



1 **IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS**
2 **CRIMINAL SIDE**
3

4 **Neutral Citation Number: [2025] CIGC (Crim) 48**

5 **INDICTMENT NO: 39 of 2025**
6
7

8 **R**

9
10 **V.**
11

12
13 **AMARI LEQUAN GRANT**
14

15 **Appearances:** **Mr. Kenneth Ferguson, Crown Counsel, Office of the Director of**
16 **Public Prosecutions for the Prosecution**

17
18 **Mr. Dennis Brady of Brady Law for the Defence**
19

20 **Before:** **Justice Cheryll Richards KC**

21 **Submissions Heard:** **26th September 2025**

22 **Sentence Judgment:** **26th September 2025**
23
24

25 ***Criminal Law - Sentencing for Aggravated Burglary, contrary to Section 244 (1) of the Penal Code (2024***
26 ***Revision), Making a Threat to Kill, contrary to section 88C of the Penal Code (2024 Revision), Common***
27 ***Assault, contrary to section 215 of the Penal Code (2024 Revision). Principles on Sentencing,***
28 ***Exceptional Circumstances.***
29
30
31
32
33
34
35



SENTENCE JUDGMENT

- 1
2
3 1. The defendant is before the Court for sentencing following his guilty pleas to four Counts of
4 the Indictment as follows.
5
- 6 2. Count 1 charges him with the offence of Aggravated Burglary, contrary to Section 244 (1) of
7 the **Penal Code** (2024 Revision). The particulars are that he on the 8th day of April 2025, entered
8 a building, namely ... Montrose Way, Bodden Town, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands, as a
9 trespasser with intent to assault Dejanae Selena Taylor and at the same time was armed with an
10 offensive weapon namely a machete. The maximum sentence is life imprisonment.
11
- 12 3. Count 2 charges him with the offence of Making a Threat to Kill, contrary to section 88C of
13 the **Penal Code** (2024 Revision). The particulars are that he on the 8th day of April 2025, in the
14 jurisdiction of the Cayman Islands, without lawful excuse, made towards Dejanae Selena
15 Taylor a threat to kill her, intending that Dejanae Selena Taylor would fear that the threat would
16 be carried out. The maximum sentence is 10 years' imprisonment.
17
- 18 4. Count 3 charges him with the offence of Common Assault, contrary to section 215 of the **Penal**
19 **Code** (2024 Revision). The particulars are that he on the 8th day of April 2025, at ... Montrose
20 Way, Bodden Town, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands, unlawfully assaulted Dejanae Selena
21 Taylor by throwing rocks at her. The maximum sentence is 1 year imprisonment.
22
- 23 5. Count 4 charges him with a second offence of Common Assault. The particulars are that he on
24 the 8th day of April 2025, at ... Montrose Way, Bodden Town, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands,
25 unlawfully assaulted Dejanae Selena Taylor by chopping at her with a machete.
26
- 27 6. The defendant first appeared in the Grand Court on the 17th April 2025. Following the defence
28 request for time, he was arraigned on his second appearance on the 2nd May 2025 and entered
29 the pleas as aforementioned.
30
31

1 7. It is accepted that the pleas were entered at the first reasonable opportunity and that the
2 defendant is entitled to full credit.



3
4 **THE FACTS**

5
6 8. The prosecution has provided a summary of the facts which is not disputed by the defence. It
7 is set out below. The Court considers that the facts of the case are unusual, and this has led to
8 the type of sentence which is imposed herein.

9
10 9. On Tuesday, the 8th of April 2025, sometime during the early afternoon, the victim was at her
11 home in Bodden Town and was engaged in a FaceTime (video) chat with her girlfriend and the
12 defendant who is the partner of her girlfriend. They were at another house in Northside. They
13 all were discussing various topics and joking around.

14
15 10. At some stage during this video chat, the victim asked the defendant why it is that people called
16 him "RT". This is an alias by which the victim knew the defendant. The defendant replied that
17 "RT" meant "retarded". They all laughed and asked him who gave him that alias. The victim
18 found the conversation funny and did not think that it would become an issue with the defendant
19 as it was common for them to tease each other and engage in friendly conversations from which
20 they would eventually move on without any hard feelings. However, she realised that the
21 defendant had become upset as he became silent before walking out of the room and slamming
22 the door. A few minutes later, he returned to the video chat and started to curse the victim
23 calling her a "bitch" and "a whore" and told her to "go suck your mother". The victim says that
24 she continued laughing, as at that stage, she thought the defendant was joking but he began to
25 make the threats to her, telling her "shut the f... up, I am going to kill you", "I am going to
26 come to your house and chop you up and kill you". He then left the room again but returned a
27 few minutes later and during the video chat, he and his friend got into his vehicle as he was
28 taking his friend to work. During this time, he continued to curse and make threats towards the
29 victim on the video chat.

30
31 11. He drove to the victim's house where he shouted for her to open her door. The victim said that
32 she opened her front door and saw him armed with a machete in his right hand. He began to
33 shout at her that he was going to kill her. He then grabbed some rocks from the ground and

1 threw them at her but none of them caught her. She then tried to close the door, but he forced
2 it open and waved the machete at her trying to cause harm with it and kept shouting “you
3 mocking me?”, “you f... mocking me?”. The victim managed to run away and to lock herself
4 in her bedroom from where she heard plates being thrown on the floor. She subsequently
5 discovered that one of these plates broke. She telephoned for help but by the time others arrived
6 at the house the defendant had left the premises.

7
8 12. On the 9th April 2025 the police contacted the defendant by telephone and invited him to the
9 George Town CID office. He later attended and was arrested.

10
11 13. The defendant was interviewed under caution by the police in the presence of Duty Counsel on
12 10th April 2025. During this interview, he accepted the account of the victim and that he did
13 say to her “*Shut the f... up, I am coming to your house to chop you and kill you*”. He stated
14 that he said those words to her in order to instil fear into her and to get her to stop making fun
15 of him. He went on to say that after the initial interaction, he spent a few hours trying to calm
16 down before he decided to get into his vehicle and drive to the victim’s house, but he
17 subsequently turned his vehicle around at the top of his street and returned home.

18
19 14. He said that sometime after 2:00pm that day, he armed himself with a machete and was in the
20 course of a journey when he contacted the victim by video chat. He continued the argument
21 with her and became angry. He drove to her house on Montrose Street, armed with the machete.
22 His explanation for arming himself with the machete at that time is that he believed that the
23 victim’s boyfriend might be at her house and he was concerned that the boyfriend might have
24 been armed with a firearm. He said that when he arrived at the victim’s house, she appeared at
25 her front door armed with a machete and therefore he picked up some rocks and threw them at
26 her - twice. He chopped at her twice in an attempt to strike her hand with the machete, but he
27 missed on both occasions. He said that he then forced himself into her house armed with the
28 machete where he broke some dishes in the dishwasher, as the victim hid herself in her
29 bedroom. He then left the premises. He later left the machete in the backyard of his house.





1 15. The machete was not recovered by the police.

2
3 **VICTIM IMPACT REPORT**

4
5 16. The Department of Community Rehabilitation (“DCR”) has provided a Victim Impact Report
6 dated 26th June 2025 (“VIR”).

7
8 17. The victim reports feeling shocked and scared by the defendant’s actions when he came to her
9 door with a machete. She said that he was making big, wide swings with the machete and she
10 was afraid that it would catch her. Some of the stones which he threw caught her in the face
11 causing bruises. These have since healed. She experienced anxiety in the immediate period
12 after the incident.

13
14 18. The victim stated also that her boyfriend was threatened. She was unable to sleep at nights, and
15 is still on alert. She said that there was no previous conflict or hostility between the defendant
16 and herself. She is still surprised and confused about the incident as she was not the one who
17 brought up the topic, so she is unsure of the reason that the defendant directed his anger at her.

18
19 19. She said also that there has been no further incident since then but asks for justice and protective
20 measures.

21
22 20. The Probation Officer’s assessment is that the victim was more significantly impacted at the
23 emotional level.

24
25 **ANTECEDENT HISTORY**

26
27 21. The defendant has no previous convictions recorded against him.

28
29 **SOCIAL INQUIRY REPORT**

30
31 22. The DCR has provided a Social Inquiry Report dated the 21st August 2025, (“SIR”). The Court
32 has read this report in its entirety and takes into account everything said therein in favour of
33 the defendant.



1
2 23. The defendant is twenty-three years old. He had a challenging childhood with periods of
3 homelessness beginning from a very early age. His home environment was sometimes abusive
4 and without the care of either parent. In school he was the victim of bullying which led to fights
5 and altercations.

6
7 24. Following high school, he endeavoured to be employed at various jobs and reportedly has no
8 history of disciplinary action or performance related issues.

9
10 25. The Probation Officer records the following: -

11
12 “Mr. Grant acknowledged that the incident was, in his own words, “highly dumb”,
13 and accepted full responsibility for his actions. He recognised that his behaviour
14 could have had a serious and painful impact on the victim, stating, “I take full
15 responsibility for my behaviour and its consequences.” He expressed immediate
16 regret, noting that he should have removed himself from the situation. The
17 defendant conveyed genuine remorse and acknowledged that his actions were both
18 inappropriate and avoidable. He also confirmed that he has had no contact or
19 communication with the victim since the incident.

20
21 It is assessed that the defendant would benefit from participating in an intervention
22 focused on addressing his attitude and behaviour within relationships. Such
23 support may contribute to strengthening these relationships and, in turn, reduce his
24 risk of reoffending.”

25
26 26. The defendant was assessed by the Probation Officer as being at low risk of reoffending with
27 no criminogenic factors above the medium level.

28
29 27. Under the heading Sentencing Options, the Officer states: -

30
31 “Mr. Grant is a twenty-three year old, Caymanian male appearing before the ...
32 Court for the first time. He has been assessed as posing a low risk of further

1 reoffending. Despite the risk level identified above, it is assessed that Mr. Grant
2 could benefit from therapeutic intervention.

3
4 The current offence is aggravated by Mr. Grant’s mutual friendship with the victim,
5 as well as the use of a weapon, namely a machete, to cause fear. However, there
6 is no evidence to suggest any significant premeditation, although he did
7 acknowledge having contemplated attending the victim’s residence. It is also
8 relevant to note that Mr. Grant did not engage in any direct physical assault with
9 the machete, but he did acknowledge striking the victim with rocks.”

10
11 28. The Officer recommends several community sentence options.



12
13 **THE SUBMISSIONS**

14
15 29. Counsel for the prosecution referenced the *Cayman Islands Sentencing Guidelines* in respect
16 of each offence. On the offence of Aggravated Burglary, Counsel referred to the harm and
17 culpability factors which would give rise to a custodial sentence and stated that:

18
19 “In stating this however the prosecution is mindful of the circumstances of the
20 offending and invites the Court to consider this aspect when determining the
21 offence category and level of harm accordingly.”

22
23 30. Counsel stated at paragraph 25 of his written submissions: -

24
25 “Finally, in light of the circumstances of the offending, the age of the offender, the
26 fact that this is his first encounter with the courts – an isolated incident, the fact
27 that he entered guilty pleas to the indictment at the earliest reasonable time
28 available to him and his remorse as expressed in his Social Inquiry Report, the
29 Court will no doubt take account of the recommendations of the respective
30 Probation Officers contained in the final paragraph of the Victim Impact Report
31 and the Social Inquiry Report to do justice to both complainant and offender.”

1 31. Defence Counsel submitted: -
2

3 “Your Ladyship has heard how the simple taunting of this young man of otherwise
4 unblemished character, led him into succumbing to an act that [can] only be
5 described as an “inexplicable gross indiscretion”, which rapidly spiraled out of
6 control, and without warning denigrated into, what for all intents and purposes,
7 must be considered as, a truly unfortunate domino effect of events, ...”
8

9 32. Counsel said that there can be no other explanation for what occurred because the defendant’s
10 response was clearly disproportionate to what was a simple matter of playful fun.
11

12 33. Counsel said the parties were friends and accustomed to frequently hanging out together. It
13 arose from a simple taunt, a joke which has led to the defendant being before the Court. It
14 triggered memories which were traumatic for the defendant. His reaction to it was “over the
15 top”. It is inexplicable how rapidly it spun out of control. Counsel said that it is truly an
16 unfortunate sequence of events. It shows an extreme demonstration of a disproportionate
17 response marked by an incapacity to control feelings of incapacity, misplaced pride and ill
18 feeling. Counsel said that cooler heads and more maturity would most likely have avoided the
19 events which followed.
20

21 34. Counsel said that the defendant is otherwise of an unblemished character. He has accepted full
22 responsibility for his actions and is a proper candidate for professional help in the area of anger
23 management.
24

25 35. Counsel said that the defendant is not beyond the scope of help and rehabilitation. He seeks to
26 be a productive and engaged member of the community.
27





1 **THE SENTENCE**

2
3 36. The Court gives consideration to the circumstances of the offence which include that the
4 defendant and the victim were friends. The victim began teasing the defendant over a video
5 call, calling him a “RT” or retard and would not stop despite repeated requests from the
6 defendant. The defendant became angry and went to the victim’s home with a machete. He
7 threw rocks at her and made threats. The defendant did not use the machete to cause any injury.
8

9 37. Defence Counsel described what occurred as a simple taunt between friends which spun out of
10 control, it triggered memories for the defendant and he lost control of himself.
11

12 38. The Court also considers the personal circumstances of the defendant as outlined by his
13 Counsel and in detail in the SIR and notes that the defendant is relatively young at twenty-three
14 years old. He has no previous convictions, is of good character, is assessed as being at low risk
15 of re-offending and is identified by the Probation Officer as a suitable candidate for therapeutic
16 intervention. At an early stage the defendant took full responsibility for his actions. He is
17 genuinely remorseful and recognises that he needs help to control his emotions. The
18 defendants’ history of being bullied at a young age is also an important factor.
19

20 39. The conclusion is that this is an exceptional case in which the primary aim of sentencing should
21 be rehabilitation and that it is appropriate in all the circumstances that the recommendations of
22 the Probation Officer be accepted.
23

24 40. The defendant is therefore sentenced on all counts as follows:

25 i) Pursuant to section 35 of the *Alternative Sentencing Act* 2008, Probation
26 Order for 12 months with the following conditions:

27
28 a. To attend and complete anger management programme through the
29 DCR.

30 b. Attend any counselling recommended by the DCR.

31 c. Not to have any direct or indirect contact with the victim, Dejanae
32 Taylor.
33

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

d. Not to come within 100 feet of the victim, Dejanae Taylor.

ii) Pursuant to section 42 of the *Penal Code* a Community Service Order is made by which the defendant is to complete 240 hours of community service in 12 months.

Dated this the 26th day of September 2025



8
9 **The Hon. Justice Cheryll Richards KC**
10 **Judge of the Grand Court**