



1 **IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS**  
2 **CRIMINAL DIVISION**

3 **Neutral Citation Number: [2025] CIGC (Crim) [3]**  
4 **INDICTMENT NO: 71 of 2024**

5  
6  
7 **R**

8  
9 **V.**

10  
11 **MIGUEL ANDREW WRIGHT**  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 **Appearances:** **Mrs. Angelique McLoughlin, Crown Counsel, Office of the Director of Public**  
17 **Prosecutions for the Prosecution**

18  
19 **Ms. Kathleen Ryan for the Defence**  
20

21  
22 **Before:** **The Hon. Justice Cheryll Richards KC**  
23

24 **Submissions Heard:** **18<sup>th</sup> December 2024**  
25

26 **Sentence Judgment:** **7<sup>th</sup> January 2025**  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 ***Criminal Law*** – *Sentencing, Abduction contrary to s.220 of the Penal Code (2024 Revision), Assault*  
32 *Causing Actual Bodily Harm contrary to s. 216 of the Penal Code (2024 Revision), Causing Fear or*  
33 *Provocation of Violence contrary to s.88 of the Penal Code (2024 Revision). Cayman Islands Sentencing*  
34 *Guidelines, Wishes of Victim in a Domestic Context.*  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39



## SENTENCE JUDGMENT

- 1  
2  
3  
4 1. The defendant is before the Court for sentencing following his guilty plea on the 6<sup>th</sup> September  
5 2024 to Counts One and Three of the Indictment and to one scheduled offence.  
6
- 7 2. **Count One** charges the defendant with the offence of Abduction contrary to s.220 of the *Penal*  
8 *Code* (2024 Revision). The particulars are that he on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of August 2024, in East End,  
9 Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands did by force compel Karen Turner-Pars to go from East End to  
10 George Town, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands. The maximum penalty is life imprisonment.  
11
- 12 3. **Count Three** charges the defendant with the offence of Assault Causing Actual Bodily Harm  
13 contrary to s.216 of the *Penal Code* (2024 Revision). The particulars are that he on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of  
14 August 2024, in the Cayman Islands unlawfully assaulted Karen Turner-Pars causing her actual  
15 bodily harm. The maximum penalty is five years imprisonment.  
16
- 17 4. The scheduled offence to the Indictment charges the defendant with the offence of Causing Fear  
18 or Provocation of Violence contrary to s.88 of the *Penal Code* (2024 Revision). The particulars  
19 are that he on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of August 2024, in the Cayman Islands used towards Karen Turner-Pars  
20 threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour with intent to cause Karen Turner-Pars to  
21 believe that immediate unlawful violence would be used against her. The maximum penalty is  
22 four years imprisonment for an offence committed at night.  
23
- 24 5. The pleas tendered are acceptable to the prosecution. They have offered no evidence on the sole  
25 remaining Count on the Indictment of Threats to Kill. A formal verdict of not guilty is entered  
26 and the defendant is discharged on this Count.  
27
- 28 6. The defendant first appeared before the Summary Court on the 7<sup>th</sup> August 2024. The case was  
29 transmitted to the Grand Court for first mention on the 9<sup>th</sup> August 2024. Following an  
30 adjournment for the Indictment to be prepared, the defendant entered the pleas on the 6<sup>th</sup>  
31 September 2024. It is accepted that the pleas were entered at the first reasonable opportunity and  
32 that the defendant is entitled to full credit.



1 **THE FACTS**

- 2
- 3 7. The prosecution has provided a detailed summary of the facts which is not disputed in material
- 4 respects.
- 5
- 6 8. In August 2024, the victim, Karen Turner-Pars and the defendant, had been engaged in an intimate
- 7 relationship for some three years. They had been living together for one year.
- 8
- 9 9. Ms. Pars was employed to a health facility located in East End. It was customary for the defendant
- 10 to drop her off in his motor vehicle and return to pick her up when she completed work. On
- 11 Sunday the 4<sup>th</sup> August 2024 at about 1:45pm, he dropped her off at her workplace. He telephoned
- 12 her at about 10pm to say that he would be picking her up. She was not quite ready, so he told her
- 13 that he was going to a nearby restaurant to use free Wi-Fi.
- 14
- 15 10. Ms. Pars left her workplace at about 10:30pm and went to the defendant's car but he was not in
- 16 the vehicle. She tried to call him, but he was not answering his phone. She walked out to the East
- 17 End main road and received information from passersby which led her to go to a nearby
- 18 restaurant. On opening the door of the restaurant, she saw the defendant sitting at the bar drinking
- 19 alcohol. She closed the door and walked away.
- 20
- 21 11. While she was walking on the roadway, a vehicle stopped by her and a male driver inquired if
- 22 she needed a ride. At the point of ending the conversation with that driver, she heard the defendant
- 23 shouting her name. She ignored him and kept on walking. The defendant drove and stopped his
- 24 vehicle at her feet. He jumped out of the vehicle and began punching her in the face. She stated
- 25 that he punched her until she passed out. When she came back to consciousness, he was dragging
- 26 her into his vehicle. She shouted out "help, help, murder, murder" but no one answered her. The
- 27 defendant took her phone from her and drove the car away from the area. He continued to punch
- 28 her in the face while he was driving. He also told her that he was going to run the vehicle into the
- 29 sea and kill them both.
- 30
- 31 12. On reaching the junction of Frank Sound and East End Roads he turned into the dock at that
- 32 location. He punched her in the face and started choking her to the point where she thought she



1 was going to die. She said that she was in great fear and that the ordeal was such that she was  
2 exhausted and did not know what to do. He threatened yet again to crash his vehicle into another  
3 vehicle and kill them both.

4  
5 13. He continued to assault her. When they reached the Savannah area, she told him that she wanted  
6 to use the bathroom, so that she could get an opportunity to escape. He stopped the car and she  
7 ran off but no one stopped to assist. He grabbed her by her blouse, pulled her back into the car  
8 and started punching her in the face with his hand.

9  
10 14. On reaching the Linford Pierson highway he calmed down a little and gave her back her phone  
11 which he had taken from her in East End. He told her that if she wanted to call the police it was  
12 okay. She stated that she kept saying to herself “keep calm, keep calm” because she did not want  
13 him to hit her again.

14  
15 15. The defendant then drove her to the George Town Police Station, parked in an open lot and  
16 walked with her into the police station where she made her report. The officers took photographs  
17 of her injuries. She was advised to seek medical attention, which she later did. She received  
18 injuries to her face and swellings to her back. Her mouth was swollen, and she was unable to eat.  
19 She had pain in her head and face. The incident lasted approximately one hour.

20  
21 16. At 12:01am on the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2024, PC Chevel Richards arrested the defendant on suspicion of  
22 commission of the offences of Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm and Causing Fear or  
23 Provocation of Violence and took him into custody.

24  
25 17. The defendant was interviewed by the Police on the 6<sup>th</sup> August 2024 in the presence of his  
26 attorney. During the interview he admitted to assaulting Ms. Pars and stated that the reason for  
27 beating Ms. Pars was because he lost control of himself. He said:

28  
29 *“ I get out of control...I hit her when she make whole heap of noise...when she screaming*  
30 *... I slap her because she was screaming.”*  
31



1 18. He admitted knowing that Ms. Pars did not want to go in his car, so he picked her up. He denied  
2 punching her but acknowledged that he used force to strike her face with the back of his hand.  
3 He also accepted that she received injuries as a result of him striking her.

4  
5 19. Ten photographs of the victim taken by the Police were tendered for this sentence hearing and  
6 were received in evidence as **Exhibit 1.**

#### 8 **VICTIM IMPACT REPORT**

9  
10 20. The Department of Community Rehabilitation (“DCR”) has provided a Victim Impact Report  
11 (“VIR”) dated 5<sup>th</sup> December 2024.

12  
13 21. The victim reported to the Probation Officer that she attended the Hospital for treatment and was  
14 prescribed pain medication. She stated that she was affected emotionally because of the incident.  
15 She was hurt and wondered what would make him do this to her.

16  
17 22. The victim also stated that the defendant has apologised to her for what happened and has  
18 promised never to do anything like this again. She said that they have reconciled and that she  
19 visits him regularly at the prison and continues to support him. She states that he is the sole  
20 provider for herself and her son in respect of whom, the defendant has become a father figure.  
21 She says that she is dependent on the defendant because he earns more than she does. She says  
22 that she believes that he has learnt his lesson and asks that he not be imprisoned for what he did.  
23 She does not believe that he will hurt her again. She has not indicated any concerns for her safety  
24 in the future and has declined offers of counseling.

25  
26 23. Notwithstanding the stance of the victim, the Officer’s recommendation is that for the victim’s  
27 safety and to prevent any future incident of violence the Court should impose as a condition of  
28 sentence that the defendant be of good behaviour towards the victim.

#### 29 30 **ANTECEDENT HISTORY**

31  
32 24. The defendant is forty-two years old. He has no previous convictions recorded against him.



1 **SOCIAL INQUIRY REPORT**

2  
3 25. The DCR has provided a Social Inquiry Report dated 28<sup>th</sup> November 2024 in respect of the  
4 defendant (“SIR”).

5  
6 26. The defendant is the father of six children, two of whom are under the age of 10 years. These two  
7 and three others are resident in the defendant’s home country of Jamaica. One of the older  
8 children is living and working in the Cayman Islands.

9  
10 27. The defendant’s parents separated when he was five years old. He was raised primarily by his  
11 mother but also had the love and support of his grandparents. His childhood is reported to have  
12 been without incident or trauma. Following school, he began working at an early age in order to  
13 support his first child. From the age of 16 years, he was employed to the same construction  
14 company for close to twenty years.

15  
16 28. The defendant migrated to the Cayman Islands in 2021 for an employment opportunity in the  
17 construction industry. His employer here speaks highly of him as a willing and hard worker.  
18 Community contacts also speak well of him and describe him as humble and quiet. Since being  
19 on remand, there are no adjudications against him and the defendant has occupied himself in  
20 positive activities at the prison including a course in mechanics.

21  
22 29. The defendant’s overall risk of re-offending is assessed as low. Of the eight criminogenic factors  
23 used in his assessment, there are no factors in the high category. The defendant scored in the  
24 medium range in respect of two factors. One of these is pro-criminal attitude/orientation. The  
25 Probation Officer records that the defendants’ account of the events appeared to mitigate his  
26 actions and to display an attitude which is supportive of the use of domestic violence.

27  
28 30. The Officer notes that the defendant’s work permit will expire on the 8<sup>th</sup> January 2025 and that  
29 his immigration status is therefore uncertain. For this reason, it is said that it would not be  
30 appropriate to recommend alternative sentencing options.



1 **SENTENCES FOR ABDUCTION**

2  
3 31. In the absence of offence specific guidelines for the offence of Abduction in the Cayman Islands  
4 both Counsel have referred the Court to a number of cases.

5  
6 32. In *R. v Clinton Everton Spence and Vernon Walter Thomas*<sup>1</sup>, the English Court of Appeal  
7 considered appeals against sentences of eight and six years imprisonment for the offence of  
8 kidnapping. The two appellants had executed a plan to kidnap two girls from Southampton to  
9 bring them to London for the purpose of prostitution. One girl escaped. The other was held and  
10 placed in the car for a journey which took five and half hours.

11  
12 33. The Court in reducing the sentences imposed to six and four years imprisonment held that there  
13 was a wide variation in seriousness between instances of kidnapping and that the case on appeal  
14 fell between two extremes.

15  
16 34. The range included at the top end of the scale those carefully planned abductions for monetary  
17 gain or where the victim was held as a hostage. At the lower end is where it occurs as a result of  
18 a family dispute or a dispute between lovers. The Court said that for offences at the top end, the  
19 sentence would seldom be less than eight years imprisonment and depending on the  
20 circumstances, for example where there was a long period of detention and or violence or firearms  
21 were used it would be much longer than this. At the other end of the scale, the circumstances  
22 seldom required anything more than 18 months imprisonment and sometimes less. Lord Lane  
23 CJ stated: -

24  
25 *“It seems to this Court that, as with many crimes so with kidnapping, there is a wide*  
26 *possible variation in seriousness between one instance of the crime and another. At the top*  
27 *of the scale of course, come the carefully planned abductions where the victim is used as a*  
28 *hostage or where ransom money is demanded. Such offences will seldom be met with less*  
29 *than eight years' imprisonment or thereabouts. Where violence or firearms are used, or*  
30 *there are other exacerbating features such as detention of the victim over a long period of*

---

<sup>1</sup> [1983] 5 Cr. App. R. (S.) 413



1            *time, then the proper sentence will be very much longer than that. At the other end of the*  
2            *scale are those offences which can perhaps scarcely be classed as kidnapping at all. They*  
3            *very often arise as a sequel to family tiffs or lovers' disputes, and they seldom require*  
4            *anything more than 18 months' imprisonment, and sometimes a great deal less. This case*  
5            *plainly falls in between those two extremes."*  
6

7            35. In the case of ***R v Noel Dzokamshure***<sup>2</sup>, the appellant had been sentenced to 18 months  
8            imprisonment following his guilty plea to the offence of kidnapping. He was of previous good  
9            character. He had been in a relationship with the victim for six months. It ended when the victim  
10           found out that he was a married man. He broke into the victim's home when she was there with  
11           her new partner. He punched her twice in the face and challenged her about her new partner. He  
12           dragged her out of the house and forced her into a car. He drove the car some distance away from  
13           her home. She was shaking and crying. He stopped and let her out and told her to leave her new  
14           partner. She received a cut to the inside of her lip and her face and head were sore. She forgave  
15           the Appellant and declined to support a prosecution of him. The English Court of Appeal upheld  
16           the sentence of eighteen months imprisonment and concluded that the mitigating factors of the  
17           appellants' previous good character, the absence of a history of harassment and the victim's  
18           wishes did not render the sentence imposed inappropriate.

19  
20           36. In the case of ***R v Kevin Charles Garwood***<sup>3</sup> the English Appellate Court reduced a sentence of  
21           four years to one of eighteen months. The appellant had been convicted after trial of kidnapping  
22           his partner from a public house, placing her in a car and striking her multiple times. They  
23           thereafter reconciled but separated sometime later.

## 24 25    **THE SUBMISSIONS**

26  
27           37. Counsel for the prosecution submitted that due to the level of violence meted out in the instant  
28           case a sentence above 18 months imprisonment is merited for the offence of Abduction. Counsel  
29           also submitted that it is an aggravating factor that the incident was committed in a domestic  
30           context and that the victim was particularly vulnerable in that she was knocked unconscious and

---

<sup>2</sup> [2009] 1 Cr. App. R. (S) 112

<sup>3</sup> Unreported Judgment 88/6007/W3 dated 20<sup>th</sup> March 1989

1 beaten while in a moving car from which she could not escape. Each time she tried to escape she  
2 was captured and subjected to additional beatings to her face.

- 3  
4 38. Counsel for the defence submitted that the offending in this case is less serious than in each of  
5 the cases detailed above. Counsel also referenced the sentence in the local case of *R v Melbourne*  
6 *Junior Dyke*<sup>4</sup>. The defendant was sentenced after trial to 15 months imprisonment for the offence  
7 of Abduction. No separate penalty was imposed for the offence of Common Assault. Counsel  
8 said that although the sentencing judgment is not available and the facts are not fully known, the  
9 offending in that case occurred at night. The victim in the case was picked up and placed into a  
10 car against her will.

11  
12 **ASSAULT OCCASIONING ACTUAL BODILY HARM**



- 13  
14 39. The prosecution submitted that the offence of Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm is one of  
15 Higher Harm because the injuries sustained are serious in the context of the offence. Counsel  
16 submits that there were repeated punches to the face of the victim who suffered multiple facial  
17 injuries because of the brutal beating inflicted by the defendant. The victim received wounds to  
18 her lips, eyes, forehead and nose and swelling to her jaw. She was choked and punched to the  
19 point of being rendered unconscious.

- 20  
21 40. As to culpability the prosecution submits that the victim was particularly vulnerable due to the  
22 circumstances. She was unable to escape because for the most part these beatings took place in a  
23 moving vehicle. Additionally, there was prolonged and repeated assault during which the victim  
24 sustained multiple injuries to her face. This is therefore submitted to be an offence of Higher  
25 Culpability.

- 26  
27 41. The starting point for an offence of Higher Harm and Higher Culpability is 3 years custody with  
28 a range of sentence of 2 to 4 years.

29  

---

<sup>4</sup>Grand Court Ind. 62/2023, Unreported Judgment dated 29<sup>th</sup> May 2024

1 42. Defence Counsel submits that the harm falls between Higher and Lower, and the culpability is in  
2 the Higher category. An offence of Lesser Harm and Higher Culpability has a starting point of 12  
3 months custody with a range of sentence of 6 to 18 months custody.



4  
5 **CAUSING FEAR OR PROVOCATION OF VIOLENCE**  
6

7 43. Counsel for the prosecution submits that the harm for the offence of Causing Fear or Provocation  
8 of Violence is at the level of Category 1 because very serious distress was caused to the victim.  
9 It is said to be one of Higher Culpability in that the victim suffered prolonged abuse for an  
10 extended period. The starting point for a Category 1 Harm, Culpability A offence is 24 months  
11 custody with a range of sentence of 18 to 30 months custody.  
12

13 44. Defence Counsel submits that the level of harm falls within Category 2 and the Culpability is at  
14 the Lower level. The starting point for an offence of Category 2 Harm and Lower Culpability  
15 which is committed at night is 12 months of custody, with a sentencing range of a Community  
16 Order to 24 months custody.  
17

18 **SUBMISSIONS IN MITIGATION**  
19

20 45. In mitigation, defence Counsel refers the Court to the SIR. The defendant is stated therein to have  
21 expressed feelings of guilt for having committed the offence and to have described crying himself  
22 to sleep most nights as he prays for forgiveness. Counsel submits that this offending is entirely  
23 out of character for the defendant. It is not who he is. He struggles to come to terms with the  
24 reality of what he has done and finds it difficult to talk about it. When he does talk about it, he  
25 breaks down crying.  
26

27 46. Counsel in response to the Court's inquiry about the defendant's responses in the SIR said that  
28 this is not a case where the defendant wishes to change his plea. This is a case where the interview  
29 with the Probation Officer took place by electronic means. Counsel said that had the interview  
30 been conducted in person the defendant would have found it easier to open up to the interviewer  
31 and to more readily admit to the offences in depth.  
32



- 1 47. Counsel asked the Court to consider the following factors in deciding on the overall sentence:-  
2  
3 i. The offending period was approximately one (1) hour.  
4 ii. There was no weapon used.  
5 iii. The force used was limited to what was necessary for the commission of the offence.  
6 iv. The offence was spontaneous, and there was no evidence of planning.  
7 v. No other person was involved.  
8 vi. The victim has not suffered psychological trauma, is not in fear for her life, has declined  
9 counselling, is not seeking compensation and has suffered no financial loss.  
10 vii. The victim remains supportive of the defendant.  
11 viii. The defendant pled guilty at the earliest opportunity.  
12 ix. The defendant is a person of previous good character with no previous convictions in this  
13 jurisdiction and his home country.  
14 x. Since the defendant's arrest for these offences, he has been in custody for more than four  
15 (4) months.  
16  
17

18 **THE SENTENCE**  
19

20 48. The Court has considered the nature of the offending in this case. It is accepted as both Counsel  
21 have pointed out, that this was not planned. It occurred most likely as a result of the defendant's  
22 anger at the victim not getting into his car when he stopped for her. What is noteworthy is that it  
23 was prolonged. There was about an hour during which there were multiple acts of violence upon  
24 the person of the victim. The first assault which occurred in East End rendered her unconscious.  
25 Thereafter she was confined in a moving car at night. There was little opportunity to escape  
26 without causing danger to herself. The actions of the defendant subjected the victim to extreme  
27 fear and what must have been a terrifying ordeal. Although there is no medical report, the  
28 pictures, in particular the ones marked CR 3 and CR 5 show the effects of what can only be  
29 described as brutal assaults to the face, head and mouth of the victim. In the Court's view the  
30 offending is serious such that the custody threshold is firmly passed.  
31

32 49. For the offence of Abduction, the Court will adopt a mid-range starting point of 48 months.



- 1  
2 50. In mitigation the Court takes into account everything written and said in the defendant's favour  
3 by his Counsel and in the SIR. He has no previous convictions and is of good character. This  
4 offending is said to be entirely out of character for him. He has shown genuine and deep remorse.  
5 He drove the victim to the police station well knowing that she wanted to make a report against  
6 him and knowing what he had just done. He admitted his offending to the police, apologised to  
7 the victim and is said to be grief stricken at his own behaviour. His level of remorse stands out in  
8 this case. He has been hardworking since the age of 16 years and has good personal qualities. He  
9 has young children whom he supports. He is assessed as being at low risk of re-offending. All  
10 these circumstances taken together serve to reduce the sentence by 24 months to one of 24 months  
11 imprisonment.  
12
- 13 51. The defendant pleaded guilty at the earliest opportunity and did not subject the victim to the  
14 ordeal of a trial. He is given the recommended full one third discount for a sentence of 16 months  
15 imprisonment.  
16
- 17 52. For the offence of Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm, there is no medical evidence. The  
18 victim states that she was prescribed medication for pain. There are no details as to the possible  
19 impact of the injuries on her. There is insufficient evidence for the Court to reach a safe  
20 conclusion that the injuries caused are serious in the context of the offence. The harm is thus  
21 assessed as being at the Lower level.  
22
- 23 53. The culpability is high because the victim was subjected to a prolonged or repeated assault. The  
24 starting point for an offence of Lesser Harm and Higher Culpability is 12 months imprisonment.  
25
- 26 54. Mitigating factors as outlined above serve to reduce the sentence by 4 months to 8 months  
27 imprisonment. With the application of the one third discount for the guilty plea, the sentence is 5  
28 months imprisonment.  
29
- 30 55. For the offence of Causing Fear or Provocation of Violence, it is evident that very serious distress  
31 was caused to the victim at the material time. The defendant's actions persisted over a prolonged



1 period. The offending is thus one of Category 1 Harm and Higher Culpability. The starting point  
2 is 24 months custody.

3  
4 56. From this starting point mitigating factors as detailed above serve to reduce the sentence by 8  
5 months to 16 months imprisonment. With the application of the one third discount for the guilty  
6 plea, the sentence is 11 months imprisonment.

7  
8 57. The offences arise out of a related incident or facts and are a series of offences committed against  
9 the same victim. As recommended by the *Cayman Islands Sentencing Guidelines*, it is  
10 appropriate that the sentences run concurrently.

11  
12 58. The wishes of the victim have been considered. The *Guidelines* provide guidance for sentencing  
13 for offences committed in a domestic context. On the wishes of the victim it states: -

14  
15 *“13.4.1 Wishes of the victim and effect of the sentence*

16 *As a matter of general principle, a sentence imposed for an offence of violence should be*  
17 *determined by the seriousness of the offence, not by the expressed wishes of the victim.*

18 *There are a number of reasons why it may be particularly important that this principle is*  
19 *observed in a case of domestic violence:*

- 20  
21 • *it is undesirable that a victim should feel a responsibility for the sentence*  
22 *imposed;*  
23  
24 • *there is a risk that a plea for mercy made by a victim will be induced by threats*  
25 *made by, or by a fear of, the offender;*  
26  
27 • *the risk of such threats will be increased if it is generally believed that the*  
28 *severity of the sentence may be affected by the wishes of the victim.*

29  
30 *Nonetheless, there may be circumstances in which the court can properly mitigate a*  
31 *sentence to give effect to the expressed wish of the victim that the relationship be permitted*  
32 *to continue. The court must, however, be confident that such a wish is genuine, and that*

1                    *giving effect to it will not expose the victim to a real risk of further violence. Critical*  
2                    *conditions are likely to be the seriousness of the offence and the history of the relationship.*  
3                    *It is important that the court has up-to-date pre-sentence report and victim personal*  
4                    *statement.”*

5  
6            59. In this case having considered the serious nature of the offending, it is not considered appropriate  
7            that the expressed wish of the victim be taken into account. The Court takes note that this is a  
8            defendant who was unable to control his anger for close to an hour during which he subjected the  
9            victim to a prolonged assault.

10  
11           60. The proposed sentences have been reviewed and are considered proportionate to the offending.  
12           The personal circumstances of the defendant have been considered but balanced against the  
13           serious nature of the offending are not thought to be such as to justify a sentence in the  
14           community. The aims of sentencing in this case must be punishment, deterrence and  
15           rehabilitation.

16  
17           61. The sentence is therefore one of immediate custody of 16 months imprisonment on Count 1, 5  
18           months on Count 3 and 11 months on the Scheduled offence of Causing Harassment Alarm and  
19           Distress. The sentences are to run concurrently with time served to be taken into account.

20  
21           62. While in custody, the defendant is to receive treatment by way of the Intimate Partner Violence  
22           Programme as recommended by the Probation Officer in the SIR.

23  
24    **Dated this the 7<sup>th</sup> January 2025**

25  


26    **The Hon. Justice Cheryll Richards KC**  
27    **Judge of the Grand Court**