SOUTHWARK CROWN COURT

27 NOVEMBER 2026

THE KING

V

NICK JAMES DALY

SENTENCING REMARKS OF MRS JUSTICE HEATHER WILLIAMS DBE

Mr Daly, you may remain seated until I tell you to stand up.

INTRODUCTION

1. On 7 October 2026, you pleaded guilty to a total of seven offences of sending malicious communications, contrary to section 1(1) of the Malicious Communications Act 1988.

2. Case 45TD0667026 concerns six offences you committed between 27 January and 6 May 2026. The intended recipients of your communications were the Rt Hon Robert Jenrick MP (Counts 1 and 2), journalist Roshan Salih (Counts 3 and 4) and the Israeli Embassy (Counts 5 and 6). Counts 4 and 6 are multiple incident counts. You pleaded not guilty at the Plea and Trial Preparation Hearing on 8 June 2026 when your trial was fixed for 2 November 2026. You changed your pleas to guilty at a hearing on 7 October 2026.

3. Case 45TD1408126 concerns a single offence committed on 17 January 2026. The recipient of your message was Hollie Ridley, then General Secretary of the Labour

Party. This offence is now Count 7 on the combined indictment. You pleaded guilty to this offence at the first Crown Court hearing.

4. You have accepted by your pleas of guilty that the messages you sent were grossly offensive and that your purpose in sending them was to cause distress and/or anxiety to the recipients. In summary, your revolting messages glorified Hitler and the Nazis, relished in threats of extreme violence towards Israelis, abused Muslims and Israelis in the vilest terms, and advocated the removal of Muslim and other minority groups from the UK and Europe.

5. I have had the benefit of written and oral submissions from Counsel. I take account of everything that has been said.

THE FACTS

6. You were born on 10 March 1996 and are now 30 years old.

7. Your first message was a post to Hollie Ridley's personal Instagram account on 17 January 2026 (Count 7). Ms Ridley did not view the message at that stage because it was filtered as spam, but she saw it when she was contacted by police in June 2026, after they discovered it on your phone.

8. This message said "Heil Britannia" next to an expletive directed at Israel. The wording would be readily associated with the Nazi greeting "Heil Hitler".

9. Screenshots found by police on your phone showed you had targeted Ms Ridley because you perceived she had a connection by marriage to Israel.

10. In her Victim Personal Statement, Ms Ridley says that the message had a lasting impact on her. It left her and her family feeling anxious about their safety and it was a key factor in her decision to leave her role as General Secretary of the Labour Party.

11. During the evening of 27 January 2026, you left two voicemail messages on the landline phone for the office of the Rt Hon Robert Jenrick MP (Counts 1 and 2). The second message said, “Fuck every single Israeli rat who is in our fucking Parliament. We will see them hang from the Tower of London and I can’t fucking wait”. The first message was similar to the one you had sent to Ms Ridley.

12. Your reasons for targeting Mr Jenrick were apparent from your WhatsApp messages to your family, at least two of which referred in derogatory terms to Mr Jenrick’s connection by marriage to Israel.

13. Your two voicemail messages were heard by Susan Gray, the Officer Manager for Mr Jenrick. In her statement she says that little shocks or surprises her, having performed her role for MPs for as long as 25 years. However, she reported your two messages to the police because they contained a threat to the safety of MPs and she found them grossly offensive and antisemitic.

14. The Speaker of the House of Commons, Sir Lindsay Hoyle, has provided a statement referring to the threats faced by MPs, their staff and families, their increasing levels of fear and the impact of this upon them. He states: “Democracy itself is at risk, if, as a result of threats and the resultant fear, MPs are forced to reduce their engagement with constituents; change the way in which they interact or vote in the House; or indeed make the decision to not stand for re-election. I am aware of some MPs that will be standing down at the next election because they no longer want to be subjected to the threat, abuse, and intimidation they receive”.

15. You expressed your seemingly entrenched views in various WhatsApp messages to your family. For example, on 19 January 2026 you said to your mother, “European countries are for European Christian indigenous natives” and “Israelis who control our society need to be exterminated”. On the evening of 27 January 2026, you wrote about an “Israeli elite” who controlled society and about Muslims and Jews being removed from Europe. You said that before the end of the year you were going to start publicly wearing swastikas and that you were “going to do my part to help exterminate the virus’s in human form, that rid our society with financial cancer”.

Your mother and father challenged and warned you about your behaviour, but this did not seem to have any effect.

16. Roshan Salih is the owner and co-editor of 5 Pillars, an online Muslim community website which has been running since 2013. You sent Mr Salih one email on 17 April (Count 3) and then a further seven emails during the period 19 April to 5 May 2026 (Count 4).

17. The first message referred to a "final crusade on Israel" as revenge for "flooding our Christian lands with Muslim barbarians" and concluded "Hail Brittania" and "Seig Heil Seig Heig Seig Heil". Your subsequent messages continued in a similar vein. They included chilling threats such as: "The concentration camps await you"; "How many rats work in your office? Need to make sure I bring enough needles"; and "We are going to cleanse all of you"; and also graphic abuse, such as "low IQ paedo worshipping rats". Attached to one of the emails were photographs of a combat jacket and a sheathed knife and a skull with the colours of the Union Jack flag.

18. In his Victim Personal Statement Mr Salih said: "My organisation is one of the most high profile Muslim organisations in the country … Since these threats my team have stopped going to the office as much, trying to work more remotely … It's a shared office, so we've also had to tell others that use it to be careful and vigilant … I am concerned for the fear and stress caused to my wife and children, as are my colleagues for theirs". He also said: "One of the greatest things in this country is our right to free speech … We know that there is a red line that can't be crossed, which is encouraging or threatening violence. This line has been crossed in these intimidating messages that are an attempt to shut down our legal free speech".

19. Your emails to the Israeli Embassy started on the evening of 3 May 2026. Your first email to one of the Embassy's published email addresses said, "Just wanted to share my summer 2026 wardrobe" and attached to the email were the photographs sent to Mr Salih along with an image of a balaclava. Your first email to the

Embassy's second published email address, sent the same evening, said "Heil Hitler" (Count 5). You then sent multiple grossly offensive emails to the same two email addresses over the next two days. Your vile threats and abuse included: "After we cleanse Europe, we will conduct the final crusade on Israel"; "You have no fucking idea what is coming you stupid rats"; "There will be no camps this time"; "Anthrax risk from all letters over the next 6 weeks"; "I do not care anymore I just want to kill as many Israelis as I can"; "if I come across an Israeli I am slitting their throats"; "There will be a package hidden outside the embassy on Tuesday 5th at 3.45am"; "I will lead at least 3 concentration camps for the extermination of Israelis and Muslims"; and "Now we will exterminate every single one of you, not even any children will survive". Two of your messages referred to Zyklon B, which you said was now injectable. Zyklon B is the brand name for hydrogen cyanide used by the Nazis in gas chambers in the concentration camps in the early 1940s. You also sent photographs of yourself holding a syringe and holding a knife.

20. The Embassy email address to which the majority of these emails were sent, automatically put them into a junk folder, where they were deleted, but police subsequently extracted them from your phone. Emails to the other Embassy address were produced to police by a member of staff at the Embassy. No Victim Personal Statement has been made by or on behalf of those working at the Embassy, but in an earlier statement, a diplomat from the Embassy observed that due to the Embassy's unique security concerns, threats of this kind were a matter of grave concern.

21. You were arrested at your home address on 7 May 2026. You made no comment during interviews when police questioned you about the messages sent to the office of Robert Jenrick MP and to Mr Salih. Following your arrest, police seized your mobile phone and discovered the further messages I have described.

22. You have one relevant previous conviction. In August 2015, when you were aged 19, you pleaded guilty to an offence contrary to section 127(1)(a) of the Communications Act 2003, and you were sentenced to a conditional discharge.

The offence related to a message you sent to your mother threatening to "burn this fucking house down" if she didn't answer her phone.

23. I understand that at the time of these offences you were living alone in a one-bedroomed council flat in Surrey. Your messages indicated you were unemployed and in receipt of benefits and that you blamed others for your situation.

THE COURT'S APPROACH

24. The maximum penalty for a single offence of sending malicious communications, contrary to section 1 of the Malicious Communications Act 1988 is two years' imprisonment.

25. I am satisfied that section 66 of the Sentencing Act 2020 applies and that your offences are aggravated by your hostility towards members of racial groups (Israelis, Jews, and people not of British heritage) and members of a religious group (Muslims).

26. The Sentencing Council has not issued a guideline specific to this offence.

27. The General Guideline: overarching principles provides that where there is no offence-specific guideline, the court should take account of the statutory maximum penalty, any relevant decisions of the Court of Appeal and the definitive sentencing guidelines for analogous offences, making adjustments for any differences in the statutory maximum sentence and the elements of the offence. It requires the sentencer to assess seriousness by considering culpability and harm, to have regard to the five statutory purposes of sentencing and to consider any relevant aggravating or mitigating factors.

28. Counsel proposed that the Sentencing Council's guideline on Harassment / Stalking / Racially aggravated harassment / stalking ("the Harassment Guideline") is relevant to consider in this case. The underlying offence, contrary to section 2 of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997, carries a maximum penalty of six months custody and an offence of racially or religiously aggravated harassment,

contrary to section 32(1)(a) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1988, has a maximum of two years' custody, the same as for an offence of sending a malicious communication. As counsel have noted, on the one hand, there must be a course of conduct for a person to be guilty of harassment (which is not a requirement for your offences), on the other hand, culpability for harassment may be lower, given a person may be guilty if he ought to have known his conduct amounted to harassment (whereas a person is only guilty of a malicious communication offence if their purpose was causing anxiety or distress).

29. The Harassment Guideline and the offences it concerns are useful in underscoring that the involvement of a racial or religious element in the harassment is treated as a very serious aggravating factor, in that instance increasing the maximum sentence fourfold. This guideline is also of value in indicating factors that are relevant to the assessment of culpability, harm, aggravation and mitigation in relation to such offending. However, I do not consider that a direct application of the starting point figures for the basic offence of harassment provides a helpful approach. First, because the statutory maximum for the basic offence is only six months' custody. Secondly, because where the racial or religious hostility element is integral to the offending itself, as is the case here, the better approach is to assess the criminality as a whole, rather than to artificially separate out a base offence and then treat the racial or religious aspect as a discrete aggravating element: *R v Gargan* [2017] EWCA Crim 780, [2018] 1 Cr App R (S) 6; and *R v Omar* [2026] EWCA Crim 92. When I indicated this view to Counsel during the hearing, they both agreed with my proposed approach.

30. I have also had regard to recent Court of Appeal decisions in respect of sentences imposed for sending malicious communications: *R v Ladbrook* [2022] EWCA Crim 113, [2022] 4 WLR 28; *R v Jones* [2023] EWCA Crim 672; *R v Nelson* [2022] EWCA Crim 1080; *R v Taylor* [2024] EWCA Crim 920; and *R v Foster* [2025] EWCA Crim 1185. I do not suggest that the facts of any of these cases are directly analogous to your case, but they give a general indication of the approach that has been taken and the seriousness with which this offence is viewed.

THE ASSESSMENT OF YOUR OFFENDING

31. Your culpability is at the highest level. Your actions were deliberate, involving intentional acts with a desired result and your conduct was intended to maximise fear and/or distress. So far as Counts 4 and 6 are concerned, there was persistent action over a prolonged period. Counts 2, 4 and 6 involved threats of serious violence. Your Counsel accepts that so far as the Harassment Guideline is instructive, your culpability equates to Category A. I have had regard to the Sentencing Council's guideline on Sentencing offenders with mental disorders, developmental disorders or neurological impairments ("the Mental Health Guideline"). I will come to the medical evidence when I consider your mitigation, but in the interests of clarity, I indicate at this stage that I do not consider that your culpability was reduced by reason of any impairment or disorder.

32. In assessing the level of harm, as the General Guideline confirms, it is right to have regard to the harm that you caused, the harm you intended and the harm that might foreseeably have been caused. I have already referred to the serious distress, the fear and the disruption you caused to Ms Ridley, Mr Salih, their families and to others working in Mr Salih's office. Whilst many of your emails to the Israeli Embassy were not read, there can be no doubt, given the nature of these and other messages, that you envisaged very serious distress being caused. Accordingly, within the context of the offence of malicious communications, I regard the harm as being serious, but not at the very highest level.

33. As I have indicated, I take into account the extreme racial and religious hostility you displayed in my assessment of the seriousness of these offences as a whole.

34. Additionally, there are the following specific aggravating factors. First, you have one relevant previous conviction. However, I bear in mind that this offence occurred some time ago when you were a much younger man. Secondly, on your own account, your current offending took place after you had consumed excessive

amounts of alcohol. Thirdly, you failed to respond to the warnings and concerns expressed by others, in particular your parents. Fourthly, offending of this kind has a wider negative impact, as described in the statements of Sir Lindsay Hoyle and Mr Salih. Fifthly, some of these offences were committed against those working in the public sector or providing a service to the public.

35. I turn to your mitigation.

36. There is evidence that during the period when you committed these offences, you had become isolated from your normal sources of support (although they were still available to you), you were experiencing some difficulties with your mental health and you were misusing alcohol.

37. I have read the report prepared by Dr Hemant Bagalkote, a Consultant in General Adult Psychiatry, who interviewed you on 19 June 2026 via a video call with HMP Wandsworth, where you have been remanded in custody since 11 May of this year. As Dr Bagalkote recognises, a significant limitation of the report is that he did not have access to any of your medical records other than some prescriptions in March and April 2026 for cannabidiol and a report from June 2010 by a Chartered Clinical Psychologist for the Developmental Neuropsychiatry and Neuropsychology Service. The 2010 report indicated that your main difficulties related to social communication and were consistent with autism spectrum disorder ("ASD"), symptoms of ADHD Hyperkinetic Disorder and anger regulation difficulties. You told Dr Bagalkote that you had suffered from long-term depression and had taken a series of different anti-depressant medication over the years; that you had been under the care of many psychiatrists but had not met with one in the last five years. You said your mood was at a low point, you were struggling to sleep in prison and you had been waiting to be assessed by the mental health team.

38. Dr Bagalkote concluded that you have a neurodevelopmental disorder such as ASD and possibly that you were suffering from a mixed depressive and anxiety disorder. He refers in general terms to potential effects and difficulties that may be

experienced by a person with ASD. However, in terms of your specific offending, he goes no further than saying that there "appears to be some evidence" that your neurodevelopmental problems, compromised coping abilities, psychosocial issues and substance misuse and the resultant impact on your mental state "may have led" to you being vulnerable and unable to fully assess the risks of the situation and prone to impaired decision making.

39. Given the qualified nature of this conclusion, the fact the doctor was unable to review your medical records and the deliberate and protracted nature of your offending, there is no "sufficient connection" (in the words of the Mental Health Guideline) between your autism and your offending behaviour for me to regard it as reducing your culpability.

40. Consistent with the Mental Health Guideline, I accept that there is a degree of vulnerability and prison is likely to weigh more heavily on you, and I note the delay you have experienced in obtaining your medication. However, as the guideline states, this can only be taken into account in a limited way.

41. It appears that you now have a degree of remorse and shame about your offending, as you expressed to Dr Bagalkote. You have also written a thoughtful letter to me, which I have read carefully. However, this impression is tempered by the assessment of the author of the Pre-Sentencing Report ("PSR") who considers you tried to justify, deflect, and minimise your behaviour during his recent interview with you. Your claims to him that the messages you sent to Mr Jenrick's office and to the Israeli Embassy were the expression of your unhappiness at recent world events (particularly the war with Iran) and that you thought Mr Salih was abusing the asylum system through his website, do not begin to explain the hate-filled bigotry, the aggression and the glorification of Nazism which you repeatedly expressed. Like the author of the PSR, I struggle to see how you could so quickly have changed your apparently entrenched views during your time on remand, although I very much hope that you have.

42. I bear in mind that there are better sides to your character, as described in your four character references and that you have used your time on remand at HMP Wandsworth constructively, acting as a mentor for the Shannon Trust which involves helping other prisoners to improve their reading and numeracy skills and also serving as a reader in church and as a wing activity representative. In the latter role you have recently received an award from the governor recognising your performance.

43. However, overall, the mitigating factors, whilst of weight, do not outweigh the aggravating features which I have identified.

44. There is no doubt that the custody threshold is passed in relation to all of your offences, as Ms Nelson accepts.

45. I begin with your sustained offending in the multiple incident counts. Your repeated messages were full of revolting abuse, permeated with racial and religious hostility and you threatened extreme violence, especially in emails to the Israeli Embassy. You sent a particularly large volume of messages to the Israeli Embassy. These are very serious offences indeed. If I were sentencing you after a trial, I would impose a sentence of 16 months imprisonment on Count 4 and 22 months imprisonment on Count 6.

46. Having regard to the Reduction in sentence for guilty plea guideline, I will allow a 20% discount for your guilty pleas which were entered after the Plea and Trial Preparing Hearing but several weeks before trial. I am told that the only prosecution witness you had required to attend in addition to the Officer in the Case, was Mr Salih and that it was indicated that his evidence was potentially capable of agreement. This discount applies to the offences save for Count 7, where I will make a 25% reduction.

47. I have had regard to the Totality guideline. I am in no doubt that the sentences for Count 4 and Count 6 must be imposed consecutively to each other. These offences involve separate victims, and your overall criminality would not be adequately

reflected if these were concurrent sentences. However, to take account of totality, I will pass concurrent sentences in relation to Counts 3 and 5. I will also make a modest reduction to the sentence after trial figures I have indicated for Counts 4 and 6, to 15 months and 20 months respectively, in order to make additional allowance for totality.

48. Your offending in relation to Counts 1, 2 and 7 has the particular aggravating factor that it was directed at a Member of Parliament and towards a leading figure in the Labour Party. It is vital to the effective functioning of our democracy that people are able to participate in the political process without being put in fear for their safety and without being deterred from undertaking this role. If you had been convicted at trial, I would have imposed sentences of 5 months imprisonment in relation to each of Counts 1 and 2 and 4 months imprisonment in relation to Count 7. In light of totality considerations, I will make each of those sentences concurrent to each other but consecutive to the sentences on Counts 4 and 6.

49. I am satisfied that the overall sentence I will pass is just and proportionate and that it is the lowest sentence I can properly impose commensurate with your offending.

50. I bear in mind the factors identified in the Imposition of community and custodial sentences guideline and Ms Nelson's submission that the sentences I pass should be suspended. Having regard to the probation officer's assessment, I accept you do not present a high risk of reoffending and that there is a real prospect of your rehabilitation in the community. In this regard, I note too, your plan upon your release you set out in your letter to me and your supportive family, many of who have attended today. There is also mitigation, albeit not at the level that I would characterise as "strong". Nonetheless, I am quite clear that the seriousness of your offending means that appropriate punishment can only be achieved by a sentence of immediate custody in this instance.

ANCILLARY ORDERS

51. The statutory surcharge will apply.

52. I do not intend to make an order for costs, given your financial circumstances.

53. I will make a restraining order in the terms applied for by the prosecution with the amendments I will detail. Given your offending, I am satisfied that it is necessary to do so for the purposes of protecting those referred to in the order from harassment and/or fear of violence and that the terms of the order I will grant are proportionate. As currently drafted, item 7 of the draft order is too wide, referring as it does to "any employee of a political party within the UK". However, I accept that my concern is met by inserting the additional words immediately after this phrase "who you know to be an employee of a political party". I agree with the suggestion that the words "in any Police Area in England and Wales" are unnecessary in item 8 and should be deleted in the interests of clarity. I accept that items 6 and 7 (as amended) have a broader reach than conduct which would in any event constitute a criminal offence.

54. I make an order under section 30 of the Elections Act 2022 disqualifying you for five years from being nominated for election to a relevant elective office and from being elected to or holding a relevant elective office. You have been convicted of an offence listed in Schedule 9 of that Act and I am satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that your offending was aggravated by hostility related to members of the House of Commons. Under this statute, it is immaterial that your hostility was also based on other factors. Your hostility towards members of the House of Commons and towards Robert Jenrick specifically in his capacity as an MP, was clearly demonstrated by the second message you sent on 27 January 2026, the terms of which I have already set out. It is not suggested that it would be unjust for me to make this order.

THE SENTENCE OF THE COURT

Stand up, Mr Daly

55. In order to protect Hollie Ridley, Roshan Salih, 5 Pillars, Members of Parliament, employees of political parties and those at the Israeli Embassy from further

harassment and/or fear of violence you will be subject to a restraining order. The order prohibits you from contacting Hollie Ridley, Roshan Salih or 5 Pillars, directly or indirectly, by any means whatsoever. You are prohibited from threatening, intimidating or harassing any Member of Parliament and employees of a political party within the UK who you know to be such employees. You are also prohibited from attending any address you believe Ms Ridley or Mr Salih to live or work at, from attending the premises of a Member of Parliament (save by prior appointment) and from attending or going within 500 metres of the Israeli Embassy in London. This order will apply until further order is made.

56. You will be given full details of the order. I must warn you that if you were to disobey the order you would be committing a further offence, punishable with up to five years' imprisonment.

57. I sentence you to 12 months imprisonment on Count 4 and 2 months imprisonment on Count 3. The sentence on Count 3 will be concurrent with the sentence on Count 4.

58. I sentence you to 16 months imprisonment on Count 6 and to 2 months imprisonment on Count 5. The sentence on Counts 5 and 6 will be concurrent to each other but consecutive to the sentence on Counts 3 and 4.

59. I sentence you to 4 months imprisonment on each of Counts 1 and 2 and to 3 months imprisonment on Count 7. These three sentences will be concurrent to each other but consecutive to the earlier sentences I have referred to.

60. Accordingly, your overall sentence is 32 months imprisonment.

61. In accordance with current sentencing provisions, you will be released no later than after you have served one-third of that sentence. The time you have served on remand with count towards your sentence. Once you are released, 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.

62. As I have already noted, it is clear that there is a side of you that is so much better than this. You are fortunate to have a supportive family. When you are released I hope, as you say in your letter, that you will do everything in your power to aid your rehabilitation.

63. However, my last thoughts are for the victims of your appalling offending and for the stress, fear and anguish you have caused them.