



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

4 **SCA NO: 37 of 2022**

5
6
7
8 **RICHARD WELLINGTON DUNN**
9

10 **V.**
11

12 **R**
13
14
15

16 **Appearances: Ms. Amelia Fosuhene of Brady Law for the Appellant**
17

18 **Ms. Shauna-Kaye James, Crown Counsel, Office of the Director of Public**
19 **Prosecutions for the Respondent**
20
21

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

24 **Hearing Date: 19th July 2024**
25

26 **Judgment: 30th August 2024**
27
28
29

30 ***Criminal Law*** – Section 181 of the Criminal Procedure Code (2021 Revision), Appeal Against Decisions
31 *of the Summary Court on Conviction and Sentence, Indecent Assault on a Female contrary to s.132 (1) of*
32 *the Penal Code (2019 Revision), Principles on Appeal.*
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

1 **JUDGMENT**



2
3 **PREAMBLE**

4
5 1. Section 12 of the *Youth Justice Act (2021 Revision)* states: -

6
7 “12. (1) *In relation to any proceedings in any court, such court may direct [and this court*
8 *so directs] that-*

- 9 (a) *no published report of or comment on the proceedings shall reveal the*
10 *name, address or school, or include any particulars calculated to lead to*
11 *the identification, of any young person concerned in the proceedings,*
12 *either as being the person by, against or in respect of whom the*
13 *proceedings are taken, or as being a witness in the proceedings; and*
14 (b) *no picture shall be published as being or including a picture of any*
15 *young person so concerned in the proceedings.*

16
17 (2) *Whoever publishes any matter in contravention of subsection (1) is guilty of an*
18 *offence and liable on summary conviction, in respect of each such offence, to a fine of*
19 *five thousand dollars or to imprisonment for six months.*

20
21 2. Section 31 of the *Criminal Procedure Code* (2021 Revision) states as follows: “Anonymity of
22 complainants in rape etc. cases: -

23
24 “31. (1) *After a person is accused of a rape offence, no matter likely to lead*
25 *members of the public to identify a woman as the woman against whom the offence is*
26 *alleged to have been committed shall be published in a written publication available to the*
27 *public or be broadcast, except as authorised by a direction of the court.*

28 (2) ...

29 (3)

30 (4) ...

31 (5) *If any matter is published or broadcast in contravention of subsection (1),*
32 *the following persons —*



1 (a) in the case of a publication in a newspaper or periodical, the proprietor;
2 editor and publisher of the newspaper or periodical;
3 (b) in the case of any other publication, the person who publishes it;
4 (c) in the case of a broadcast, any person having functions, in relation to
5 the programme in which it is made, corresponding to those of an editor of
6 a newspaper,
7 commit an offence and are each liable on summary conviction to a fine of
8 one thousand dollars.”
9

- 10 3. For the avoidance of doubt: It is the Court’s view that the charges against this Appellant, based
11 on the particulars of the offence, fall within this section of the law by virtue of the use of the word
12 “etc.” and therefore it is ordered that there be no identification of the complainant in this case.
13
14 4. In pursuance of this, this Judgment has been anonymised to protect the identity of the
15 complainant.
16

17 **INTRODUCTION**
18

- 19 5. This is an appeal against conviction and sentence following a trial in the Summary Court.
20
21 6. The Appellant was convicted in the Summary Court of Charges 02015/21: (1) - (4). These are
22 four offences of Indecent Assault contrary to s. 132 (1) of the **Penal Code** (2019 Revision).
23
24 7. The particulars of Charge (1) are that he on the 13th day of June 2021, at ..., Cayman Islands,
25 indecently assaulted [X], a child aged 11, by touching her on her breast.
26
27 8. The particulars of Charge (2) are that he on the 13th day of June 2021, at ..., Cayman Islands,
28 indecently assaulted [X], a child aged 11, by touching her vagina over clothing.
29
30 9. The particulars of Charge (3) are that he on the 16th day of June 2021 and 17th day of June 2021,
31 at..., Cayman Islands, indecently assaulted [X], a child aged 11, by touching her breast.
32



- 1 10. The particulars of Charge (4) are that he on the 16th day of June 2021 and 17th day of June 2021,
2 at ..., Cayman Islands, indecently assaulted [X], a child aged 11, by touching her vagina over
3 clothing.
4
- 5 11. On the 17th November 2022, the Appellant was sentenced to 66 months (5 and ½ years)
6 imprisonment on each count to run concurrently.
7
- 8 12. By Notice of Appeal dated on the said day, the Appellant appeals his conviction and sentence. He
9 indicated then that grounds would be filed by his attorney. Three grounds were filed in May 2024
10 as follows: -
11
- 12 i) Failure to properly investigate.
13 ii) Failing to bring before the Court evidence that wholly undermined the defendant's
14 ability to have a fair trial and challenge properly the issues the Court had to
15 determine in the case.
16 iii) Failure to contemplate or allow the evidence of the complainant's previous
17 complaints and conduct.
18
- 19 13. The Court's powers on an appeal from a decision in the Summary Court are set out in s.181 of
20 the ***Criminal Procedure Code***. (2021 Revision).
21

22 *"181. The court may adjourn the hearing of the appeal, and may, upon the hearing*
23 *thereof confirm, reverse, vary or modify the decision of the Summary Court, including the*
24 *passing of some other sentence (whether more or less severe) or remit the matter to the*
25 *Summary Court for retrial, or may make such other order in the matter as it may think just,*
26 *and may, by such order, exercise any power which the Summary Court might have*
27 *exercised, and such order shall have the same effect and may be enforced in the same*
28 *manner as if it had been made by the Summary Court: Provided that the court may,*
29 *notwithstanding that it is of the opinion that the point raised in the appeal might be decided*
30 *in favour of the appellant, dismiss the appeal if the court considers that no substantial*
31 *miscarriage of justice has actually occurred."*
32
33



1 **THE CASE FOR THE PROSECUTION**
2

3 14. The prosecution's case at trial was in summary as follows. In June 2021, the complainant was
4 eleven years old. She resided with the Appellant and her mother. The Appellant is married to her
5 mother and is thus her stepfather. Her mother was absent from the home on some evenings
6 because of work. The complainant alleges that while her mother was away from home on two
7 occasions, on the 12th June and 16th June 2021, the Appellant touched her indecently.
8

9 15. The complainant stated that on the 12th June 2021, whilst she was seated on the sofa the Appellant
10 reached over her and placed his hand under her clothing. He touched her left breast and the front
11 of her vagina over her underwear. She pushed him off and went to her room where she remained
12 until her mother came home. She did not report it and gave the reason as fearing that her mother
13 would not believe her and would believe the Appellant.
14

15 16. The complainant said that on the second occasion, on the 16th June 2021, in the course of play
16 fighting with the Appellant, he touched her on her breasts under her bra and put his hand down
17 her pants where he touched her on her vagina over her underwear. He pushed her down on to the
18 couch and was on top of her. He was moving up and down on her and she could feel his penis on
19 her vagina. She hit him on the shoulder and told him to stop. When he did and came off her, she
20 went to her room and hid in the closet. She called her stepmother and told her what had happened.
21 She remained there until her mother arrived home with the police.
22

23 17. The Appellant was represented at trial by Counsel Mr. Greg Burke. The Appellant chose to give
24 evidence in his own defence. He called his wife, the mother of the complainant in his defence.
25 His defence was a denial, that he had never touched the complainant indecently and that the
26 complainant had fabricated the allegations for a number of reasons. He testified that nothing
27 happened between them on the 13th June 2021. He said that on the 16th June, they were both at
28 home. The complainant came into the room while he was watching television and began hitting
29 him on his leg. She did so twice. He told her to stop. She did not. On the second occasion he
30 grabbed her arm, pushed her to the sofa and told her to stop. She appeared angry and went to her
31 room. Later the Police and his wife came and removed the complainant from the home.
32
33



1 **THE MAGISTRATE’S FINDINGS**

2
3 18. The learned Magistrate (“the Magistrate”) conducted a ground rules hearing and pre-trial meeting
4 with the complainant prior to the start of the trial. The conclusion from the assessment conducted
5 at the meeting was that the complainant was competent and capable of giving oral evidence. This
6 was based on the findings that the complainant was capable of understanding the questions put
7 to her, the difference between telling a lie and the truth and that the proceedings required her to
8 tell the truth. The Magistrate also found that the witness provided clear answers in response to
9 questions and was well able to cope with questioning.

10
11 19. In addition to the evidence of this witness, the statements of three witnesses were read by
12 agreement, PC Sarah Beckley, PS Laura Hicks and Carol Robinson.

13
14 20. In coming to a decision, the Magistrate reminded herself of the relevant directions with respect
15 to the age of the complainant, delay in reporting and good character. Under assessment of the
16 evidence, the Magistrate adverted to the burden and standard of proof. In accepting the evidence
17 of the complainant, the Magistrate considered the reason that the complainant had not reported
18 the incident on the 13th June and the possible motives for concoction of the allegations.

19
20 **THE SUBMISSIONS**

21
22 21. In summary, the submission on behalf of the Appellant is that he did not receive a fair trial. It is
23 said that there was material which was not before the Summary Court because either it was not
24 obtained by the Police or it was not obtained by defence Counsel who represented the Appellant
25 in the Summary Court. Secondly, it is said that the Magistrate ought to have allowed more
26 detailed background evidence to be given by the complainant’s mother as to the behaviour of the
27 complainant in the weeks leading up to the alleged incident. It is said that this may have assisted
28 with a determination as to the complainant’s credibility. The resulting effect says the Appellant
29 is that his conviction is unsafe, and this appeal should be allowed.

30
31 22. The Respondent submits in reply that there has been no substantial miscarriage of justice such
32 that this appeal should succeed.



1 **GROUND 1 – FAILURE TO PROPERLY INVESTIGATE**
2

3 23. Counsel for the Appellant submitted that on the 16th June 2021 in the immediate aftermath of the
4 report, the Police failed to take the clothing of the Appellant and of the complainant for
5 examination. The Police failed to obtain a proper account from the first Officer on the scene, PC
6 Coleman and a proper account from the complainant’s stepmother as to everything that had
7 actually been said to her. In addition, no statement was obtained from the complainant’s father
8 and stepmother.
9

10 24. Counsel submitted that as the evidence of the complainant was that she had been touched
11 underneath her clothing, the underside of that clothing may have yielded forensic opportunities.
12

13 25. Counsel for the Respondent submits in response that given the nature of the touching and the fact
14 that the two parties resided in the same home, there would have been no forensic merit in seizing
15 any of the clothing.
16

17 26. Counsel also notes that the complainant’s stepmother provided an account to the 911 operator on
18 reporting the incident. The record of what she said was disclosed to the Appellant as part of the
19 Police Record Management System report. Attempts were made to take a statement from her
20 stepmother which were not successful. PC Coleman did not provide a statement but made a note
21 of his dealings on the 16th June 2021, which note was disclosed to the Appellant.
22

23 27. Counsel also said that the witness’s stepmother and father were spoken to but cannot be forced
24 to provide witness statements.
25

26 28. This Court notes that defence Counsel Mr. Burke, raised the issue of the absence of DNA testing
27 before the Magistrate. Counsel in written closing submissions submitted that it was unfortunate
28 that the Police did not invoke standard procedure in dealing with allegations of sexual assault.
29 Counsel said that the complainant’s underwear could have been seized and possibly may have
30 provided DNA evidence that may either have corroborated the complainant’s account or
31 exonerated the Appellant.
32



1 29. This is an issue of absence of evidence. It could neither exculpate nor inculpate. It would be
2 speculative to say otherwise. What the Magistrate had to bear in mind was that there was an
3 absence of evidence in support of the complainant.

4
5 30. As to the failure to take witness statements, Counsel for the Appellant in submissions noted the
6 animosity between the father and the Appellant which meant that there was an unwillingness to
7 try to co-operate with the Appellant's wife when she tried to find out what happened. The
8 submission is that the Police ought to have obtained these statements. Counsel gave the example
9 that no one asked the complainant why it was that after the second incident she went off and
10 slammed her door. No one asked her what she said about that.

11
12 31. My view is that the failure to obtain these statements cannot be said to be a serious miscarriage
13 of justice. These persons were not witnesses to the alleged events. Their evidence would be
14 limited to the complaints made and what was said by the complainant. The first person called by
15 the complainant was her stepmother who then called the Police. The defence were in possession
16 of the notes of what was said in that call. Secondly there is no property in a witness. The defence
17 were aware of them and could have sought the issue of summonses for their attendance if they
18 considered that they had material evidence.

19
20 **GROUND 2 – FAILURE TO BRING EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE CREDIBILITY**

21
22 32. The Appellant's submission is that the credibility of the complainant was not properly explored.
23 It is said that the Police documentation records that there was an allegation of inappropriate
24 touching in 2020. The complainant said that she had been touched by a thirteen-year-old cousin
25 when he was visiting the Cayman Islands from another country. The record from the Child Abuse
26 report is that it happened when the complainant resided in another country.

27
28 33. Counsel submits that the information from the child's mother is that this could not have happened
29 as no relative who was visiting would have been aged thirteen years. Defence Counsel's
30 submission is that this means that the complainant fabricated the previous incident.



1 34. In addition, Counsel submits that the complainant's full school and medical records were not
2 properly disclosed to the defence and that it is understood from her mother that there are a number
3 of other incidents which would have assisted the Court in a determination as to her credibility.
4

5 35. Four incidents are detailed by Counsel as follows: -
6

- 7 1. 8th February 2021 - complainant told father an untruth about having after school
8 classes.
- 9 2. 12th February 2021 - complainant was suspended for taking a razor blade to school and
10 trying to influence others to cut themselves.
- 11 3. 16th February 2021 - complainant was taken to hospital for having suicidal thoughts.
- 12 4. 18th February 2021 - complainant taken for mental health counselling and other
13 appointments.
14

15 36. Counsel said that on the complainant's account almost everyone was abusive to her including her
16 grandmother and the helper. All this behaviour happened shortly before the allegations were made
17 against the Appellant. The behaviour showed a pattern where the complainant would lie to get
18 herself out of situations.
19

20 37. Counsel argues that there is a question whether the Court should have had access to all the
21 available information about the complainant in order to properly consider her credibility. Counsel
22 said that without looking at the significant background and without allowing the complainant's
23 mother to give evidence about these issues, the Court fell into error. This is material which is
24 capable of placing the allegations in the context of the recent behaviour of the complainant.
25

26 38. Counsel said that there is information that the home was visited by a Social Worker on the 15th
27 May 2021 which raises the question whether or not any other professionals visited and spoke
28 with the complainant between the 13th June and 16th June 2021. Counsel submits: -
29

30 *“ There is no evidence as to why a social worker was even appointed or whether or not*
31 *these reports might contain anything which is capable of explaining if there may be alternate*
32 *reasons for this complainant making allegations she did against [mother].”*
33



1 39. Counsel said that there was a pattern where the complainant makes up allegations of abuse to
2 obtain the outcome which she wants. The complainant did not have a good relationship with the
3 Appellant and wanted her mother to herself.
4

5 40. Counsel said that all that the Summary Court had was an outline of the issues and not the full
6 picture. There would have been significantly more.
7

8 41. In response to an inquiry from this Court, Counsel said that the issue of incompetence of Counsel
9 is not being raised. Defence Counsel did what he could with the material which he had.
10

11 42. Counsel for the Respondent in reply submitted that the issue of the complainant's credibility was
12 before the Summary Court. All the matters raised by the Appellant's Counsel were brought to
13 the attention of the Court and the Magistrate summarised these. Counsel said that the ruling of
14 the Magistrate contained vital pieces of evidence on the issues when considering the credibility
15 of the witness. There was nothing to suggest that the witness had any motive for concocting the
16 allegation against the Appellant.
17

18 43. Counsel also notes that Defence Counsel Mr. Burke made extensive written submissions about
19 the previous complaints made by the witness and her behaviour.
20

21 44. The Police record as to the earlier allegations about a thirteen-year-old cousin does not give a
22 timeline as to when that allegedly occurred.
23

24 45. In response to the assertion that there was further material which was not provided, Counsel also
25 advises that: -
26

- 27 • The complainant's school reports were obtained and disclosed.
- 28 • The Multi Safeguarding Hub ("MASH") referral document was disclosed.
- 29 • There were no disclosure requests from the defence which were ignored.
- 30 • The mother of the complainant gave evidence on behalf of the Appellant and could and
31 did speak to other matters such as events in 2021.
32
33
34



1 **GROUND 3 FAILURE TO ALLOW EVIDENCE**

2
3 46. The submission on this ground is that the Court failed to allow the mother of the complainant to
4 give evidence as to the issues leading up to the complainant's behaviour in the months and weeks
5 prior to the complaint. This meant that the Magistrate failed to hear evidence which was capable
6 of undermining the credibility of the complainant on this particular issue. Counsel says that the
7 end result of this failure is that the Appellant did not have a fair trial.

8
9 47. The Respondent submits in reply that the Magistrate did not fail to allow evidence of previous
10 complaints and conduct to be given. This evidence was allowed and considered.

11
12 **ANALYSIS**

13
14 48. Given the issues raised on this appeal I have to assess whether there is material which the
15 Magistrate ought to have considered or allowed into evidence, the absence of which would make
16 the conviction unsafe. In summary, that had this material been heard or considered it cannot be
17 said with any certainty that the same conclusion would have been reached.

18
19 49. It is of note that this is not a case where fresh or new evidence is said to exist of which the defence
20 was unaware. In some respects what is being said is that the unused material disclosed by the
21 prosecution should have been further explored because it *might* have revealed other material
22 which might impact the complainant's credibility.

23
24 50. It is said that the complainant's report as to the earlier allegation against a thirteen-year-old cousin
25 could not be true because according to her mother no person of that age visited in 2020. Even
26 putting aside that no timeframe is given in the report or the possibility of mistakes as to age and
27 time, this is material which appears to have been disclosed to the defence as part of the trial
28 process. Mother was called as a witness for the defence.



1 51. It is also clear from the written submissions made by defence Counsel at trial, Mr. Burke that this
2 evidence was in fact given by mother¹.

3
4 52. Had the Magistrate heard evidence about this there would have been an obligation to give the
5 appropriate direction that this did not necessarily mean that the complainant was telling lies about
6 the instant offending.

7
8 53. I consider that many of the issues with the complainant which are raised by Counsel on this
9 appeal were fully before the Summary Court.

10
11 54. In Mr. Burke's written submissions, paragraph 22 to 28 is under the heading, previous complaints
12 of the complainant. He details therein the allegations made by the complainant against her mother
13 and the helper. Counsel submitted that they provided examples of manipulation on the part of the
14 complainant to undermine her mother in setting behaviour boundaries.

15
16 55. Paragraphs 28 to 31 state: -

17
18 *"28. Whilst also being away from the family home, [X] was excluded from school in*
19 *February 2021 for carrying a razor blade to school, leading to another student*
20 *cutting herself. (Tab 1)*

21
22 *29. After [X] had been removed from the family home, following D's charge, in October*
23 *2021, [X] was again excluded for causing emotional distress to a fellow student and*
24 *bullying a new student.*

25
26 *30. This behaviour are examples of [Xs] behaviour when not under the direct guidance*
27 *of her mother, ...*

28
29 *31. It is also worthy of note that in her ABE [X] was asked at p2, why might we make up*
30 *a lie up, do you think: [X] answered, "To get what we want".*

31

¹ Appellant's Bundle page 148 – Submissions dated 14th April 2021

1 56. Counsel highlighted that there was no evidence from stepmother as to what had been said by the
2 complainant to her on the call on the 16th June 2021, (paragraph 44).



3
4 57. Counsel noted that: -
5

6 *“46. [X]accepted in cross examination that she had complained to her social worker*
7 *regarding a 13-year-old cousin visiting from ..., who touched her sexually. [X]*
8 *accepted she did not tell her mother, father or stepmother.*

9
10 *47. We know from [Mother] that no such visitor has ever been in the family home.*

11
12 58. Also highlighted was what was said to be the complainant’s bizarre behaviour.
13

14 *“48. D gave evidence in his police interview (p12) regarding a bizarre discussion with*
15 *[X] about a week before these allegations. D explained a conversation of a girl*
16 *following [X] with hair in her face, telling [X] to do stuff and liked seeing people in*
17 *pain.”*

18
19 59. It is evident from all of this that much evidence was led and highlighted as to the complainant’s
20 behaviour prior to the allegations and that her credibility was being strongly challenged as a result
21 of this.

22
23 60. The Ruling of the Magistrate indicates that this was very much a focus of consideration.
24

25
26 61. In summarising the defence case, the Magistrate said this: -
27

28 *“The Defendant surmises, that [X] is fabricating the allegations as she is “a troubled*
29 *child”, who, he says, lies against her parents to the other, and has had trouble at school.*
30 *This trouble he says, includes being suspended for carrying a razor blade to school and*
31 *threatening to kill herself. He also proffered a basis for his position that [X] is a “troubled*
32 *child”, by indicating that she is also under the care of Counsellors. It is against this*



1 *background that the Defendant, (who gave oral evidence) says that [X] is not to be*
2 *believed.*

3
4 *The Defendant's wife (X's mother) was called as a witness in support of her husband. This*
5 *witness gave evidence that X is "troubled", and is seeing counsellors, and has been*
6 *suspended from school. She indicated that she was unable to speak directly to the*
7 *allegations made against the Defendant, as she was not there."*

8
9 62. Importantly the Magistrate adverted to the burden and standard of proof and directed herself as
10 *follows: -*

11
12 *"19. I remind myself that my job is not to speculate about anything not presented in*
13 *evidence. I must assess only the evidence presented, and form my own judgment on the*
14 *matter and the issues of fact. If after considering all the evidence presented, I am satisfied,*
15 *such that I have no reasonable doubt and I am sure of the Defendant's guilt I must find that*
16 *the Crown has proved its case and that he is guilty. If I have any reasonable doubt, I must*
17 *resolve that doubt in favour of the Defendant, and find him not guilty."*

18
19 63. There was consideration as to whether the conduct of the complainant created doubt. The
20 Magistrate stated: -

21
22 *"I also bore in mind whether doubt was created by the evidence of [X] getting into*
23 *difficulties at school, and being under the care of counsellors and medical professionals.*
24 *Whilst there is evidence to support the view that [X] was suspended on two occasions in*
25 *2021 (in February and then in October), I made note that the October suspensions was*
26 *after the allegations surfaced in June 2021. I considered therefore, that this suspension*
27 *was of no relevance to the allegations which had been made several months prior. With*
28 *regards to the February suspension, in cross-examination when the matter was put to her,*
29 *[X] without hesitation, agreed with the suggestion that she had been "excluded from*
30 *school' previously. She did not deflect nor seek to hide from this fact. Just the opposite, she*
31 *openly accepted that she was suspended as suggested to her.*



1 ...

2
3 *(f) Like the June 13th incident, I had to consider whether her description was a made-up*
4 *story and that she was attempting to “pit her parents against each other” or whether her*
5 *troubles at school caused me to have doubt about the accuracy and reliability of her*
6 *description. I concluded that they did not. She may be a child who has been expelled from*
7 *school and who is under the care of a School Counsellor, but that does not mean that she*
8 *is a child who lied about this description.”*

9
10 64. The Magistrate considered each offence separately and gave detailed reasons in each case for
11 finding the complainant to be a truthful witness. These included the detailed and specific nature
12 of the account which she provided, clear and cogent reason for not reporting the earlier incident,
13 the fact that there were no difficulties in the relationship between the two before the allegations
14 surfaced and her demeanor, among others.

15
16 65. The Magistrate did not believe the Appellant in material respects and rejected his account.

17
18 66. The conclusion was that the Magistrate was satisfied so that she was sure that the prosecution
19 had proven its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

20
21 67. Matters of the credibility of a witness are for the tribunal of fact. There is the opportunity to see
22 and hear the witnesses. There is nothing to suggest in this case, that the Magistrate failed to
23 consider all of the issues touching and concerning the complainant’s behaviour. There is every
24 indication that there was careful and detailed consideration of these matters. There is no evidence
25 that the wife of the Appellant was prevented from giving evidence which she sought to give in
26 support of her husband. In fact, there is every indication that she did such evidence. The
27 Appellant was represented at trial by competent and experienced Counsel. There is everything to
28 suggest that the Appellants’ case was put with vigor.

29
30 68. There is no basis to conclude that the conviction is unsafe.

1 69. No arguments were raised, or grounds advanced on this appeal as to sentence. In any event given
2 the nature of the offending, the sentence does not appear to be manifestly excessive or wrong in
3 principle.

4

5 70. The appeal against conviction is dismissed and the sentence is affirmed.

6

7 **Dated this the 30th August 2024**

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Cheryll Richards', written in a cursive style.

8

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