

ENGLAND AND WALES / JUDGMENT

Hall, R. v [2026] EWCA Crim 556 (24 April 2026)

[2026] EWCA Crim 556

Source: bailii.org · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

Neutral Citation Number: [2026] EWCA Crim 556 Case No 2024/02586/B1 IN THE COURT OF APPEAL CRIMINAL DIVISION ON APPEAL FROM THE CROWN COURT AT NOTTINGHAM (HIS HONOUR JUDGE RAFFERTY) [U20241777] Royal Courts of Justice The Strand London WC2A 2LL 24 April 2026 B e f o r e : LORD JUSTICE DOVE MR JUSTICE SOOLE THE RECORDER OF THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA (His Honour Judge Edmunds KC) (Sitting as a Judge of the Court of Appeal Criminal Division)

R EX

- v - SALVADORE LEROY HALL

Computer Aided Transcription of Epiq Europe Ltd, Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1JE Tel No: 020 7404 1400; Email: rcj@epiqglobal.co.uk (Official Shorthand Writers to the Court)

Miss R Coleman appeared on behalf of the Appellant

HTML VERSION OF JUDGMENT

Crown Copyright © This Transcript is Crown Copyright. It is not to 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. Friday 24 April 2026 LORD JUSTICE DOVE: I shall ask Mr Justice Soole to give the judgment of the court. MR JUSTICE SOOLE: On 17 June 2024, in the Crown Court at Nottingham, the appellant, then aged 32, was sentenced to a total of 16 years' imprisonment in respect of five offences on two indictments. The sentences were as follows. On the first indictment, U20231777, on count 1, false imprisonment, he was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment; and on count 2, causing grievous bodily harm with intent, contrary to section 18

of the Offences against the Person Act 1861, to a concurrent term of six years' imprisonment. On the second indictment, U20230817, on count 1, possession of a prohibited firearm, contrary to section 5(1)(aba) of the Firearms Act 1968, to a consecutive term of six years' imprisonment; on count 2, possession of ammunition without a firearm certificate, contrary to section 1(1)(b) of the Firearms Act 1968, no separate penalty was imposed; and on count 5, possession of a firearm with intent to cause fear of violence, contrary to section 16A of the Firearms Act 1968, to a concurrent term of four years' imprisonment. The appellant had been convicted of the offences in the first indictment after a trial; and had pleaded guilty to the offences in the second indictment. With the leave of the single judge, the appellant contends that the sentences imposed, both individually and collectively, were manifestly excessive.

The First Indictment In the early hours of 2 April 2023, and in accordance with a prior plan, Vincent Jordan was lured by the appellant's co-accused, Olivia Williams to an address in Nottingham where he was subsequently assaulted by a group of three men, including the appellant and another co-accused, Nathan Rochester, who had arrived for the purpose. Vincent Jordan was in bed and naked. The motivation for the assault was Olivia Williams' allegations of abuse she had suffered from Vincent Jordan. By the time of these events, Olivia Williams and Nathan Rochester had been in an on and off a relationship for some time. The appellant had been recruited to the plan at a later stage. Vincent Jordan was detained in the house for about two hours during which time the three men attacked him with heavy weapons. Part of the assault was recorded on a mobile phone video. This showed Jordan badly injured and with his hands tied and bound. The video was subsequently posted to Snapchat and found on Nathan Rochester's phone. At some point Jordan managed to escape and he collapsed at a petrol station. He was bleeding heavily from his head and face. He was taken by ambulance to hospital and found to have suffered nine knife wounds, fractures to his right hand and a fractured ankle. In addition, some of his dreadlocks had been cut off during the assault.

The Second indictment The appellant was identified as a suspect and as the owner and registered keeper of a Mercedes car believed to be linked to the offences to which we have just referred. In consequence on the evening of 4 April 2023, police officers saw the appellant driving this vehicle and pursued him. In the course of the chase the appellant threw a sandwich bag out of the window which was found to contain dreadlocks. The police stopped the vehicle and the appellant was arrested. The following day a shoulder bag was found near the spot where the Mercedes had stopped. It contained a US Army issue Remington Rand .45 automatic Colt pistol. This contained a number of live rounds of automatic Colt pistol ammunition. The safety catch was set in the fire position, but there was no ammunition in the breach. The barrel was less than 30 centimetres and was therefore a prohibited weapon within section 5(1)(aba) of the Firearms Act 1968. In his sentencing remarks the judge described the false imprisonment and assault on Vincent Jordan as a revenge attack which had been planned by Nathan Rochester and Olivia Williams. He accepted that it may well have been late on that the appellant was brought into the plan, but observed that he well knew that violence was going to be used against somebody and had joined in. The judge found that it was part of the plan that Vincent Jordan should be in bed naked, so as to put him to disadvantage and unable to reach for any weapon he might have had with him. Noting that he was stabbed nine times but that none of these wounds put his life at risk, the judge concluded that the reason for stabbing him that way was to teach

him a lesson, to torture him and to frighten him that he was at risk of something worse. The filming of the exercise was done as a lasting souvenir; it showed that the assailants were enjoying what they were doing. They were singing a song to add to his torture and discomfort. By that stage he had been bleeding heavily and was barely conscious. His dreadlocks were cut in the knowledge that they were a matter of importance to him. Turning to the firearms offences, the judge observed that within days of the assault and whilst being pursued by the police, the appellant had thrown from the car one of the most dangerous firearms: "Illegal, loaded, safety off. It may be that there was nothing in the chamber but, beyond cocking the gun, ready to go". The judge made clear that it could not be said that the gun had anything to do with the previous assault; but it demonstrated that the appellant was still in the market for criminal activity by either using it himself or, as he had stated in evidence at the trial, by taking it to an unknown man in Derby for him to use. The judge took the count of false imprisonment as the lead offence in the first indictment. At that time there was no sentencing guideline for that offence, and the judge was duly reminded of the factors identified in the guideline kidnapping case of *R v Needham*

[2022] EWCA Crim 545. These comprised the length of detention; its circumstances, including location, method of restraint and any humiliating treatment of the victim; the extent of the violence used, including whether what was done might be described as torture; whether weapons were used; whether the offence was planned; whether there was evidence of particular psychological or other effect on the victim following the offence and whether the victim was vulnerable; how many people were involved; whether the offence involved demands of money from, or threats made to, others; and whether it was associated with other criminal behaviour. We interpose to observe that Vincent Jordan had not co-operated with the prosecution. He gave no account beyond that he had been "attacked by three persons with knives and poles"; and had thus given no evidence of psychological or other effects. However the prosecution contended that he had been rendered vulnerable by the plan which caused him to be naked and in bed at the time of the arrival of the assailants. As to the allied count of causing grievous bodily harm with intent, the judge concluded that it fell within category A3 of the sentencing guideline for section 18 offences. This provided a starting point of five years' imprisonment and a category range of four to seven years. The judge concluded that the appropriate sentence for both Nathan Rochester and the appellant on count 1 was ten years' imprisonment. The sentence on Olivia Williams was eight years' imprisonment. On the allied section 18 offence, the judge imposed on each of Nathan Rochester and the appellant a concurrent term of six years' imprisonment. Turning to the second indictment, there was no dispute that the pistol was a type 1 weapon. The judge identified the count 1 offence of possession of a prohibited firearm as falling within the guideline culpability category A and harm category 1. This produced a starting point of eight years' imprisonment, and a category range of seven to ten years. Further, the offence was subject to the five year minimum term provision, regardless of plea. The judge noted the appellant's previous conviction for an offence in April 2007 of possession of an imitation firearm in a public place. In

determining the sentence, the judge stated that he took account of totality and reduced the term on count 1 from that which would otherwise have been imposed. With 25 per cent credit for plea, the judge imposed six years' imprisonment, which he ordered to run consecutively to the sentence on the first indictment. He imposed no separate penalty on count 2; and four years' imprisonment, concurrent, on count 5. The Appeal The first and second grounds of appeal are that the sentence of ten years' imprisonment for the offence of false imprisonment was manifestly excessive; and that the judge should have drawn a distinction between the offending of Nathan Rochester and that of the appellant. The evidence at trial showed that Rochester and Olivia Williams had planned the offence together; and that following the offence Rochester had instructed Williams to remove and destroy evidence from the scene. There was no evidence that the appellant was involved in planning the offence or any such subsequent conduct. Unlike them, he had no motive or reason to harm Jordan; and the evidence was capable of showing that he had been recruited at the last minute. Nor was Jordan "vulnerable" within the meaning of Needham . There was no evidence that he was undressed when the applicant was present in the flat; and the video showed him fully clothed. In any event, this offence did not have many of the grave features of a kidnapping case. Further, the overall intention and motivation was to assault Jordan. For the purpose of considering the overall sentence on this indictment, the court should therefore have founded the sentencing exercise on the guideline for the section 18 offence in category A3. Combining the features of the assault and the false imprisonment, the appropriate overall sentence should have been no more than at the top of that category range, namely seven years' imprisonment. The third ground of appeal is that the consecutive sentence of six years' imprisonment for the offence of possession of a prohibited firearm was manifestly excessive. It is said that the judge should have categorised that offence as 2A, not 1A: and thus should have taken a lower starting point of seven years' imprisonment, with a category range of six to eight years. None of the harm category 1 features – "serious alarm/distress caused", "high risk of death or serious physical or psychological harm" and "high risk of serious disorder" – was present in this case. The applicant's evidence at trial was that he had been asked to take the firearm to "someone in Derby", but this was plainly with the intention that it would be used to threaten or to cause fear by another. The final ground of appeal is that the judge failed adequately to apply the principle of totality when dealing with the firearms indictment. Whilst it was accepted that a different type of offending that occurred on a separate occasion would usually warrant a consecutive sentence, in circumstances where the offending occurred two days later and was of a shorter duration, a downward adjustment should have been made to reflect totality. Miss Coleman submitted in oral argument today that against sentences of ten years' imprisonment and six years' imprisonment on the two indictments, it appeared that although the judge had stated that he had taken totality into account, he had not done so. Discussion and Conclusion We start with the first indictment. We do not consider that the judge was wrong to impose the same sentence on the appellant as on Nathan Rochester. True it is that the appellant was not involved in the planning and is taken to have been recruited at a relatively late stage.

However, he participated fully in this vicious, sustained, gleeful and deliberately humiliating brutality. We see no mitigating feature in the fact, if so, that he had no underlying reason or motive to harm Vincent Jordan. If anything, the absence of that feature only emphasises the culpability of his own conduct. Whether or not he was present when Jordan was naked, he was by this stage all part of a plan which was designed to place Jordan at a disadvantage when the attack began. In any event, the trial judge was in the best position to make the assessment of the comparative culpability of each participant. The guidelines set out in Needham were appropriately taken into account. We do not accept that the overall sentencing range should have been confined to the relevant section 18 category range. All in all, we are not persuaded that the sentence of ten years' imprisonment on the lead offence of false imprisonment was excessive. As to the second indictment, we are not persuaded that the lead offence of possession of a prohibited weapon should have been placed in category 2A. Once again the judge was in the best position to evaluate the appellant's evidence in the trial in respect of taking the firearm to Derby. With a weapon of this nature, we consider that the judge was fully entitled to reach a conclusion that the facts and circumstances established the high risks identified in category 1A. Further, in sentencing on this lead offence, the judge had to take account of the significant additional offending in counts 2 and 3. The judge was then plainly right to conclude that the overall sentence on the second indictment must be imposed consecutively to the sentence on the first. The offending was quite distinct and had to be marked by a consecutive sentence. The judge then took express account of totality, as against the sentence on the first indictment, before determining the overall sentence on the second indictment. Thus he did indeed take totality into account before reaching his final overall sentence. In our judgment a notional sentence of eight years, reduced for the guilty plea to six years, took proper and sufficient account of totality. In the result, we conclude that the overall sentence of 16 years' imprisonment for these very serious offences was not manifestly excessive. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

BAILII: Copyright Policy | Disclaimers | Privacy Policy | Feedback | Donate to BAILII

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

ORIGINAL SOURCE <https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Crim/2026/>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/england-and-wales/hall-r-v-2026-ewca-crim-556-24-april-2026>

Prepared on 24 October 2026 · Esheria