

ENGLAND AND WALES / JUDGMENT

# R v Jack Westlake

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 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. Neutral Citation Number: [2026] EWCA Crim 471 IN THE COURT OF APPEAL (CRIMINAL DIVISION) ON APPEAL FROM THE CROWN COURT AT PLYMOUTH HHJ Turner 50EL0403524/50EL0397023/50EL0414324 Case No: 202504607/A1 Royal Courts of Justice Strand, London, WC2A 2LL Date: Wednesday 1 st April 2026 Before : LADY JUSTICE MAY DBE MRS JUSTICE MCGOWAN DBE and HER HONOUR JUDGE PLASCHKES (Sitting as a Judge of the CACD)

- ----- Between : REX
- and - JACK WESTLAKE Appellant Respondent REFERENCE BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL UNDER S.36 OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT 1988
- ----- Computer Aided Transcript 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 G WHITE appeared on behalf of the Appellant MISS K CHURCHER appeared on behalf of the Respondent J U D G M E N T Lady Justice May: 1. The provisions of the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1992 apply to these offences. Under those provisions, where a sexual offence has been committed against a person, no matter relating to that person shall, during that person's lifetime, be included in any publication if it is likely to lead members of the public to identify that person as the victim of that offence. This prohibition applies unless waived or lifted in accordance with section 3 of the Act. We shall refer to the five victims in this case as V1, V2, V3, V4 and V5.

## Introduction

2. 3. 4. 5. 6. This is an application by His Majesty's Solicitor General for leave to refer a sentence under section 36 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 ("the 1988 Act") which she considers to be unduly lenient. The respondent Jack Westlake is now aged 21, having been born in September 2004. On 16 May 2025 in the Crown Court at Plymouth after a trial before His Honour Judge Linford KC and a jury, the offender, then aged 20, was convicted of the following offences under indictment number 50EL0403524 (indictment 1): two offences of sexual activity with a child, counts 1 and 2; two offences of breach of a sexual risk order, counts 3 and 4, and one offence of failure to comply with notification requirements, count 5. On 13 October 2025 in the Crown Court at Plymouth after a trial before His Honour Judge Turner and a jury, the offender, then aged 21, was convicted of the following offences under joinder indictment 50EL0397023/50EL0414324 (indictment 2): three offences of assault by penetration, counts 1, 2 and 4; two offences of rape, counts 3 and 9 and four offences of sexual activity with a child, counts 5, 6, 7 and 8. On 28 November 2025 and at a subsequent slip rule hearing on 22 January 2026, the offender, then aged 21, was sentenced to a total of nine years' imprisonment comprising a sentence of three years and six months on count 3 (indictment 2) rape, and five years six months consecutive on count 9 (indictment 2) rape. There were concurrent sentences of two years each on counts 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 on indictment 2, assault by penetration and sexual activity with a child, and a sentence of three years on count 8 (indictment 2), sexual activity with a child. Concurrent sentences of eight months' detention were passed on counts 1 and 2 on indictment 1, sexual activity with a child, and sentences of eight months, four months and one month respectively on counts 3, 4 and 5 on indictment 1, breach of a sexual risk order and failure to comply with notification requirements. There were the usual orders for notification and automatic barring. The surcharge was imposed in the appropriate sum. Facts of the offending 7. We can take the facts, which are agreed, from the Reference. The offender was between 16 and 17 years old during the offending period for indictment 2 and 20 years old at the time of the offences on indictment 1. He was 20 years old when convicted on indictment 1 and 21 years old when convicted on indictment 2. He was 21 years old at sentence. He had no previous convictions or cautions recorded against him. 8. We set out the details of each offence below but in summary, during a period between 26 January 2021 and 14 November 2024, the offender committed a total of 14 offences. Eleven offences were contact sexual offences committed against five different victims, each aged between 13 and 14 years old at the time. Two of the victims were raped and most of the offences were penetrative in nature. One victim fell pregnant and had to have a termination. The offender was aged 16 to 20 during this period. The remaining three offences related to the offender breaching his sexual risk order and notification requirements. 50EL0397013 Indictment 2 Counts 1 and 2 (V1) 9. 10. During the Covid lockdown the offender found V1 online via social media. He contacted her, quickly sent her messages intending to flatter her and turned the conversation to sexual matters. V1 told the offender that she was 13 years old early on in their communications. This did not deter him from sending her overtly sexualised messages. He convinced V1 to meet with

him. At their first meeting the offender behaved in a manner consistent with a young teen, they kissed and hugged but nothing further took place. On their second meeting the offender digitally penetrated V1's vagina against her will twice before scaring her into leaving by telling her that he wanted to have sex with her. Undeterred by her protestations and in saying that she did not have any contraception, the offender suggested V1 lay down on the alleyway floor. V1 then managed to extract herself from his company by pretending her mother was contacting her. V1 was only in contact with the offender for about a week overall but in that time his actions changed her from a bubbly, chatty, confident 13-year-old to one fraught with anxiety. She saw him once more after the offending but took friends with her. V1 managed to cut contact with the offender, who had tried to maintain contact despite being warned to stay away from her by an older friend of her brother. V1 made it clear that he should leave her alone. Counts 3 and 4 (V2) 11. 12. Not long after V1 made it clear that she did not want any further contact with him in the summer of 2021, the offender contacted V2, again via social media. The offender was originally in a group chat but began to message V2 privately. In these messages the offender told V2 he was 15, so he appeared to be closer to her age than he was. He was almost 17 at the time. The offender persuaded V2 that they were dating and they met and kissed a few times. V2 said that their kiss was nothing serious as far as she was concerned. It had only constituted a peck on the cheek between them but it soon became clear to her that he was not content just with that. On 26 August 2021 the offender persuaded V2 to meet him privately in a field. They lay next to each other and the offender got on top of V2, under the guise of play-fighting. Once he was on top of her, holding her down, he digitally penetrated her vagina against her will and then he raped her. The offender stopped midway through, probably because someone walked past. This enabled V2 to get up and away from him by pretending that her mother had contacted her. 13. In the minutes after she escaped, the offender messaged V2 threatening to throw himself off a bridge. This probably helped to ensure that V2 did not speak up and enabled him to keep in contact with her over the following days, until she realised that he was getting close to other girls as well. V2 reported the rape in March 2022. Counts 5 to 8 (V3) 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. That same summer the offender had also targeted V3 through social media. She was the younger friend of a mutual friend and within a day of speaking to her online he was asking to meet with her. V3 was vulnerable for several reasons, not just her age but she also had had a difficult background, meaning she found it hard to stand up for herself and tell other people that she did not want them to touch her. She later told the offender about these circumstances and he was therefore aware of her vulnerabilities. At their first meeting the offender penetrated V3's vagina with his fingers and again the next time they met he digitally penetrated her. V3 made it clear that she found it hard to say "no". V3 distanced herself from the offender. He had started to make her feel uncomfortable and she found out he was talking to other females too. But he resumed contact with her a few weeks later. V3 believed if she told the offender that she had difficulties in saying no to people that he might slow down his sexualised behaviour towards her. He did not. On their third and final meeting he lured V3 to an old derelict World War II bunker at Mount Wise, got her to remove her school skirt and tights and penetrated her vagina with his fingers and his penis,

ending the sexual abuse by ejaculating inside her. By now the offender was 17 years old. The next day, worried about the offender's intentions towards a similarly aged female friend of hers, V3 reported what had happened to her friend, their school and the police. The offender was arrested and interviewed. He denied that they had had sex. DNA was obtained which proved that sex had occurred. This was his first police arrest. On 11 August 2022 the police arrested and interviewed the offender again, this time about the offences against V2. He denied committing them and was released from the police station once more. Count 9 (V4) 19. 20. Fifteen days after the police interview in August 2022, the offender raped 14-year-old V4. The offender first met V4 around the time he was interviewed in relation to V2 and began communicating with her daily on Snapchat. They had met in person prior to the rape and had engaged in consensual kissing. V4 told the offender she was 14 and that at times she was unhappy in her home life. On 26 August 2022, V4 agreed to sneak out of her mother's home address late at night and meet the offender outside a supermarket. From there they walked back to his home address where he took her up to his bedroom and exactly a year after raping V2, he raped V4. The rape resulted in his ejaculating inside V4 and impregnating her. 21. The next morning V4's mother realised that she was missing from home and using a tracking app linked to her mobile telephone she traced V4 to the offender's home address. Once V4's mother and step-father appeared at his door, the offender, assisted by an older male, convinced V4 to flee the house undetected. Whilst away from the offender's home, the offender spoke to his mother on the telephone. He and his mother persuaded V4 to keep quiet about the sexual act that had taken place. Too scared to defy them, V4 played up when faced with her mother, the police and other family members. V4 was taken back to her family home by the police and treated as a found missing person. It was only when she realised that she was pregnant and required a termination that V4 spoke out about what had happened to her. The offender's response was to tell her to have a termination and he sent her pictures of him having sex with another girl. In the months that followed V4 struggled with her mental health before reporting the rape. Again, the offender was interviewed by the police and he denied the rape. 22. 23. 50EL0403524 Indictment 1 (V5) 24. 25. 26. 27. Released on police bail and also awaiting trial, the offender met and sexually abused V5, who was aged 14. He was then aged 20. By the time he met V5 the offender had been made the subject of a Sexual Risk Order that prevented him from having any contact with anyone under the age of 16. The imposition of that order did not stop his offending and the offences committed against V5 also placed him in breach of that order. On 11 November 2024 the offender was out in Plymouth when he bumped into V5 who was in the company of another school aged child that he knew. The three began talking, with the offender offering to give V5 a ride on his motorbike. As she reached for a helmet, the offender made a comment implying that he was attracted to her. Their mutual friend told the offender that V5 was only 14 years old and he responded in a way that demonstrated he had heard and understood what the mutual friend had said. As they continued to speak, the offender told V5 he wanted to see images of her breasts and bottom on the photo reel of her mobile telephone. He requested her Snapchat details and planned to meet with her again. A few days later they met and during that meeting V5 made it clear that she did not like being

touched, she was not interested in a relationship with the offender and she pointed out that she was only 14 years old, he was 20. As she suggested they leave the area they were because it was cold, the offender touched V5's inner thigh. She immediately told him to get off her, and he made the excuse that he was trying to warm his hands. The offender then asked V5 for a hug. He cuddled her from the side and grabbed at her breast. V5 pulled away. When other males appeared and looked over at them, the offender told the other males that they could look at V5 but her "ass" was his. He then dropped V5 back home. The offender later messaged V5 telling her he loved her and that she was his dream girl. He asked if she would want him to use protection if they had sex. She replied saying they would not be having sex. The next day the offender met V5 again but on this occasion her sister raised the alarm with their mother, V5 was asked to return home and the police were contacted. 28. The offender had also failed to notify the police of a change of address and his use of a new mobile telephone, the one he had used to contact V5. He was therefore also in breach of the notification requirements which applied following the imposition of the Sexual Risk Order.

29. When interviewed by the police the offender claimed he did not know how old V5 was and he denied touching her sexually. The offender was then remanded in custody after charge and that remand necessarily ceased his offending. Sentence 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. The sentencing hearing took place on 28 November 2025. There were before the court for sentence a pre-sentence report from probation, a psychological report from Dr O'Brien dated 9 October 2024 and victim impact statements from each of the five victims. The prosecution had filed a sentencing note for the assistance of the court, drawing the court's attention to the case of Ahmed [2023] EWCA Crim 281. We have read all of this material closely and carefully. The judge began by noting that the majority of the offences had been committed when the offender was under 18. He considered the seriousness of the offences, observing that the five offences of non-consensual penetrative sexual activity crossed the custodial threshold and that had the offender been before the youth court aged 17 that court would have committed these offences to the Crown Court on the basis that a sentence of "substantially in excess of two years" was likely to be imposed. The prosecution had suggested that each of the rape offences and the assault by penetration offences fell into culpability A of the relevant Sentencing Council guidelines, arguing that each of these offences had involved a significant degree of planning. The judge concluded that these were category B2 offences in the adult guideline where there is a starting point of eight years and a range of seven to nine years. The rape of V4, resulting as it had in pregnancy and termination, merited an upward adjustment, as also did the fact that the offender had been on bail at the time having been arrested for the rape of V2 just two weeks' previously. Turning to the offences of assault by penetration, the judge placed those also in category B2 in the adult guideline where there is a starting point of six years with a range of four to nine years, saying that where there were two offences that was an aggravating factor. Regarding the offences of sexual activity with a child involving V3, the judge placed these into category A1 in the adult guideline, where there is a starting point of five years with a range of four to 10 years. The last of these offences involved ejaculation, which was an aggravating factor, as

was the fact that there had been multiple offences against V3. Dealing lastly with the set of offences committed against V5 when the offender was aged 20, the judge concluded that these fell into category B3 of the adult guideline with a starting point of a medium level community order and a range of a low to high community order. However, the fact that these offences were committed whilst the offender was on police bail and in breach of the terms of the Sexual Risk Order imposed on the offender merited a "substantial upward adjustment" from the starting point, passing the custody threshold. 36. Having dealt with where in the adult guidelines the various offences fell, the judge then turned to consider the offender's mitigation. He identified the offender's age at the time of the first set of offences (16 to 17) as a substantial mitigating factor. He noted the fact that although the later offences were committed on bail the offender had not previously been convicted of any offences at all. He recorded the offender's difficult upbringing, with a period of particular instability from the age of 14 when he had gone into foster care. The judge referred to the psychology report and the diagnosis of ASD when the offender was aged 11, together with a later diagnosis of ADHD. He noted that he had seen the offender give evidence at trial, which had showed that he was "capable of thoughtful recall and insight". 37. The judge then moved to dangerousness. Probation in the PSR had assessed the offender as dangerous and the judge accepted this assessment, observing: "This was repeated offending against multiple victims, despite being on police and then court bail. You pursued girls younger than you, no doubt because they were a little in awe of you and also a little afraid. Therefore, you were more able to bend them to your wants and desires without a thought for what each of these young girls themselves wanted." 38. The judge said that he was in no doubt that the offender presented a significant risk of serious harm being caused by the commission of further specified offences. However, he went on to say that he would not pass an extended sentence explaining, "I can and do step back from imposing an extended sentence. The sentence I pass in this case is lengthy. You are still a very young man. I am of the view that a lengthy determinate sentence is sufficient in this case to meet the risk that you pose." 39. The judge structured the sentence by taking as lead offences the two counts of rape (counts 3 and 9 on indictment 2) and passing consecutive determinate sentences on those with concurrent determinate sentences on all the remaining offences. He passed a sentence of five-and-a-half years on count 9, reduced from an equivalent adult sentence of nine years and a consecutive sentence of three-and-a-half years on count 3, reduced from an equivalent adult sentence of seven years. Observing shortly that the remainder of the sentences were to run concurrently, the judge then went on to pass the sentences for the other offences which we have noted above. Submissions on the Reference

40. Miss White for the Solicitor General submits first that the judge failed to structure the sentences in such a way as to reflect the overall gravity of the offending against five separate victims. It is said that the judge misapplied totality such that the final overall sentence was not just and proportionate to the full catalogue of serious offending for which this offender was responsible. The judge should either have imposed adjusted consecutive sentences for the offending against each victim; alternatively, the lead sentences for the rapes should have

been uplifted to a greater extent than they were in order properly to reflect the other offending. 41. 42. 43. Next, Miss White says that the judge's decision to afford a reduction of 50 per cent to the equivalent adult sentence was too great a reduction. At the time of the most serious rape (count 9 on indictment 2), the offender was aged 17 years and 11 months, just two weeks off his 18th birthday. It is said that the reduction should have been tapered to reflect the fact that his offending continued into adulthood and in breach of a Sexual Risk Order put in place specifically to afford protection to the public against the risk of serious sexual offending which he represented. Lastly, Miss White argues that the judge's decision not to pass an extended sentence failed to provide sufficient protection given the persistence of the offending against five separate victims, disregarding warnings, arrest, bail and the terms of a Sexual Risk Order. In addition to that, as indicated in the pre-sentence report, the offender continued to reject any responsibility despite the jury's convicting him on all counts, all bearing badly for the prospects of successful intervention or rehabilitative work with him to reduce the risks posed. The fact that contact offences against V5 occurred despite the imposition of a Sexual Risk Order, shows that these measures did not deter him or mitigate the risks to younger girls. An extended licence period, she says, should have been imposed so as to provide a significant period of further protection to the public.

44. Miss Churcher, for the offender, draws attention to the way the judge approached the case. He made a finding of dangerousness but decided not to impose an extended sentence which was within the ambit of his reasonable discretion given the length of the sentence being imposed. She says that he had the opportunity to observe the offender at trial and he had clearly read and considered all the reports. The approach which he has adopted to dealing with dangerousness and risk was one that was within the reasonable exercise of his judgment. The applicable legal principles The court's powers under section 36 45. The principles which apply to the application of section 36 of the 1988 Act are well established. They were summarised in Attorney General's Reference (R v Egan)

[2022] EWCA Crim 1751 and are as follows: "The principles to be applied on an application under section 36 of the 1988 Act are well established and have been summarised as follows: i. ii. iii. iv. The judge at first instance is particularly well placed to assess the weight to be given to competing factors in considering sentence. A sentence is only unduly lenient where it falls outside the range of sentences which the judge at first instance might reasonably consider appropriate. Leave to refer a sentence should only be granted by this Court in exceptional circumstances and not in borderline cases. Section 36 of the 1988 Act is designed to deal with cases where judges have fallen into gross (see for example Attorney-General's Reference (Azad) [2021] EWCA Crim 1846;

[2022] 2 Cr App R(S) 10, at paragraph 72 in a judgment given by the Chancellor of the High Court." 46. It is to be noted that even where this court considers that a sentence is unduly lenient, it retains a discretion as to whether or not to exercise the power to increase the sentence. Sentencing for offences committed as a child 47. The principles to be applied when sentencing adults for offences committed as a child were discussed in joint appeals

determined by this court (Lord Burnett CJ, Sir Tim Holroyde VP CACD and William Davies LJ) in R v Ahmed [2023] EWCA Crim 281. The general principle is set out at paragraph 21: "In our judgment, the applicable principles are clear. ... There is, in our view, no reason why the distinction in levels of culpability should be lost merely because there has been an elapse of time which means that the offender is an adult when sentenced for offences committed as a child." 48. The court then dealt with a number of the possible difficulties in applying the approach from which these observations are relevant: "28. Fourthly, in a case where the sentencer must consider multiple offences by the child offender, the chronology and circumstances of the offending will sometimes (though not always) enable the sentencer to focus on the likely sentence at the time for the offending as a whole. ...

30. Lastly, where the offender has committed offences both as a child and as an adult, it will commonly be the case that the later offending is the most serious aspect of the overall criminality and can be taken as the lead offence(s), with concurrent sentences imposed for the earlier offences. In such circumstances the key considerations for the court are likely to be an assessment of the extent to which the offending as a child aggravates the offending as an adult, and the application of the principle of totality." 49. At paragraph 32 the court provided directions for courts to adopt when sentencing these cases. We include here those that are of particular relevance to the case before us: "i) Whatever may be the offender's age at the time of conviction and sentence, the Children guideline is relevant and must be followed unless the court is satisfied that it would be contrary to the interests of justice to do so. ... iii) The court must take as its starting point the sentence which it considers was likely to have been imposed if the child offender had been sentenced shortly after the offence. ... vi) the starting point taken in accordance with (iii) above will not necessarily be the end point. Subsequent events may enable the court to be sure that the culpability of the child offender was higher, or lower, than would likely have been apparent at the time of the offending. They may show that an offence was not, as it might have seemed at the time, an isolated lapse by a child, but rather a part of a continuing course of conduct. The passage of time may enable the court to be sure that the harm caused by the offending was greater than would likely have been apparent at that time. Because the court is sentencing an adult it must have regard to the purposes of sentencing set out in section 57 of the Sentencing Code. In each case, the issue for the court to resolve will be whether there is good reason to impose on the adult a sentence more severe than he would have been likely to have received if he had been sentenced soon after the offence as a child." 50. Having addressed the principles to be applied, the court went on to consider each of the individual appeals before it. Discussion and decision 51. 52. 53. The sentencing task facing the judge in this case was a particularly difficult one. In Ahmed the court noted at [30] that where an offender has committed offences both as a child and as an adult "it will commonly be the case that the later offending is the most serious aspect of the overall criminality." That was not the case here. The most serious offending in the present case was that comprised in the charges on indictment 2 committed when the offender was aged 16 to 17, albeit that he was nearly 18 when he committed the last and most serious of these offences. The offences on indictment

1, committed when he was a young adult aged 20, were serious, particularly as they were committed in breach of protective orders, but they were not at the level of severity of the earlier rapes. The most serious aspects of the offending to be reflected in sentence had therefore to be considered in accordance with the Ahmed principles. As we see it, there are two issues which really arise for our decision on this Reference. First was the total custodial period of nine years sufficiently reflective of the seriousness of all the offending, bearing in mind the fact that he was a child when most of the offences took place? Second, was the level of risk which this offender presented adequately addressed by a determinate sentence? The judge's approach to categorisation of the offences cannot be faulted. Having considered the overarching children guideline and the child specific guideline for sexual offences, he concluded rightly that these offences were too serious to result in anything but a custodial sentence, considering but dismissing a child community penalty. Having made that determination, the judge followed the guidance at paragraph 6.46 of the child guideline and step 4 of the child specific sexual offences guideline by arriving at a sentence of between half and two-thirds of the equivalent adult sentence for each offence. We commend his careful approach to the individual sentences. It follows that the sentences for the two rapes against V2 and V4 are in themselves, in our view, entirely proper sentences; indeed counsel for the Solicitor General has not sought to argue otherwise. The issue is whether the total nine years arrived at by ordering the rape sentences to run consecutively has sufficiently factored in the remaining offending in respect of which the judge passed concurrent sentences. We cannot discern from his remarks what adjustment, if any, he made to the sentences for the rape offences to take account of all the other offences against separate victims; in announcing that all other sentences would be concurrent, the judge did not explain his reasoning.

54. We have considered therefore whether the total of nine years sufficiently reflects the gravity of all the offending, bearing in mind that the gravest offences were committed when the offender was aged 16 and 17. The very significant harm resulting from his actions is evident from the victim impact statements. When thinking about his culpability, we bear in mind the observations in Ahmed (which we have set out above) to the effect that subsequent offending when adult would be relevant. Two matters strike us as of particular significance in these facts. First, the rape of V4 which happened at a time when the offender was just short of moving into adulthood and when he had just been arrested and interviewed about the rape of V2. He had had very clear warnings about his behaviour. Second, now aged 20 and despite having attended at court hearings with a trial pending on the offences against four young victims and having been made the subject of a Sexual Risk Order with conditions, the offender breached those conditions by contacting V5 and then committing sexual offences against her. Whilst these were in themselves less serious than the earlier ones, the age difference was by now much more significant: V5 was 14 and the offender was aged 20. The offender was by then more mature. He knew of conditions put in place to curb his behaviour yet went ahead anyway. These two matters appear to us to invest the earlier offending with a greater degree of culpability and significance which needed to be reflected

in the overall sentence.

55. Miss Churcher suggested in her written response that nine years was the equivalent of an 18-year adult sentence, but we disagree. Taking account of the tapering which must be considered bearing in mind the age of the offender, nearly 18 at the time of the most serious rape offence, the adult equivalent would in our view be nearer to 12 to 15 years which would be an insufficient sentence for this collection of very serious offending against five separate, young teenage victims. These same factors taken together with the severity and persistence of the offending also bear on the nature of the appropriate sentence. The judge had carefully considered all the reports and had made a finding of dangerousness. That finding was in our view inevitable. The judge did not then go on to pass an extended sentence. In this respect we think that he fell into error. The offending against young teens had continued despite warnings, court orders and, in the case of V5, the imminence of a trial. Nothing short of being remanded into custody seems to have stopped the offender's drive to obtain sexual gratification without regard to the feelings of his victims. 56. Further, after being convicted he still failed to acknowledge any responsibility for the harm that he caused to his victims and according to reports from the place where he is currently detained, he continues to do so. These were and remain highly concerning aspects of his case which in our view called for further protection than a determinate sentence, even one of some length, afforded. In the face of his persistent offending and continued denials it was just not possible to be confident that further maturation, together with targeted rehabilitation, would be effective in reducing the risk he represents. There could be no certainty of any rehabilitative work being successful in moderating or changing his behaviour. The social difficulties associated with the offender's ASD add to that concern. 57. In our view this was a case which called for an extended licence period as an additional protective measure. Reflecting on both these matters, length of sentence and type of sentence together, we have concluded that the determinate sentence of nine years passed in the case of this offender was unduly lenient. The appropriate sentence was an extended sentence of 16 years with an 11-year custodial term and a five-year extended licence.

## Conclusion

58. Accordingly, we grant leave for the Reference. We quash the sentence on count 9, indictment 2, replacing it with an extended determinate sentence of 16 years, comprising a custodial term of 11 years with an extended licence of five years. The sentence on count 3, indictment 2, will remain at three-and-a-half years but will run concurrently not consecutively. The remaining sentences and orders on both indictments will stay unchanged. 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/2026/471>

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

Prepared on 28 October 2026 · Esheria