



ROTHERHAM

GROOMING GANG TRANSCRIPT

2024



Mohammed Amar



Yaser Ajaib



Mohammed Sadiq



Mohammed Siyab



Abid Saddiq



Tahir Yasin



Ramin Bari



The sentencing remarks of Mohammed Amar, Yaser Ajaib, Mohammed Zameer Sadiq, Mohammed Siyab, Abid Saddiq, Tahir Yasin, and Ramin Bari

Active from 2003-2008

PUBLISHED OCT 26

About the Centre for Justice Policy

The Centre for Justice Policy researches why Britain's justice system fails, and what would fix it. We start with evidence most people can't get to. Court transcripts cost hundreds of pounds a hearing, victims struggle to obtain their own records, and reform is argued over with very little hard information behind it. Through our Open Justice UK project we were the first organisation to privately obtain and publish court transcripts en masse, and the first to publish a full trial transcript in UK legal history.

Courts sit in public, but attending in person is not realistic for most people. In the UK, transcripts are not created or released automatically. Private organisations like ours have to request each one from the court, liaise with judges, often challenging refusals, pay for the transcript, and then publish it safely. We are the only organisation doing this work at scale.

From there we look at causes. We are mapping the patterns across the grooming gang scandal, examining what Britain can learn from justice systems that work better than ours, and tracing the roots of our biggest crime and justice failures: demographic change, frontline services stretched past the point of function, institutions that cannot or will not act. We test our conclusions against what the public actually thinks, and take them into Parliament where sentencing law needs to change.

You are about to read material that the courts have not made easy for you to see. We would like to publish far more of it. Please donate to help us obtain the next transcript and put it in front of the public:

www.centreforjusticepolicy.org/donate

About this case

These remarks concern seven defendants, sentenced as a result of arrests made during Operation Stovewood, initiated in 2014 by the National Crime Agency in the aftermath of The Jay Report.

The victims were aged 11 and 15 when the abuse started, which ran from 2003 and 2008, with both spending time in the care system throughout. The Jay Report estimated that at least 1,400 girls, the majority in their teenage years, were groomed, abused, and trafficked in Rotherham between 1997 and 2013. There were various other trials following Operation Stovewood, itself one of multiple related police initiatives (Operation Central and Operation Clover).

Mohammed Amar (14 years) was sentenced for multiple offences of indecent assault. Yaser Ajaib (6 years) was sentenced for indecent assault.

Mohammed Zameer Sadiq (15 years) was sentenced for unlawful sexual intercourse with a child under the age of 13, and rape. Mohammed Siyab (26 years) was sentenced for unlawful sexual intercourse with a child under the age of 13, multiple offences of rape, and human trafficking.

Abid Siddiq (24 years) was sentenced for indecent assault, and multiple offences of rape. Tahir Yasan (13 years) and Ramin Bari (9 years) were both sentenced for multiple offences of rape.

The case was heard by HHJ Michael Slater, who characterised the victims, owing to their extreme vulnerability, as being “there for the taking, having been groomed by others not before the court.” Each victim experienced their years growing-up as having been “ravaged by sexual abuse.” A spokesman from the NCA also stated that this case specifically formed “some of the worst offending” investigated under Operation Stovewood.

Notably, proceedings during the trial were marked by disturbances in the public gallery by relatives of the defendants, who were asked by the judge to leave the court.



IN THE CROWN COURT AT SHEFFIELD

Case No: T20237213

50 West Bar
Sheffield
S3 8PH

Date(s) of hearing: Friday, 13th September, 2024

Start Time: 11.16 Finish Time: 12.44

Page Count: 19

Word Count: 5455

Number of Folios: 77

Before:

HIS HONOUR JUDGE SLATER

R E X

- v -

**MOHAMMED AMAR, YASER AJAIB
MOHAMMED SADIQ, MOHAMMED
SIYAB, ABID SADDIQ, TAHIR YASIN
& RAMIN BARI**

MR NJ LUMLEY KC & MR MA BEAN appeared on behalf of the prosecution

MR DA McGONIGAL appeared on behalf of the defendant **AMAR**

MR D WOOD appeared on behalf of the defendant **YASIN**

MR DF HUGHES appeared on behalf of the defendant **BARI**

It was not possible to ascertain all defence counsel from the DARTS log

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 office 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
2nd Floor, Quality House, 6-9 Quality Court, Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1HP
Tel No: 020 7067 2900 DX: 410 LDE
Email: info@martenwalshcherer.com

11.16

JUDGE SLATER: As I indicated to the public gallery of this court yesterday and to the overspill court in Court 11, during the course of this process I expect no disruption from the public gallery. Any sentence will be met with silence and anybody who causes disruption will be removed from the public gallery in either court.

You, seven defendants, now fall to be sentenced for those offences of which you were convicted unanimously by the jury's verdict earlier in the summer. Before sentencing each of you in turn, I shall make some observations that apply to the sentencing process in general.

In each of your cases, I have had to carefully decide the type of the inevitable custodial sentence that must follow. As I have indicated to counsel during the course of their sentencing submissions, I have decided that in each of your cases a lengthy determinate sentence of imprisonment is appropriate in managing the individual risk you each pose to the community.

Those defendants dealt with as offenders of particular concern will receive a sentence comprising two elements, namely a custodial term of imprisonment and an extended licence period. Your counsel in due course will explain to you the effect of that type of sentence on your ultimate release.

Each of you at the conclusion of your sentences will be released on licence. Should you reoffend whilst on licence or not comply with the terms of your licence then you will be returned to prison to serve the outstanding balance of your sentence. In arriving at the appropriate sentence in each of your cases I have firmly borne in mind the principle of totality of sentence. I also bear in mind for most of you it will be your first

experience of custody and your sentence will be served in difficult conditions, as acknowledged by the Court of Criminal Appeal in the case of *Ali*.

As you have heard this morning, I don't think that sexual harm prevention orders are appropriate in this case save for the defendant, Abid Saddiq. Having regard to all I have heard during the course of the trial and subsequently, I do intend to impose restraining orders forbidding any contact between you and your respective complainants and those orders will be indefinite in nature. In other words, until further order of the court. Should you breach such an order in future, you will be returned to court and sentenced to up to five years' imprisonment for the breach.

I was informed yesterday with the exception of Saddiq that all of you are to receive 100 days qualified remand to set against the sentence imposed and as I indicated yesterday, should that figure be either too high or too low it can be adjusted administratively in due course.

If a victim surcharge is appropriate in any of your cases it will be payable within six months of date of release.

I now want to restate something I said to the jury during the course of my summing-up. During the time encompassed by this indictment, Person 1 and Person 2 were growing up in Rotherham, leading the chaotic lifestyles that we heard so much about in the course of the trial, both from witnesses and from official records. In my view, they desperately craved the affection and emotional support that was absent from their everyday lives. As a result, they were starkly exposed to those who on the pretext of befriending them sought them out for ultimately sexual exploitation. In my view, they were there for the taking, having been groomed by others not before the court. Drink, drugs and gifts oiled the wheels of that exploitation which followed.

The facts of these offences were fully explored and articulated during the course of an eight week jury trial and so I do not intend to rehearse them once more, save to say that the effects of your offending has undoubtedly contributed and continues to contribute both jointly and severally to the ongoing psychological symptoms I am more than satisfied each of these complainants continues to experience.

Yesterday their respective victim personal statements were read out to the court. Person 1 read hers out from the witness box. Person 2 had hers read out by Mr Bean on behalf of the prosecution. Each was a moving, articulate and measured account of a childhood ravaged by sexual abuse with all the dreadful consequences that followed. Suffice to say I have no difficulty in accepting without question the contents of each of their statements. I also have little difficulty in concluding, in accordance with the case of *Chal* that they have experienced severe psychological symptoms and continue to do so by what has occurred to them, either at your hands or the hands of others.

So, it is within that context that I now turn to sentence which I do in indictment order.

Starting with Mohammed Amar, the defendant may remain seated for the time being. You fall to be dealt with for two offences of indecent assault under the 1956 Act in respect of which each maximum sentence is ten years' imprisonment. They were committed when you were between 21 and 22 years of age and the complainant, Person 1, was just 11 years of age.

The comparable offence under the current Sexual Offences Act 2003 is rape of a child under 13 contrary to section 5 of the Act. As directed in the case of *Forbes*, I have to consider but not mechanistically apply the sentencing guideline for that offence. The prosecution contend that this case, as far as you are concerned, your offending

would fall within category 2A of the sentencing guideline. Not so says Mr McGonigal on your behalf. He contends for a 3A categorisation.

I take the view that it falls between 2A and 2B. 2A has a starting point of 13 years' imprisonment and 2B with one of eight years' imprisonment.

By reason of the nature of the offences committed, you fall to be sentenced as what is known as an offender of particular concern. In my view, your mitigation is limited.

In respect of count 1, I adopt a starting point of eight years' imprisonment which I reduce by 12 months to reflect your limited mitigation. The sentence on count 1, therefore, is eight years in all. A custodial term of seven years' imprisonment with an extended licence period of 12 months in addition by reason of your offender of particular concern status.

On count 2, there will be a similar consecutive sentence. It seems to me that in all the circumstances a consecutive sentence is justified, you having first of all been introduced to the hapless complainant and the going back for more when she was aged 11.

That results in a sentence of 16 years comprising 14 years' imprisonment and two years' extended licence. You will be eligible for parole halfway through the custodial term but not entitled to automatic release until two thirds of the way through it and I credit you with 100 days of time spent on remand.

I do not find that the criteria for a sexual harm prevention order are made out in your case. However, it seems to me that a restraining order of indefinite length should be imposed in the usual terms.

Yes. Very well, stand up, please. On count 1, seven years' imprisonment with an extended licence period of 12 months. Count 2, seven years' imprisonment consecutive with a consecutive extended licence period of 12 months. 14 years' imprisonment in all with two years' extended licence.

Very well. You may go down.

The next defendant to be sentenced is Yaser Ajaib who may remain seated for the time being.

Yaser Ajaib, you are now 39 years of age. You have a minor, non-relevant record. You fall to be dealt with for one offence of indecent assault under the 1956 Act in respect of which the maximum sentence is ten years' imprisonment. It was committed when you were just 18 years of age and the complainant, Person 1, was 11.

As in the case of Amar, I am required to consider the sentencing guidelines in relation to the comparable offence of rape of a child under 13 and its appropriate guideline. Again, I consider this offence to fall between 2A and B within the guideline.

You too fall to be sentenced as an offender of particular concern. The main point of your mitigation is your age at the time that the offence was committed. At the age of 18, you clearly knew what you were doing was wrong but you had yet to fully mature into the man you subsequently became as spoken of in the many positive references I have read on your behalf. The courts now recognise that maturation takes a number of years in young men and I take that into account.

I adopt in your case a starting point of eight years which on account of your mitigation I reduce to six years as the custodial term. There will therefore be a sentence of seven years altogether comprising the custodial term of six years with an extended licence period of 12 months. As with Amar, you will be eligible to apply for parole

halfway through the custodial term but not entitled to automatic release until two thirds of the way through the sentence and I credit you with 100 days qualifying time on remand as well.

I do not think the criteria for a sexual harm prevention order is made out in your case but again I think it appropriate that a restraining order in relation to the complainant be made for an indefinite period of time and as you have heard, a breach of such an order would result in a sentence of up to five years' imprisonment.

Should you be liable to a victim surcharge it will be payable within six months of the date of your release.

Very well, stand up please. In relation to this offence a sentence of seven years comprising a custodial term of six years with an extended licence period of 12 months.

Very well, you may go down.

I now turn to the defendant, Mohammed Syam. I am sorry, Mohammed Zameer Sadiq. You are 49 years of age. You have no relevant previous convictions and you fall to be dealt with for count 5, an offence of unlawful sexual intercourse with a child under 13 and count 6, an offence of rape which was one of a pair of offences put before the court as alternatives, having regard that count 6 was committed during the jurisdiction of the 1956 Sexual Offences Act – I am sorry, count 5 was committed during the jurisdiction of the 1956 Sexual Offences Act and count 6 under its successor, the 2003 Sexual Offences Act. No. I am corrected. Yes. Thank you, Mr Bean. I will start again.

You fall to be dealt with for count 5, an offence of unlawful sexual intercourse with a child under 13 under the 1956 Act and you were convicted of count 6, one of the

two alternatives in respect of an instance of rape, itself falling under the same Act. Both of those offences render you an offender of particular concern.

These offences were committed when you were between 28 and 30 years of age. So, you were a mature man by that time. The complainant was aged between 11 and 12.

The comparable offence in relation to both counts is rape of a child under 13 contrary to section 5 of the current Act. It should be said that both offences under their respective jurisdictions carried a maximum of life imprisonment.

Again, I regard the offence in terms of comparison to the current guideline as falling between 2A and 2B.

In relation to count 5 I adopt a starting point of ten years' imprisonment which I reduce by 12 months on account of your limited mitigation. Whilst I entirely sympathise with your familial situation I have to say that the difficulties your family are now experiencing are entirely down to your misbehaviour and they do not credit any reduction in the sentence whatsoever.

The sentence on count 5 is therefore one of ten years comprising nine years' custody and 12 months' extended licence on account of your offender of particular concern status.

The sentence on count 6 is one of in total 16 years comprising 15 years' custodial term and 12 months' extended sentence. It will run concurrently to the sentence in count 1 making a total sentence of 15 years' custody with a 12 months' extended licence period.

You too will be subject to the release provisions that I have previously described. I also credit you with 100 days qualifying remand time.

Again, I don't feel that a sexual harm prevention order in your case is either warranted or made out. I do think that a restraining order of indefinite length is appropriate and you've heard what you would get if you breached it, a sentence of anything up to five years.

The victim surcharge if appropriate will be payable within six months of the date of your release.

Very well, stand up, please. On count 5, a sentence of ten years comprising nine years' custody and 12 months' extended licence. On count 6, a sentence of 16 years comprising 15 years' custody and 12 months' extended licence. Those sentences to run concurrently making a total sentence of 16 years comprising 15 years' custody with 12 months' extended licence.

Very well, you may go down.

The next defendant is Mohammed Siyab. 45 years of age and of previous good character falling to be sentenced for counts 8, 9, 10 and 12. They comprise one offence of sexual intercourse with a girl under 13 and two counts representing three instances of rape which are 9 and 10, number 10 being a multiple incident count and count 12, the trafficking offence.

As already stated, the comparable offence for the sexual intercourse with a girl under 13 is rape of a girl under 13 and I've already indicated that I place such offences of rape as a starting point between 2A and 2B for the purposes of the *Forbes* comparison.

The comparable offence regarding the trafficking offence is human trafficking contrary to section 2 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015 which has a maximum life sentence as opposed to the 14 year maximum for the instant offence under the previous Act.

The prosecution contend for 1A in the categorisation of the sentencing guidelines, that having a starting point of 14 years and a sentencing range of between ten and 18 years.

At the time these offences were committed you were between 24 and 27 years of age, a fully mature man. The complainant was between 11 years of age in count 8 and 14 years of age in the remaining counts.

On count 8 there will be a sentence of nine years comprising eight years' custody and an extended licence period of 12 months. This offence causes you to be regarded as an offender of particular concern.

As far as count 9 is concerned, this was the first of the three rapes which were described as being particularly unpleasant by Person 1. I impose a sentence of ten years' imprisonment as far as that is concerned which will be concurrent.

On count 10, the multi-incident count of rape, at least two rapes which were convicted. I impose a concurrent sentence of 15 years' imprisonment.

In relation to count 12, the trafficking offence, I adopt a starting point of 11 years' imprisonment which I reduce by 12 months to reflect your very limited personal mitigation. In my view of the case, you were a persistent and cruel sexual predator as far as this complainant was concerned and the sentence on count 12 will be ten years which will run consecutive to the sentences I have already indicated.

That in total gives a sentence of 26 years' imprisonment comprising a custodial term of 25 years and an extended licence period of 12 months. I credit you with 100 (sic) hours qualifying remand days.

Again, I feel a restraining order of indefinite duration is more appropriate than a sexual harm prevention order in your case and any victim surcharge will be payable within six months of your date of release.

Very well, stand up, please. As far as count 8 is concerned, nine years comprising eight years' custody and an extended licence period of 12 months. Count 9, ten years' imprisonment concurrent. Count 10, 15 years' imprisonment concurrent. Count 12, ten years' imprisonment consecutive. A total sentence of 26 years all told, 25 years in custody with an extended licence period of 12 months.

Very well, you may go down.

Well, I am grateful to the public gallery for their restraint and dignity in sitting and listening to these proceedings. I now intend to have a short break before dealing with the remaining three defendants.

11.46

(A short adjournment)

12.21

JUDGE SLATER: The next defendant who falls to be sentenced is Abid Saddiq who is 43 years of age now. He falls to be sentenced for counts 13, an indecent assault, section 14 of the 1956 Act when Person 1 was 12; count 15, a rape when she was between 14 and 15 and of course, two offences of rape against Person 2 when she was 15 to 16.

You, Saddiq, of course have relevant convictions. On 30th August of 2019 for offences of a very similar nature including indecent assaults under the 1956 Act and rape together with taking a child without lawful authority times two. I sentenced you to a total of 20 years' imprisonment.

I remind myself of what I said about you at the time: "I take the view that at the material time you were a cunning and determined sexual predator who notwithstanding your acknowledged intellectual learning difficulties knew exactly what you were doing." I have had no reason to change my view from 2019 of your offending behaviour.

The offences you were convicted of back in 2019 by the jury dated between 18th July 1998 and 31st December 2002 when you were between 17 and 21 years of age. The present offences were between 24th September 2003 and 23rd January 2008. Whilst I am prepared to accept that there was a certain degree of overlap between the offences involving Person 1 and the investigation of those earlier offences, that was certainly not the case by the time you came to be committing similar offences against Person 2.

As far as count 13 is concerned, that makes you an offender of particular concern. The comparable offence we are familiar with by now, section 5 of the 2003 Act, rape of a child under 13. Counts 15, 16 and 17 are, of course, of a similar nature.

I mention count 17 because it is said to be a specimen count but it is a specimen count on its own. A multi incident count has not been used and nor has more than one specimen been used. So, I remind myself that I can only sentence on that count in respect of a single offence of rape.

It seems to me that there is no reason why the sentences in relation to the two complainants should not run consecutively and also the fact that counts 16 and 17 were committed whilst you were under investigation, if not more so, are serious aggravating features. You knew what you were up to and you continued doing it in exactly the same way as before.

I adopt the starting point, as I've indicated before, of between 2A and 2B of the sentencing guideline for the offence in count 13. The sentence will, therefore, be a total of nine years comprising eight years' custody and 12 months' extended licence. I have regard to the principle of totality, as I indicated at the outset of this sentencing exercise, and for count 15 there will be a starting point of eight years increased to 12 on account of this was the second such sexual offence. They will run concurrently together.

As far as count 16 is concerned, the first incident of rape against Person 2, that will be a term of eight years' imprisonment which will be increased to 12 to reflect the fact that you were under investigation at the time and carried on regardless and there will be a similar concurrent term on count 17. So, 12 years as far as the offences in relation to Person 2.

As I have said, I see no reason, having regard to the fact that these were two complainants, they were separated in time by some distance, why these terms should not run consecutively. So, count 16, 12 years, will be consecutive to count 15 and count 17, 12 years, will be concurrent to count 16. That makes a total of a custodial term of 24 years' imprisonment.

In relation to count 13, there will be the extended 12 months' licence, as I've previously indicated. So, the total sentence in your case is one of 25 years; 24 years custodial and 12 months extended licence.

The main point that is in issue in your case, in my view, is whether that sentence should be concurrent or consecutive to the sentence you are already serving. Having carefully considered the situation together with your very limited mitigation, having regard principally to totality, it seems to me that the appropriate way forward is for it to run from today's date.

There will be the sexual harm prevention order contended for by the prosecution and also there will be restraining orders in respect of both complainants of an indefinite duration which if you breach you'll face up to five years' imprisonment as you will with the sexual harm prevention order.

If the victim surcharge is applicable in your case, it will be payable within six months of date of release.

Very well, stand up. As far as count 13 is concerned, nine years comprising a custodial term of eight years and an extended licence period of 12 months. Count 15, 12 years' imprisonment concurrent. Count 16, 12 years' imprisonment consecutive. Count 17, 12 years' imprisonment concurrent. A total sentence of 25 years; 24 years custodial, 12 months extended licence period together with the orders I have outlined and I emphasise that sentence will start today. It is concurrent to the one you are serving at present.

Very well. You may go down.

I now turn to the defendant, Tahir Yasin. You are now 38 years of age. You have the single conviction on your record, that being back in 2005 for a dissimilar matter and it was shortly after your release from that offence that you came to commit the offences as you've been convicted of by the jury in counts 18 to 25.

In short, they comprise 26 separate instances of rape committed between 1st August 2007 and 1st May – between 1st and 5th January 2008, that being when the complainant, Person 2, was 15 years of age and approaching her sixteenth birthday at the end of the offending period.

They represent sexual offending within what the complainant was to tell the police was a consensual sexual relationship, absent of violence or fear of violence, which culminated in the two trips to a hotel in the counts 24 and 25 for sex with others.

Mr Wood submitted in your behalf in effect that you were not a sexual predator, that you were not greatly removed in age from that of the complainant, being six years older, and that I should not take the approach suggested in the sentencing guidelines for those who carried out a campaign of rape. The guidelines suggesting sentences of 20 years or more being appropriate for such offenders and during the course of submissions yesterday I indicated that I agreed with that submission.

It seems to me that you were more a sexual opportunist than predator, albeit you took full advantage of this vulnerable complainant and by their verdicts in your case the jury clearly regarded the complainant as being in a position where she had been so conditioned she was not able to give a genuine consent to what occurred and she herself spoke of various sexual acts that she was not entirely enthusiastic about.

Mr Wood also submitted that this series of offending insofar as rapes are concerned, that they should be categorised as 2B within the sentencing guideline and I agree too with that submission and I accept that there was no force or threat of force used. But nonetheless, these are inevitably to be met with a significant period of imprisonment.

As far as count 18 is concerned, the first vaginal rape, there will be a sentence of eight years' imprisonment. Count 19, the multi incident count relating to that, 15 years' imprisonment. Count 20, the first instance of oral rape, eight years' imprisonment. Count 21, the multi incident count relating to that, 15 years' imprisonment. Count 22, the first instance of anal rape, eight years' imprisonment. Count 23, the second instance

of anal rape, ten years' imprisonment, again the sentences being concurrent, and then the two hotel offences, concurrent sentences of 15 years' imprisonment each.

And I afford you two years credit for mitigation. After that initial conviction, you have stayed out of trouble for a long time and have not offended since then but also I am prepared to accept the contention that you are someone who has been of positive good character in the light of the references supplied on your behalf from various members of the community and so there is a reduction of two years' imprisonment on counts 24 and 25 to make the overall sentence 13 years' imprisonment.

Again, in your case I see no reason for a sexual harm prevention order but I think an indefinite restraining order is appropriate and you have heard what I have said to others about that, should they breach it. The same applies to you.

If the victim surcharge is appropriate, you will pay it within six months of your date of release.

Very well, stand up, please. Count 18, eight years' imprisonment; count 19, 15 years' imprisonment concurrent; count 20, eight years' imprisonment concurrent; count 21, 15 years' imprisonment concurrent; count 22, eight years' imprisonment concurrent; count 23, ten years' imprisonment; count 24, 13 years' imprisonment concurrent and count 25, 13 years' imprisonment concurrent. A total sentence of 13 years' imprisonment of which you will serve two thirds.

Very well, you may go down with the officer.

MR HUGHES: Just before he is taken down, I am standing in for Mr Wood today. I may be mistaken, your Honour, but I had understood your Honour to have said counts 19 is 15 years and counts 21, 15 years. I wonder whether your Honour was to apply a two year

mitigation discount to those counts? Ultimately, your Honour outlined 13 years as I understood it.

JUDGE SLATER: No. The mitigation applies to the last two counts.

MR HUGHES: Very well, your Honour.

JUDGE SLATER: Yes. I am sorry, Mr Hughes. It's been a long morning.

MR HUGHES: Yes, it has, your Honour.

JUDGE SLATER: 19 and 21, they are 13 years. 13 years concurrent.

MR HUGHES: Thank you very much, your Honour.

JUDGE SLATER: Total sentence 13 years. Thank you.

Yes, the final defendant to be sentenced is Ramin Bari who is now 38 years of age and essentially of previous good character, having no convictions but a caution.

You fall to be sentenced in respect of counts 26, 27, 28 and 29, four rapes of [REDACTED] on two separate occasions at the Etap Hotel, the first occasion being in October 2007, the second being in January 2008.

At the time the offences were committed you were 21 years of age and the complainant was in [REDACTED] of 2007 [REDACTED] months short of her sixteenth birthday and then [REDACTED] weeks short in [REDACTED] 2008.

Mr Hughes adopts in large part on behalf of you the submissions made by Mr Wood on behalf of the defendant, Yasin. As previously indicated during the sentencing of Yasin, I take the view that the offences are properly categorised as falling within 2B of the sentencing guideline with a starting point of eight years and a range of seven to nine years and that is the starting point I adopt in relation to these offences.

In relation to counts 26 and 27, the first visit to the hotel, there will be concurrent sentences of eight years' imprisonment. On counts 28 and 29 I take the view

that the sentence should be increased by reason for this being the second bite at the cherry, as it were, and my starting point for these two offences is ten years' imprisonment from which I deduct 12 months on account of your limited mitigation.

That gives sentences of nine years to run concurrently in respect of 28 and 29 and an overall sentence of nine years.

I credit you with the 100 days you have spent on remand.

Again, I think a sexual harm prevention order in your case is not warranted but a restraining order of indefinite length is and I accordingly impose one.

Any victim surcharge is to be paid within six months of the date of your release and as I understand it, you will serve two thirds of that sentence.

Very well, stand up, please. In relation to count 26, eight years' imprisonment. In relation to count 27, eight years' imprisonment concurrent. In relation to count 28, nine years' imprisonment concurrent. In relation to count 29, nine years' imprisonment concurrent. A total sentence of nine years' imprisonment.

Yes. Very well, you may go down.

Yes, Mr Bean.

MR BEAN: Your Honour, there is one matter I need to raise. Your Honour will recall in the closing stages of the case the Crown agreed to sever count 11.

JUDGE SLATER: Yes.

MR BEAN: The Crown indicated I think at the time we wouldn't seek trial in respect of that count.

JUDGE SLATER: That's right.

MR BEAN: That remains the position and I am instructed to offer no evidence in respect of that.

JUDGE SLATER: Very well, Mr Bean. Well, in respect of that count there will be a formal not guilty verdict.

12.44

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
2nd 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
Web: www.martenwalshcherer.com

To read more transcripts and to learn more about our work visit: [*centreforjusticepolicy.org*](https://centreforjusticepolicy.org)

To support our work go to:
[*centreforjusticepolicy.org/donate*](https://centreforjusticepolicy.org/donate)

For inquiries please contact:
[*info@centreforjusticepolicy.org*](mailto:info@centreforjusticepolicy.org)

