



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

IND. 43, 51 & 52 OF 2023

IN THE MATTER OF

THE KING

V

SHAUN JACKSON

JONATHAN ALEXANDER WOODHOUSE

Appearances: Mr. Mark Heywood K.C. with Mr. Neil Kumar for the Crown
Mr. Ben Tonner K.C. with Mr. Greg Burke for the Defendant (Jackson)

Before: The Hon. Mrs. Justice Marlene I. Carter

Sentence Hearing: 26 January 2024

Judgment: 13 February 2024

HEADNOTE

*Criminal Law – Sentence- Murder -Section 182 of the Penal Code - Conditional Release Act (2019
Revision)*

TARIFF JUDGMENT

1. On 6 May 2023, Randy Robinson was murdered, and Barshawn Lewis was seriously wounded.
2. The Defendant was tried by jury for the offences of Murder and Wounding with Intent of Robinson and Lewis, respectively. On 15 December 2023, the Defendant was found guilty of the offence of Murder. The Defendant pled guilty to the wounding of Barshawn Lewis on the basis that he was a secondary party to that offence.



THE FACTS, the basis upon which sentence is passed

3. Randy Robinson, or “King” as he was also known, had gone out on the night of the 5th of May 2023 with three of his cousins. They arrived at Carib Café, at some time after 12.30 am in the early morning. There was a party in progress at the Cafe.
4. Barshawn Lewis and his wife, Patricia Walters, also went to Carib Café as Patricia knew someone who was having a party there. She and her husband drove to the venue, parked their car nearby and walked over to the café. As Lewis and his wife made their way towards Carib Café, Lewis said something about celebrating his birthday; it was his birthday month, and he raised his arms and, in a loud voice, shouted out, “Boop! Boop! Boop!”
5. The Defendant and two other men were walking in the direction of Lewis and his wife. The Defendant took this gesture as if it were meant for him, as if Lewis was “bursting shot” at him. From the testimony of other witnesses at trial, it appears that the Defendant felt that he/they had been disrespected by Lewis. The Defendant was at this time armed with a knife. Another defendant, Woodhouse, went back to the car in which he and this defendant had arrived and armed himself with a large-bladed weapon or knife.
6. Lewis and his wife continued to Carib Café. They spoke to Randy Robinson who was standing at the entrance of Carib Café. Randy Robinson said something to the effect that he knew those guys, meaning this defendant and his friends, and they were cool, the impression given to Lewis and his wife that there was nothing to worry about. Lewis and his wife entered Carib Café. During the time that they remained there, the Defendant was, at different points, watching and following them. At one point, when Lewis and his wife attempted to leave Carib Café, the Defendant blocked their path and said words to the effect: “You are not leaving here tonight.”
7. During this time, one witness, Shemar Cummings, who knew this Defendant, recalls speaking to the Defendant while in the bar at Carib Café shortly before the violence began. Noting the Defendant’s posture, he said to him, “*don’t make some dumb stuff make you do something stupid.*”
8. The Defendant eventually rushed towards Lewis in the bar area within Carib Café. Lewis attempted to pull a chair between himself and the Defendant and the others who were with him. The Defendant was armed at this time with what appeared to be a flick knife. The Defendant followed Lewis from that bar area inside Carib Café to an area next to the DJ on a small stage immediately outside the bar. The defendant, Woodhouse, who was with this defendant, was armed with the large-bladed weapon or knife. Randy Robinson moved toward the stage area after Lewis, the Defendant and Woodhouse.

9. It is at this point that Lewis was attacked on the stage and was injured. From admissions, Lewis suffered two main injuries, a deep cut through the muscle of his left bicep, and a deep cut on the outer aspect of the right elbow, exposing the elbow joint. He also suffered superficial, skin-deep lacerations on the front of the left knee and scratches on his back.
10. Within minutes of rushing Lewis, the Defendant left that area of the DJ on the raised stage. As he did so, he turned back, and there appeared to be some interaction between himself and Randy Robinson, who was at the edge of the stage. The Defendant returned to the stage with the knife in his right hand. Within a matter of seconds, it is estimated to be 11 seconds, Randy Robinson left the stage and collapsed on the ground just past the doorway to the bar area, moving toward the exit of Carib Café. Barshawn Lewis then staggered off the stage wounded and was assisted by his wife away from the area. The Defendant and the other men then walked off the stage, with the Defendant leading. The Defendant walked past Randy Robinson on the floor where he had fallen. The Defendant did not stop or acknowledge Robinson as he lay on the floor.
11. Randy Robinson was rushed to George Town Hospital by ambulance. He was pronounced dead at 2:19 am that morning. He had sustained multiple stab injuries to the chest and abdomen. The wounds were recorded as follows: from admissions,
 - (i) Stab wound (#1) to the left chest. This wound entered the chest 11.5cm from the centre and about 5cm below the left nipple. It was sufficiently forceful to pierce a portion of the bone of the 5th rib as it penetrated the chest. It continued to a depth of approximately 15cm, resulting in a “through and through” perforation of the left chamber of the heart, leading to the loss of approximately 2.5L of liquid blood into the left chest cavity. This was the fatal wound. It would have led to death within no more than minutes, or even seconds.
 - (ii) Stab wound (#2) to the lower portion of the right chest, to an approximate depth of 8.6cm, piercing the diaphragm and liver. The injury perforated chest muscles and entered the chest cavity through the 7th intercostal space.
 - (iii) Stab wound (#3) a single elliptical stab injury to the right midarm, 17cm from the shoulder. The injury penetrated the skin, subcutaneous and soft tissue up to 2cm.
 - (iv) Stab wound (#4) to the right armpit area, the center of which was 14 cm from the top of the shoulder, penetrating the skin, resulting in a deep subcutaneous stab, and causing soft tissue and muscle injury.



- (v) Stab wound (#5), a large, gaping stab injury to the lower right abdominal wall. The stab wound perforated the abdominal wall and punctured the small intestinal coil, resulting in hemorrhage and the release of fecal material.
12. All the injuries shared the same appearance in that all were inflicted by a sharp weapon.
13. On the morning of the 6th of May 2023, the Defendant turned himself in to the Police. Upon arrest, at interview, and in a prepared statement, the Defendant stated that he had been attacked and took out the knife which he had in his waistband and swung it to keep his attackers at bay. He did not know if the knife had connected with anyone. At trial, the Defendant resiled from this version of events by his guilty plea to manslaughter. The Defendant did not give evidence at trial.

Wounding – complainant Barshawn Lewis

14. The offence of wounding, contrary to section 204 of the Penal Code (2022 Revision), carries a maximum sentence of seven years imprisonment.
15. Barshawn Lewis suffered the following injuries:
- (i) 10 cm wound to right forearm on the outer aspect of the right elbow exposing the elbow joint.
 - (ii) 14 cm wound to left bicep muscle, cutting through the muscle on the left upper arm.
 - (iii) 2 cm superficial skin-deep laceration to the left knee.
 - (iv) 4 cm superficial scratches to left side of the back.
16. I find that these injuries are serious in the context of the offence of wounding. As such, this is an offence of greater harm.
17. As to culpability, there are factors indicating higher culpability present on the facts of this case. These are:
- (i) The use of a weapon to inflict the injury, and
 - (ii) The fact that this defendant and the defendant Woodhouse played a joint leading role as a group, notwithstanding that the jury accepted this defendant's lesser intent.
 - (iii) There was a significant degree of planning in context from the facts of this case. This defendant was armed before he arrived at Carib Café. The defendant, Woodhouse, armed himself after the outburst by Lewis by going back to the car to secure a weapon. Sometime before the actual



chopping and inflicting of the injuries to Lewis, Lewis and his wife were prevented by this defendant from leaving Carib Café. There was evidence of premeditation present. The time between bringing the knife from the car to the stabbing was approximately 01.20hrs – 02.00hrs, during which time the defendants were watching and following Lewis and his wife at Carib Café.

18. With respect to factors lowering culpability, I do not accept that there was evidence of provocation. In order for this court to find lower culpability on the basis of provocation, I would have to find that there was a greater degree of provocation than normally expected; this is not the case on the evidence presented at trial.
19. Nor do I agree with the submissions of Counsel for the Defence that there was a lack of premeditation in respect of this offence. The planning outlined above vitiates this argument.
20. As per the Guidelines, the starting point when there is greater harm and higher culpability is 5 years in custody, with a sentencing range of 3-6 years.
21. There are aggravating factors present in this case. These are:
 - (i) The location of the offence. This offence was committed in a public place crowded with patrons at the relevant time.
 - (ii) The presence of others, especially the wife of the victim, Lewis.
 - (iii) The attempt to dispose of evidence by the defendants after the incident, here the knife and clothing worn by the defendants.
22. There are Mitigating factors to be considered:
 - (i) The age of the Defendant, his relative youth of 22 years old at the time of the offence
 - (ii) The Defendant's effective, good character
 - (iii) The fact that this incident could be viewed, in light of his effective good character and no previous incidents or convictions for violence, as an isolated incident.
23. The Defendant pled Guilty on the first day of trial and will receive credit for his guilty plea.
24. The starting point is 5 years in custody. Given the aggravating and mitigating factors there is no basis for increasing this starting point. The Defendant will receive a discount to his sentence of 20 % for his early guilty plea. That will take his sentence to 4 years imprisonment. Any time that the Defendant has spent in custody pending trial and sentence is to be deducted from this sentence.



Murder – Deceased Randy Robinson

25. Section 182 of the Penal Code (2019 Revision) prescribes the punishment for murder.

“Punishment of murder

182. Any person convicted of murder shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life.”

26. The Conditional Release Act (2019 Revision) (“the Act”) at Section 7 provides:

“Minimum periods of incarceration

7. (1) Prisoners shall be eligible for conditional release as follows —

(a) prisoners sentenced to imprisonment for life shall be eligible to be considered for conditional release on licence after serving the minimum period of incarceration imposed under section 14(1)”

27. Section 14 of the Act states, so far as is immediately relevant:

“Release of life prisoners

14. (1) Notwithstanding any other Law to the contrary, when sentencing a prisoner to a term of imprisonment for life, the court shall specify the period of incarceration the prisoner shall serve before the prisoner is eligible to be considered for conditional release on licence, the period being such as the court considers appropriate to satisfy requirements of retribution, deterrence and rehabilitation, but for murder, the period shall be thirty years before the prisoner is eligible for conditional release unless there are —

(a) extenuating circumstances, exceptional in nature, in which case the court may impose a lower period of incarceration; or

(b) aggravating circumstances, exceptional in nature, in which case the court may impose a longer period of incarceration.

(1A) ... [Whole life sentences – not applicable in the present case, the statutory criteria not being met]

.....

(2) In making a decision under subsection (1)(a) or (b)... the court shall state the extenuating circumstances or the aggravating circumstances, as the case may be.

(3) The Board may, after considering the factors referred to in sections 9 and 10 and in accordance with the procedures set out therein, order conditional release on licence of



a prisoner sentenced to a term of imprisonment for life after the prisoner has served the period of imprisonment specified by the court under subsection (1)...”

28. Section 21 of the Act states:

“Regulations

21. The Cabinet may make regulations prescribing all matters that are required or permitted by this Law to be prescribed, or are necessary or convenient to be prescribed for giving effect to the purposes of this Law.”

29. In accordance with s.21 of the Act, Cabinet enacted The Conditional Release of Prisoners Regulations 2016 (the Regulations). Regulation 14 provides:

“For the purposes of determining the earliest possible conditional release date in relation to a prisoner on a term of imprisonment for life, the circumstances set out in Schedule 12 shall be considered.”

30. Schedule 12 of the *Regulations* (the Schedule) states:

“Introduction

1. (1) Where a mandatory life sentence for murder is prescribed by any Law, for the purposes of section 14 of the Law the aggravating and extenuating circumstances are outlined in this schedule.

(2) For offences other than murder, for the purposes of section 14 of the Law, the aggravating and extenuating circumstances may include all the relevant circumstances of the offence and or the offender.

(3) For murder, the period shall be thirty years before the prisoner is eligible for conditional release unless there are extenuating or aggravating circumstances, exceptional in nature, in which case the court may impose a shorter or longer period of incarceration respectively;

“Aggravating circumstances and extenuating circumstances

2. (1) Detailed consideration of aggravating or mitigating circumstances may result in a minimum term of any length.

(2) Aggravating circumstances that may be relevant to the offence of murder include –

(a) a significant degree of planning or premeditation;



- (b) the fact that the victim was particularly vulnerable because of age or disability;*
 - (c) mental or physical suffering inflicted on the victim before death,*
 - (d) the abuse of a position of trust;*
 - (e) the use of duress or threats against another person to facilitate the commission of the offence;*
 - (f) the fact that the victim was providing a public service or performing a public duty;*
 - (g) concealment, destruction or dismemberment of the body;*
 - (h) previous convictions;*
 - (i) abduction and sexual or sadistic conduct; and*
 - (j) any other circumstances which may be considered relevant.*
- (3) Extenuating circumstances that may be relevant to the offence of murder include –*
- (a) an intention to cause serious bodily harm rather than to kill;*
 - (b) lack of premeditation;*
 - (c) the fact that the offender suffered from any mental disorder or mental disability which (although not falling within section 185(1) of the Penal Code (2013 Revision)), lowered the offender's degree of culpability;*
 - (d) the fact that the offender was provoked (for example, by prolonged stress);*
 - (e) the fact that the offender acted to any extent in self-defence or in fear of violence;*
 - (f) a belief by the offender that the murder was an act of mercy;*
 - (g) the age of the offender; and*
 - (h) any other circumstances which may be considered relevant."*

31. The Schedule also provides the following:

"Duty to give reasons

5. *(1) Any court making an order pursuant to section 14 must state in open court, in ordinary language, its reasons for deciding on the order made."*



AUTHORITIES

32. The Cayman Islands Court of Appeal (the “CICA”)¹ has considered several appeals wherein the provisions of the Schedule have been examined. The following points are particularly relevant to the sentencing exercise in connection with this Defendant:

- (i) The lists of aggravating and extenuating circumstances in Schedule 12 paras 2(2) and 2(3) are non-exhaustive.
- (ii) The words ‘*Exceptional in nature*’ in regard to aggravating and extenuating circumstances do not relate to the frequency with which a circumstance occurs but rather to its seriousness.² The factor must be of sufficient weight and seriousness so as to take the case into the exceptional category and move the minimum period of incarceration, either upwards or downwards, from the 30-year starting point in a life sentence for murder. The non-exhaustive lists of aggravating and extenuating circumstances in Schedule 12, paragraphs 2(2) and 2(3), respectively, are, in themselves, examples of circumstances exceptional in nature.
- (iii) These principles have now been distilled into the Sentencing Guidelines for Violent Offences (hereinafter “the Guidelines”). Specifically, at page 6, the Guidelines state:

“6. In determining whether the circumstances of a case, taken as a whole, were "exceptional in nature" so as to justify a minimum term for an offence of murder other than 30 years or whole life, the court will undertake a two-stage analysis. The first step will be to decide whether there were circumstances that were exceptional in nature. The second step will be to decide whether, in light of any exceptional circumstances that had been found to exist, a minimum term of 30 years would be arbitrary and disproportionate. In considering the second step, the court will keep in mind the intent behind the legislation which was the protection of the public.

7. In considering the first step, in order to be "exceptional" the circumstances had to be unusual or uncommon, although they do not need to be unprecedented or very rare. The assessment should be holistic, taking into account all of the circumstances. The test is not related to the frequency with which the circumstances occur but to their seriousness. The question for the court is whether the circumstances of the murder in question were so serious

¹ Ricketts and others v The Queen (Criminal Appeals Nos. 3, 7, 7, 10, 11 and 13 of 2018 - 2 September 2019) and in Ramoon v The Queen, Douglas v The Queen (Criminal Appeals Nos. 34 and 35 of 2016 – 7 December 2018).

² Ramoon v The Queen, Douglas v The Queen at paras 101, 105 and 106; Ricketts and ors v The Queen paras 17-19



as to mark out the nature of the case as exceptional and to justify imposing a longer period of imprisonment.”

COUNSELS' SUBMISSIONS

33. The Crown submits that the circumstances of the case, as a whole, were “exceptional in nature” within the meaning of the Act and the Guidelines, such as to justify an increase to the minimum term beyond 30 years for the following reasons:

- “i. The murder took place in a public place, where others were present and put at risk*
- ii. The murder was committed in the course of Jackson’s joint participation in the wounding of another.*
- iii. The murder was committed in the course of violence that was premeditated, though the deceased was not the original target.”*

34. Apart from these, the Crown submitted that there was a further general aggravating factor to be considered, that being *“the use of 2 knives, with at least one, was brought to the scene to be used as a weapon in what transpired to be the fatal violence.”*

35. Counsel for the Defendant submitted that there were no aggravating circumstances exceptional in nature for the Court’s consideration, neither were there any general aggravating factors in this case.

36. Regarding mitigating factors, both the Crown and Defence agree that the following should be considered. These have not been advanced as extenuating or mitigating circumstances, exceptional in nature.

- (i) That the Defendant was of effective good character. The Defendant had no relevant previous convictions at the time of the offence and no convictions for violence. The only matter recorded against the Defendant was a non-conviction probation order imposed on 30 September 2020 for breaching the COVID curfew by going fishing.
- (ii) The Defendant’s comparative youth at the date of the offence; the Defendant was 22 years old. The sentencing Guidelines for Violent Offences for Murder, at paragraph 14, states:

“Where the offender is under 21, especially if the offender has no previous convictions that are treated as relevant, this may constitute an exceptional factor justifying a reduction in the



minimum period depending on the level of maturity of the offender. If so the reduction is likely to be between 2-4 years depending on the circumstances.”

While the Defendant was not under 21 at the time of the offence, which factor may have led to his age being a factor exceptional in nature, he was only 22 at the time of the offence, and his not having any relevant previous convictions is sufficient for this to be a general mitigating factor.

37. Counsel for the Defendant submitted that there were other mitigating circumstances present in this case:

- (i) that in its consideration of whether there was an intention to cause serious bodily harm rather than to kill, the Defendant should be given the benefit of the doubt in this regard.
- (ii) That there was a lack of premeditation on the Defendant’s part. Counsel for the Defendant submitted that the knife used by the Defendant to inflict the fatal injuries to Robinson was already in his possession at the time of the first exchange with Mr. Lewis. The jury, by its verdict, has found that he did not intend to cause Lewis really serious harm. The lack of premeditation says the defence should be taken from the fact that having played a role in the wounding of Lewis, the Defendant appeared to exit that altercation before returning to the direction of Randy Robinson, whereupon the fatal wounds were inflicted. There was no premeditation because the Defendant made a spur-of-the-moment decision to return to the altercation.
- (iii) Remorse shown by the Defendant by his plea to manslaughter. The Defendant also expressed, through his counsel at trial, his remorse for his actions.

38. For the Defendant, it was submitted that:

“In all the circumstances, the imposition of a minimum term of 30 years would be arbitrary and disproportionate, and that the minimum term that Mr. Jackson must be ordered to serve before the Conditional Release Board can consider his releases from prison on license should be 25 years.”

COURT’S CONSIDERATIONS

39. I have carefully considered Counsel’s helpful submissions, the relevant legislation and the authorities referred to. Each case turns on its own facts, and this Court must consider the overall circumstances of this case.



40. I find that there are aggravating circumstances of an exceptional nature in this case. As outlined in the Guidelines, the fact that this was a murder that took place in a public place, where others were present and put at risk, is not only likely to aggravate the seriousness of the offence but is a factor that can meet the test of being an aggravating factor exceptional in nature.³ This incident took place at a club at which a birthday party was being celebrated. This party was well attended. The violence took place not on the outskirts of the party but within the main area. The evidence of the witnesses was of persons scrambling to run away as the violence began. The evidence was that the stage where Lewis was chopped, and Robinson stabbed housed not only the DJ booth but also sofas for patrons. As the Crown submits, the very risk to others that elevates this factor to be exceptional is unfortunately exemplified by the fact that Randy Robinson himself was killed when reacting to the violence directed at Barshawn Lewis in that public place.
41. Schedule 12 of the Conditional Release of Prisoners Regulation sets out factors which may be aggravating or extenuating. However, the categorization is not exclusive or exhaustive. There may be other circumstances that may be considered relevant. I find such a circumstance exists in this case. There is a second aggravating factor exceptional in nature. This is the fact that the murder was committed in the course of this defendant's joint participation in the wounding of another where Robinson was not the original target.
42. The actions of this defendant, along with others in attacking and injuring Lewis, were serious in and of itself. The jury found that this defendant went beyond and outside of that joint participation to inflict the wounds on Randy Robinson, which resulted in his death seemingly within minutes of him being stabbed. The fact that Randy Robinson was not the original target of the Defendant and the others with him, yet this defendant inflicted the kinds of wounds, the nature and seriousness of which have been described above and which resulted in Robinson's death, makes this an uncommon and exceptional factor.
43. Having found that there are aggravating factors of an exceptional nature in this case, I must go on to consider whether there are mitigating circumstances, exceptional in nature. I do not find that any such mitigating circumstances exist in this case. I am mindful that this is not the end of my considerations. I must also consider whether there are mitigating circumstances which, although not exceptional in nature, may be such as to warrant a reduction from any uplift which might follow from my finding that there are aggravating circumstances of an exceptional nature.⁴

³ See paragraph 11 of the Guidelines at page 7

⁴ *Rivers v His Majesty the King* (Criminal Appeal No.7 of 2019 – 11 January 2024), at paragraph 23



44. As to these general mitigating factors or circumstances, the Court notes that these are present. I accept those noted above at paragraph 36 above:

- (i) That the Defendant was of effective good character;
- (ii) The Defendant's comparative youth.

45. Counsel for the Defendant has submitted that the Court should also consider that the Defendant's intention when he stabbed Randy Robinson was to cause serious bodily harm rather than to kill and that the Defendant should be given the benefit of the doubt in this regard. I am unable to view this as a factor in this defendant's favour. The nature and seriousness of the wounds inflicted on Randy Robinson within seconds of him being confronted by this defendant do not lean towards a finding of an intention to inflict serious bodily harm rather than to kill.

46. As set out in paragraph 11 above, the 5 stab wounds which the deceased suffered were significant and severe penetrating wounds which would have had to have been inflicted with much intensity and force. The first three injuries were all potentially life-threatening. I agree with the prosecution that the infliction of these kinds of wounds to the most vulnerable parts of the deceased's body demonstrates an intention to kill. The only evidence before the jury is of the Defendant inflicting these severe injuries within some 11 seconds and then walking past Robinson, where he had fallen without a glance or attempt to assist or even call for assistance.

47. I accept that there was a lack of premeditation in relation to the attack on Robinson and that this is a factor that may be viewed as a mitigating circumstance.

48. Regarding remorse, the Defendant has expressed, through his counsel at trial, his remorse for his actions.

49. This court having found that, taken as a whole, there are circumstances of this case which were exceptional in nature so as to justify a minimum term for the offence of murder other than 30 years, I must now determine whether, in light of these, the imposition of such a term would be arbitrary and disproportionate. I am mindful that the intention of the legislation is the protection of the public.

50. This court has considered the character references that have been submitted on the Defendant's behalf as well as the victim impact reports from Mr. Lewis and from the family members and friends of Mr. Robinson.

51. In submissions to this court, Counsel for the Defendant invited the Court to consider the sentence judgment of Chapple J. (Actg.) in the case of *the Crown v Jashawn Owen Johnson*⁵ as being an example of how a court has treated a defendant similar in age, sentenced for murder in similar circumstances. The Learned Judge noted in his remarks that notions of respect and disrespect were at the heart of that case. That is the striking similarity between these two cases, notions of respect and disrespect.
52. Mr. Jackson, you embarked upon this campaign against Barshawn Lewis because you felt that he had disrespected you. However, respect is something that is earned. Respect is not fear and intimidation because you carry a big knife. Even if you considered that Barshawn Lewis, a man who did not know you or even have you in his contemplation as he took his wife out that evening, had disrespected you, this cannot ever excuse the violence that you caused to be inflicted on Mr. Lewis and so much more so, it cannot excuse the fatal injuries that you inflicted on Randy Robinson. Your need to be respected has deprived Randy Robinson's 11 children of their father, his parents of their son, and his wife of her life partner. This court expresses its condolences to them. It also recognizes that you have now lost your youth and freedom by your own hand.
53. The aggravating circumstances exceptional in nature present in this case warrant an uplift to the minimum term of 30 years. To do otherwise would be arbitrary and disproportionate. The mitigating circumstances outlined above, while not exceptional in nature, are relevant and have been considered by this court in arriving at the appropriate minimum term over and above the statutory minimum. The sentence of the Court is that this defendant will serve a minimum term of 31 years imprisonment for the offence of murder. The sentence for the offence of wounding will run concurrent to this term of imprisonment.
54. The Defendant will be given credit for the time spent on remand pending trial and sentence from 6 May 2023. The Defendant will have served 283 days in custody. Such is to be deduced from the sentence on Count 1.



The Hon. Mrs. Justice Marlene Carter
Judge of the Grand Court

⁵ IND0001/2021, 11 January 2022