

28th November, 1985.

Superior Number

Ian Christopher Taylor

JUDGMENT

BAILIFF: Taylor, we are going to grant the conclusions and sentence you to a total of 4 years' imprisonment. We do not accept that you came to this Island to seek work and that you came in a hire car driven by somebody who was coming here purely for a holiday. We think that you and that person, and probably a third person, came here quite deliberately from England to commit these two crimes with the intention of then returning to England as soon as possible thereafter - in other words you were here for just 2 days which was necessary for the commission of these crimes. The two crimes concerned, committed at either end of the precinct, were professionally executed. Masks were worn; you and the other two were extremely well equipped and the car was used as a battering-ram in one case to smash in the jeweller's shop window. The Court believes that this was a crime that was ruthlessly executed. The probation report suggests that such sort of crime may be commonplace in the greater Manchester area - we do not know whether that is true or not but it certainly is not common here and it is our duty to make quite clear that anybody that commits this sort of crime and is convicted will face a very substantial sentence. Another aggravating element is the fact that this car was driven at high speed down the precinct and although it was in the middle of the night there could have been somebody in the precinct and indeed the police themselves were put at risk. I know you were not the driver but you were part of the enterprise and the police themselves were put at risk. Your counsel, who has said everything he possibly could on your behalf, has referred us to the question of the normal sentence imposed for burglary of private houses and the element there of distress to the occupiers. We entirely agree with the words which were quoted, but we think that there was an element in this case and in this sort of case which is quite different to burglary. Burglary of private houses is very serious too, but if one looks at the report which your counsel handed up we see, if we carry on from where he read, that in fact, in the case of professional crime and a person who has in fact had previous convictions - and you, Taylor, have had previous convictions including 3 years on one case and other custodial sentences - we see there that 4 years is a sentence which is imposed from

time to time even in England. Your counsel also referred us to the local case of Sheldrake and Bree, but the remarks which I have just made apply equally there. There is a different element here, an element of public ruthlessness in a public place. The mitigating factor we have taken into account, and the only mitigating factor, is a plea of guilty. There is no other mitigating factor. You, Taylor, did not help to recover the jewellery and there is still some jewellery missing and we might add at this time that in fact the total amount of jewellery stolen was £68,750. It is the duty of this Court to make it clear that this sort of ruthless crime is going to attract the most severe punishment and the Court has no hesitation therefore in sentencing you to 4 years' imprisonment on count 1 and 4 years' imprisonment concurrent on count 2, making a total of 4 years' imprisonment.