

**IN THE CROWN COURT AT MANCHESTER**

Case No: T20227179  
CAO No: 202304014\*B2\*1

The Court House  
Minshull Street  
Manchester M1 3FS

Date(s) of hearing: **Tuesday, 31st October, 2023**  
Start Time: **16.17** Finish Time: **16.54**

Page Count: 14  
Word Count: 5078  
Number of Folios: 71

**Before:**

**HER HONOUR JUDGE LANDALE**

**R E X**

**- v -**

**JAHN SHAHID GHANI, MOHAMMED  
FIASAL GHANI, INSAR HUSSAIN, ALI  
RAZA KAZMI & MARTIN LESLIE  
RHODES**

**MSS RIMMER & Ms LAVIN** appeared on behalf of the prosecution  
**MISS THOMSON** appeared on behalf of the defendant KAZMI  
**MISS IRONFIELD** appeared on behalf of the defendant RHODES  
It was not possible to ascertain a list of counsel in full

**SENTENCING REMARKS**

-----  
*WARNING: reporting restrictions may apply to the contents transcribed in this document, particularly if the case concerned a sexual offence or involved a child. Reporting restrictions prohibit the publication of the applicable information to the public or any section of the public, in writing, in a broadcast or by means of the internet, including social media. Anyone who receives a copy of this transcript is responsible in law for making sure that applicable restrictions are not breached. A person who breaches a reporting restriction is liable to a fine and/or imprisonment. For guidance on whether reporting restrictions apply, and to what information, ask at the court of ice or take legal advice.*

*This Transcript is Crown Copyright. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part other than in accordance with relevant licence or with the express consent of the Authority. All rights are reserved.*

Digital Transcription by Marten Walsh Cherer Ltd  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Quality House, 6-9 Quality Court, Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1HP  
Tel No: 020 7067 2900 Fax No: 020 7831 6864 DX: 410 LDE

Marten Walsh Cherer Ltd  
Tel: 020 7067 2900

Email: [info@martenwalshcherer.com](mailto:info@martenwalshcherer.com)  
Web: [www.martenwalshcherer.com](http://www.martenwalshcherer.com)



## SENTENCING REMARKS

JUDGE LANDALE: Please remain seated, gentlemen (sic).

Before I proceed to sentence I am going to address the preliminary ancillary orders. In each of your cases you will be barred from working with and from carrying out certain activities with vulnerable adults and children under the Safeguarding and Vulnerable Groups Act.

Each of you will be subject to the notification requirements and must notify the police of your name, address and changes to your personal details for the rest of your lives.

I am not satisfied in any of your cases that it is necessary to impose a sexual harm prevention order in order to protect the public from sexual harm from you or to protect children or vulnerable adults from sexual harm in light of the time that has passed between you committing these sexual offences and the sentences I am about to pass.

I am satisfied that in the light of the evidence and the victim personal statements that it is necessary to impose restraining orders upon each of you in order to protect the victims from acts of harassment. The draft orders will take effect until further order.

I now turn to sentence. You have each been found guilty following a trial of serious sexual abuse. Martin Rhodes, you pleaded guilty to the offences to which you are to be sentenced immediately before the trial began. Your cases together and individually reflect appalling abuse of two young women who were children when you offended against them. It is clear from the evidence and from their appearance and behaviour that you were each well aware of their young ages and of their vulnerabilities.

I was able to watch closely and listen carefully as the evidence of the witnesses was given and to assess them as well as you as you sat in the dock through this long trial. Jahn Shahid Ghani was the only defendant to give evidence.

[Person A] and [Person B] were both immature naive children who are loved by their families. They both wanted to be grown up and they wanted to be

loved. As children they believed they had street credibility, but in reality that was fake. Each girl was a child ripe for exploitation by unscrupulous older men. Your behaviour towards them during the commission of these offences was highly predatory, controlling and manipulative. They were ripe for exploitation because of their immaturity and their situations. You each hooked them and used them for your own sexual pleasure.

The impact on both women has been lasting and is severe. Their lives changed forever because of the sexual abuse. Their personal statements bear witness to some of the harm they have endured and continue to endure. It is likely to affect them for the rest of their lives. They showed real courage in cooperating with these long legal proceedings and attending court to give evidence, as did two other witnesses, [Person C] and [Person D].

Turning individually, Mohammed Ghani, you are at least five years older than [Person A]. Having met her by chance you ruthlessly exploited her innocent affection as a way to get sex for yourself and you pressured her to have sex with your friends, including with Insar Hussain. It is clear from the evidence that you told your much older brother Jahn Shaid Ghani about her which led directly to his exploitation of her.

Your behaviour corrupted her and corrupted her attitude to the sexual abuse that she was suffering. You did indeed treat her as a piece of meat. This was no relationship. You had no interest in her for anything other than sex. You regularly engaged in oral and vaginal sex with her and on one occasion anal intercourse. You made her feel like she had to have sex with your friends to please you. The episode in the butcher's flat when you and Insar Hussain and two other men took turns in pushing your penises into her mouth in the filthy bedroom demonstrates how you regarded her, just a body to be used for your sexual pleasure.

[Person A] believed the sex was necessary to please you.

You did everything you could to avoid responsibility for your offences. Despite knowing that she would be able to identify you, you denied knowing her, which resulted in her having to attend an identification procedure to pick her (sic) out.

Perhaps you thought she would not go through with it. When she did you told lies in your interview about her.

The sentencing guidelines apply to your offences. It is accepted that these are category 1A offences.

Having heard the evidence I am satisfied that you used grooming behaviour towards her and that you provided her with alcohol throughout the time you sexually offended against her, not every time but often. It is clear that everything you did and said was for the sole purpose of manipulating her into sexual activity. There was not chit-chat, no affection. You groomed her into thinking she had to perform sexual acts and if she did not you would be horrible to her. The only thing you wanted from her was sex. The only thing she wanted from you was affection. The supply of alcohol was a daily part of the routine that you participated in.

The starting point for a single offence is five years with a range of four to 10 years. I find there are aggravating features: ejaculation, the presence of others on many occasions but not all. I also find that she was threatened that if she did not have sex the bottle video would be shown to her mother. I am sure that [Person A] told the truth about the threat to use that video of her.

She described being at the butcher's flat with a group of men, including you and Insar Hussain. She was given so much alcohol that she blacked out and the next day she was shown a bottle by Jahn Shahid Ghani covered in faeces. A video of her being penetrated with the bottle had been made. It had been shown around Rochdale and threats were made to show it to her mother. It was not possible to identify the person inserting the bottle into her; only the person's hand could be seen. But having heard her evidence I am sure she told the truth about this incident.

This was a traumatic event painfully recalled. Her evidence is not undermined by the fact that [Person C] could not recall the video or the bottle. Her lack of recollection does not mean it did not happen. I find that in this situation [Person A] was mostly likely to accurately remember such an event; she was the victim. [Person C] was not present when the bottle was inserted and there is no reason why she would have noticed a bottle in the bathroom and there was more than one video of [Person A] that was sent around Rochdale.

I also reject Jahn Shahid Ghani's evidence that he did not show the bottle to [Person A] or see the video. He was not a truthful witness.

To be clear, I accept the starting point and aggravating features as set out in the prosecution's sentencing note. I also observe that you have shown no remorse at all. Turning to mitigation, you were aged 19 to 21 at the time of the offending. You have not offended since and you have led a useful life.

Your personal mitigation.

I take account of what has been said on your behalf and what I have read in the pre-sentence report and the references which speak highly of you as a family man. I bear in mind the principle of totality. In order to achieve a just result to reflect the totality of your offending in which you penetrated her anus, vagina and mouth with your penis over a period of about two years there must be an adjustment in the individual sentences to reflect the harm you caused and your culpability. I consider the totality of your offending can be achieved by imposing concurrent sentences rather than shorter individual consecutive sentences. This means that you will be sentenced outside of the sentencing range for the multiple incident counts, but that is to take account of totality. The overall offending is reflected in the sentences for Counts 17 and 20.

I am required to consider dangerousness. Having considered the circumstances of these offences, your conduct since these offences, all of the information and the commensurate length of the sentence, I am satisfied that a determinate sentence will be sufficient to protect the public.

On Count 5, eight years' imprisonment; Count 11, eight years' imprisonment; Count 14, eight years' imprisonment; Count 17, 14 years' imprisonment; Count 20, 14 years' imprisonment. The total sentence is 14 years' imprisonment. You will serve half of that sentence in custody when you will be released on licence. If you offend on licence you are liable to recall to serve the remainder in custody.

Turning to you, Insar Hussain, you were also at least five years older than [Person A]. You jumped onto the coattails of your friend Mohammed Ghani. [Person A]'s childish affection for him left her open to exploitation by you. The evidence demonstrates your clear disregard for her and your steadfast

abuse of her. You also treated her like a piece of meat. The example of when you took her directly to the lorry stop for sex after picking her up, then immediately taking her home again without a word of conversation shows how transactionally (sic) you regarded this child. You got what you could out of her. If she did not have sex with you you would whinge to Mohammed Ghani about her.

There is clear evidence that you gave her copious amounts of alcohol despite knowing that she was a child. You penetrated her mouth with your penis on multiple occasions. On one occasion you raped her vaginally.

There is no credit for plea.

The sentencing guidelines apply.

Count 30 is the rape count. It is agreed that this is category two harm. There is disagreement about whether this is culpability A or B and I must resolve that issue. The prosecution submit it is culpability A because of the use of alcohol and/or drugs. Your barrister invites me to find this is not a culpability A case. He submits that because the occasion of rape is not particularised and in the absence of direct evidence of use of alcohol on this particular occasion I cannot be satisfied so that I am sure that alcohol was used on this occasion.

In resolving this issue I have considered the whole of the evidence, as must the jury in convicting you. [Person A]'s evidence was that the only thing you were interested in was to have sex with her and in order to achieve that she was routinely given drink and sometimes cannabis. "Nothing came for free," she said. She knew sex was expected in return for drink.

It would be wholly artificial to interpret the jury verdict on Count 30 as meaning the single incident count was intended to reflect an occasion when alcohol was not given to facilitate sex. I agree with the prosecution that this offence is within category 2A, which provides a starting point of 10 years with a range of nine to 13.

There are aggravating features: ejaculation. [Person A]'s evidence was that condoms were not used. I have already found that the aggravating feature of the threat to show her mother the bottle video is made out on the evidence. I am sure that this

incident took place and in your presence whilst you laughed at what you could see was being done to her. I also find that you were a party to the threat to use it. In

making this finding I am not finding you guilty of an offence. I am accepting that you were party to the use of distressing evidence to humiliate and control her.

The sentencing guidelines for Counts 29 and 35, I conclude that these are category 1A offences. I am sure there was grooming behaviour by you towards [Person A]. You had no interest in her for anything other than sexual offending. It is clear from the evidence that everything you said and did towards her was for the purpose of manipulating her into sexual activity. There is direct evidence of the provision of alcohol and I reject any defence submission that this was category B offending as being unsustainable on the evidence.

There are aggravating features. It is clear from [Person A]'s evidence that the majority of your offending towards her was in the presence of others and that it ended with ejaculation. I have already found that the use of threats apply and you have shown no remorse at all.

In mitigation you were aged 19 to 21 at the time, there has been no sexual offending since and you have no relevant convictions.

Your personal mitigation.

I have read the references from people you value which refer to you as a hardworking family man who is respected by your friends and associates.

So far as time on remand is concerned I am asked by your barrister to deduct or credit time you have served on remand for an entirely unrelated sexual offence relating to a family member of which you were acquitted in December 2022. It had no connection to this case or to this victim.

I have read the case of *R v. Williams* referred to in the defence sentencing note. That was a case where the defendant was sentenced for breaching a restraining order. He was acquitted of some counts relating to the restraining order and convicted of other counts relating to the same restraining order. The court in that case said the time spent in custody on the breaches of the restraining order not proved should be taken

into account. That case does not seem to me to be authority for the suggestion that a defendant can “bank” time spent on remand for completely separate offences.

Totality.

In order to achieve a just result to reflect the totality of your offending, which involved multiple offences in which you penetrated her mouth with your penis over a period of about two years and raped her on one occasion, there must be an adjustment in the individual sentences to reflect the harm you caused and your culpability.

All sentences will run concurrently. The lead offence is the rape offence and the sentence for that offence has been upwardly adjusted to reflect the totality of your offending, which takes it outside of the range.

Dangerousness.

I am required to consider dangerousness. Having considered the circumstances of these offences, your conduct since these offences, all of the information and the commensurate length of the sentence, I am satisfied that a determinate sentence will be sufficient to protect the public.

On Count 29, a sentence of eight years’ imprisonment; on Count 30, 17 years’ imprisonment; Count 35, 12 years’ imprisonment. The total sentence is 17 years’ imprisonment. You will serve two-thirds of the sentence in custody when you will be released on licence. If you offend on licence you are liable to be recalled to serve the remainder in custody.

Turning to you, Jahn Shahid Ghani. The suggestion at your trial that you coincidentally bumped into [Person A] without knowing your brother was exploiting her was a lie. I am sure that you met her, as [Person A] said, having been given her number by your brother. You knew before you even set eyes on her that she was a particularly vulnerable girl who was ripe for sexual exploitation. What you did was take that exploitation to another level.

You must have known the impact it would have on her. At the time you were working with vulnerable adults. You were more than twice the age of [Person A] and

[Person B]. You were addicted to sex and saw [Person A] and [Person B] as children you could exploit for your sexual fantasies.

You were responsible for the corruption of both girls. You exposed [Person A] to lesbian sex when she did not want it and you persuaded and encouraged her to engage in it.

You introduced her to large amounts of Class A drugs in order to dis-inhibit her and to achieve your fantasy of group sex. You facilitated [Person B]'s use of Class A drugs to encourage her to have sex with you and [Person A] on the same occasions and to have sex with her when you saw her individually.

You were well aware that each girl was a child but you did not care what impact your offending had on them. You exploited their naivety and immaturity. The evidence of your grooming behaviour towards them can be seen particularly clearly in [Person A]'s distress when she reported your behaviour to the police. You deceived her and made her feel as though you were her friend at a time when you knew she was in desperate need of a friend. The reality is you only wanted her for sex.

It is right to say that you were jovial and pleasant towards the children, but that does not indicate within the context of the whole of the evidence that you were interested in any genuine relationship or friendship with either child, indeed when [Person A] was no longer engaging in sexual activity with you you rebuffed her attempts to contact you socially.

You offended against each child on multiple occasions over a period of months. The offences against [Person A] are particularly grave because you were instrumental in inciting her to engage in lesbian sex and you introduced her to Class A drugs in order to achieve sexual disinhibition. Whilst [Person B] had already been exposed to Class A drugs, you exploited that by providing her with Class A drugs to achieve sexual activity with her.

The sentencing guidelines apply. It is agreed these are category 1A offences. I find that you engaged in a substantial degree of planning. You took the children to

different addresses and you liaised with other people to set the scene and with [Person A] to have group sex. You provided drugs, you groomed them, there was a significant age difference, in [Person A]'s case you acted with others and recorded images.

The aggravating features are that you ejaculated, you were also under the influence of drink and drugs and some of these offences were committed in the presence of others.

Turning to the mitigation, you have committed no further sexual offences and there are no relevant other offences recorded against you.

Your personal mitigation.

You are well thought of by those who know you and you have a history of hard work. I take into account what has been said on your behalf and what is reported in the pre-sentence report and in your references. You have provided genuine assistance to the brother of a young man who relied on you as a carer.

The principle of totality.

You offended against two children, sometimes together and sometimes individually, over a period of months. It involved the oral and vaginal penetration of [Person A] with your penis and vaginal penetration of [Person B]. In your case because there are two victims it is appropriate to impose consecutive sentences. An adjustment must be made to reflect the totality of your offending to achieve a just result. To achieve that I will reduce individual sentences and impose consecutive sentences to achieve the appropriate overall sentence for the overall offending.

I am required to consider dangerousness. Having considered the circumstances of these offences, your conduct since these offences and all of the information and the commensurate length of the sentence, I am satisfied that a determinate sentence will be sufficient to protect the public.

On Count 46, six years' imprisonment; on Count 48, six years concurrent; Count 52, eight years concurrent; Count 56, 10 years concurrent; and Count 58, 10 years to run consecutively to Count 56. That makes a total sentence of 20 years' imprisonment. You will serve half of that sentence in custody when you will be

released on licence. If you offend on licence you will be liable to be recalled to serve the remainder in custody.

Martin Rhodes, you offended against both [Person A] and [Person B]. You knew they were both children and despite being warned against having sex with Terry Parrott by the authorities and her family you continued to do so.

Both [Person B] and [Person A] were too young to comprehend the damage being done to them from being in sexual relationships at 14 years of age. Each child believed they were in a relationship with you and you treated them as

girlfriends. You were seen to show affection towards them, but I have no doubt that these were not genuine relationships.

You did groom [Person A]. Within a week you were having sex with her, falsely flattering her with compliments to sweet talk her into sex.

I accept that your sexual relationships with [Person B] and [Person A] were not simultaneous.

Your case is distinct from your co-defendants, whom you did not know, as some parts of your contact with [Person A] and [Person B] was not intended abuse. The relationship with [Person A] lasted for about a month. Your relationship with [Person B] lasted longer, for six months or slightly more.

At the time your life was in a desperate mess. You were addicted to Class A drugs. You provided [Person A] and [Person B] with a place to go when they should have been at home and in doing so you exposed both children to your Class A drug use, [Person B] to self-harm and also to violence. I am sure that [Person B] told the truth about the extent of the violence that she was exposed to and the self-harm that she witnessed.

The jury's verdicts can readily be understood within the context of Teri Parrott's evidence that when she was having sex with you she demonstrated enthusiasm. That candidness supports her credibility and supports her evidence that she told the truth about the violence she experienced from you.

The sentencing guidelines apply. In [Person A]'s case I have carefully

considered Miss Ironfield's submissions, but I find that this was category 1A for the reasons I have outlined. I accept that you did groom her. There are no aggravating features.

[Person B], it is agreed this is category 1A offending. There are aggravating features. You were under the influence of drugs and you ignored warnings to stay away from her.

In mitigation you were aged 20 to 21 at the time. I accept you did show some kindness to [Person B] especially and you provided both children with some support. Your personal mitigation.

12

Marten Walsh Cherer Ltd  
Tel: 020 7067 2900

I take into account everything that has been said on your behalf and the contents of the pre-sentence report and note that you have stopped using heroin. Totality.

Each count reflects multiple offending. There must be consecutive sentences to reflect the fact that there are two separate victims, whilst the total length of individual sentences will be reduced to achieve a just result which is proportionate. You will receive 10 per credit for your pleas of guilty.

I am required to consider dangerousness in your case. Having considered the circumstances of these offences, your conduct since these offences, all of the information and the commensurate length of the sentence, I am satisfied that a determinate sentence will be sufficient to protect the public.

Count 63, three years' imprisonment; Count 64, four years concurrent; Count 66, five years concurrent; Count 68, eight years six months to run consecutively to Count 66. The total sentence is 12 and a half years' imprisonment. You will serve half of that sentence in custody when you will be released on licence. If you offend on licence you are liable to be recalled to serve the remainder in custody.

Ali Raza Hussain Kazmi, you knew [Person B] when she was aged 13 and 14. I am satisfied, having heard the evidence, that from the beginning you were intimidating and aggressive towards her. You showed you contempt for her by

slapping her and calling her a slag.

Over a period of about a year when she naively believed she was in a relationship with you you had oral sex with her many times in public in the presence of others.

When you were 16 or 17, whilst out in the town centre of Rochdale in a group of your friends you raped her near a subway despite her desperate attempts to stop you. It is clear that were angry when she rejected your sexual attention and that you raped her in order to punish her.

There was a clear degree of aggression shown towards her during that offence when you forced her to the ground and removed her clothing despite her begging you to stop. You have shown no remorse.

The sentencing guidelines apply. The youth guidelines are relevant because at the time of the rape offence you were aged 16 or 17 and 15 or 16 for the sexual activity offences. The sentencing guidelines for sexual offences for adults also apply. For the rape offence for adult offenders this is a 2A offence in my judgment.

[Person B] was particularly vulnerable and having listened to the evidence during the trial with care I am sure that you had previously used violence against her. I reject any suggestion that the jury must have rejected [Person A]'s evidence that you were violent to [Person B]; there is no basis to do so. She was not challenged about that part of her evidence. The issue in your case was identification.

The aggravating feature is clearly the presence of others.

Turning to the indecency with a child, the starting point for a single offence for the equivalent single offence for an adult is one year. Again, the aggravating feature is the presence of others.

Turning to your mitigation, there are no previous convictions recorded against you. You were 15 or 16 for the indecency offences and 16 to 17 for the rape offence. I agree with Miss Thomson that it is fairer to err on the side of caution as to your age and sentence you as if you were aged 16 when you raped [Person B].

I reject the suggestion that there was any meeting of minds between you and [Person B]; there is no evidence of that. [Person B] was an extremely vulnerable victim of child exploitation and you added to that exploitation. There is no evidence that you treated her in a loving way. I accept there is no evidence of a link between your offending and your co-defendants.

Your personal mitigation.

I note the contents of the pre-sentence report and the submissions by Miss Thomson about the support you offer for your family. You are well thought of by those who know you and you have carried out charity work.

Dangerousness.

I am required to consider dangerousness. Having considered the circumstances of these offences, your conduct since these offences, all of the information and the commensurate length of the sentence, I am satisfied that a determinate sentence will be sufficient to protect the public.

14

Marten Walsh Cherer Ltd  
Tel: 020 7067 2900

If you had been an adult when you raped [Person B] the sentence for that individual offence would be 12 years. Rather than impose consecutive sentences I will reflect the totality of your offending in the rape offence.

On Count 70, eight years' imprisonment; Count 71, nine months concurrent; Count 72, two years concurrent. The total sentence is eight years' imprisonment. You will serve two-thirds of the sentence in custody when you will be released on licence. If you offend on licence you will be liable to be recalled to serve the remainder in custody.

That concludes my sentencing remarks.

Miss Rimmer?

MISS RIMMER: Your Honour, I am content with your Honour's proposal so far as anonymity is concerned.

JUDGE LANDALE: Thank you very much.

**Marten Walsh Cherer hereby certifies that the above is an accurate and complete record of the proceedings or part thereof.**

Digital Transcription by Marten Walsh Cherer Ltd  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Quality House, 6-9 Quality Court, Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1HP  
Tel No: 020 7067 2900 Fax No: 020 7831 6864 DX: 410 LDE  
Email: [info@martenwalshcherer.com](mailto:info@martenwalshcherer.com)  
Web: [www.martenwalshcherer.com](http://www.martenwalshcherer.com)