

ENGLAND AND WALES / JUDGMENT

R v Alex Constantin

Source: caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

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 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. Royal Courts of Justice IN THE COURT OF APPEAL CRIMINAL DIVISION The Strand London WC2A 2LL ON APPEAL FROM THE CROWN COURT AT BIRMINGHAM (MR JUSTICE WALL) [20BW1482624] Case No 2025/01118/B4 Tuesday 17 February 2026 Neutral Citation: [2026] EWCA Crim 265 B e f o r e: LORD JUSTICE POPPLEWELL MR JUSTICE PICKEN HIS HONOUR JUDGE MANSELL KC (Sitting as a Judge of the Court of Appeal Criminal Division)

R EX

- v – ALEX CONSTANTIN

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)

Non Counsel Application

J U D G M E N T (Approved)

Tuesday 17 February 2026 LORD JUSTICE POPPLEWELL:

1. The applicant renews his application for leave to appeal against his conviction for murder and robbery, following refusal by the single judge.
2. We have carefully considered the papers and are entirely in agreement with the reasons given by the single judge as to why there is no merit in the grounds and an appeal has no realistic prospect of success.
3. Since the case raises no issues of general importance, we do not need to set out the facts of the case which are well known to the applicant and are summarised in the Criminal Appeal Office summary, of which he has had a copy. Nor do we need to set out the single judge's reasons, of which again the applicant has had a copy.
4. Accordingly, this renewed application for leave to appeal against conviction is refused.
5. We need to address an issue about reporting restrictions. The applicant is aged 17. He will turn 18 in six days' time. In the court below a reporting restriction was imposed by an order pursuant to section 45 of the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999. The period for which it was to last was expressed in the following terms: "This order lasts until the youth reaches the age of 18. This order will last until the jury deliver their final verdict." 6. It appears from the sentencing remarks that the judge considered that the reporting restriction remained in place following the verdict. We therefore treat it as having been made to run until the applicant's 18th birthday. Following his conviction for this serious offence, and in the light of the fact that it has only six days to run, we see no good reason for maintaining such an order.
7. Accordingly, we order and make clear that there is now no reporting restriction affecting publication of the identity of the applicant in relation to the proceedings below or in this court.

Epiq Europe Ltd hereby certify that the above is an accurate and complete record of the proceedings or part thereof. Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1JE Tel No: 020 7404 1400 Email: rcj@epiqglobal.co.uk

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://caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ewca/crim/2026/265>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/england-and-wales/r-v-alex-constantin-2026>

Prepared on 24 October 2026 · Esheria