is met.
19. In the light of the facts of this case, a targeted shooting of someone you perceived as a threat to your gang rather than a rival gang member, all that I know about the on-going feud, in my judgment the test is met.
20. Having come to that view, I have to consider the provisions of s.285 of the Sentencing Act 2020, and whether the seriousness of the offence is such as to justify the imposition of a sentence of imprisonment for life. If so, then I must impose a sentence of imprisonment for life. I have very much in mind what was said by Lord Thomas CJ in Att.-Gen.'s Reference (No. 27 of 2013) Burinkas [2014] 2 Cr App R (S) 45, that a life sentence remains a sentence of last resort. In my judgment the seriousness of the offence here is such that such a sentence is justified and should be imposed. The issue for me is the appropriate minimum term to be imposed. When it comes to the minimum term, I make plain that I am not ordering that you are released at the end of it: whether you will be released or not at that stage will be a matter for the Parole Board to consider. Only when the minimum term has been served can the Parole Board decide whether it is safe to release you or not. If the Parole Board does release you, then you will remain on licence and liable for recall for the rest of your life.

21. I note in passing that had Mr Guzel died, and you had been convicted of murder, the start point for the minimum term of a life sentence would have been one of 30 years.

Sentence.

22. In my judgment, taking account of your role relative to that of the gunman, together with the aggravating and mitigating factors I have identified I have concluded that the appropriate determinate term would have been one of 30 years' imprisonment. Taking two-thirds of that notional determinate sentence as the appropriate figure to calculate the minimum term, there will be a life sentence with a minimum term of 20 years. The days on remand, which I am told number 434 days, will count towards that sentence and so the minimum term will be 20 years less the 434 days.
23. I make a deprivation order in respect of the two iPhones CIC/1 and CIC/2, the two Nokia mobile phones JJR/180725/1 and CIC/3 and the Kia Niro DAS/1. I make no order as to compensation in light of the sentence imposed. I commend Mr Onur Guzel for his bravery and outstanding public-spirited conduct. I order that the Sheriff for Greater London pay a reward to Mr Guzel in the sum of £750 to reflect public appreciation of his bravery.
24. If the statutory surcharge applies then the appropriate order may be drawn up.

The Recorder of London

His Honour Judge Mark Lucraft KC

Central Criminal Court.

London EC4M 7EH

25th September 2026

Before leaving this case I would wish to pay tribute to Graham Trembath KC. Just before I was due to sentence in this case the sad news reached me of Graham's death. He was a gifted advocate and used all of his many skills to great effect to do the very best for all he represented. He was someone who thrived on the drama that takes place in all cases. By his own admission he was not the greatest academic lawyer, but he had tactical nous in great abundance. It was always a real delight to see him in court and he will be greatly missed by family, professional colleagues and by all of us here at the Central Criminal Court. He was one of those who took his work in court seriously but also did not take himself too seriously and used his excellent sense of humour and take on everyday life to great effect in superbly crafted jury speeches. May he rest in peace.