

JERSEY / JUDGMENT

AG v Atkinson and Others

[2007] JRC 090 (30 April 2007)

[2007] JRC 090

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

JUDGMENT

THE COMMISSIONER: 1. This sentencing hearing relates to offences which took place in Jersey between February and November 2006. The total value of the drugs imported at street level prices was £209,520, of which, £154,520 relates to cannabis and £55,000 to heroin. There are three Indictments with certain individuals appearing in more than one Indictment. We summarise the facts first. First Indictment 2. Taking the First Indictment, as this covers a number of separate incidents, we deal with the facts by reference to each of the Counts. (i) Count 1 - conspiracy to fraudulently evade the prohibition of the importation of drugs. This Count involved James Fitzgerald. On 10 th March, 2006, an unknown quantity of cannabis resin was imported into the Island concealed within a spare tyre of a vehicle. Mr Fitzgerald admitted in interview that he had received 5 kilos from a consignment which had been imported on that date, not in one go, but on a number of drops over a period of time, and he had been asked to sell it. He admitted receiving a total of £16,000 from which he retained £1,000 and he passed on the balance on the basis of instructions received by him. This consignment, which Mr Fitzgerald admitted receiving and distributing, would have had a wholesale value of between £15,000 and £20,000, and a maximum street value of £28,800. (ii) Count 2 - assisting another to obtain the benefit of drug trafficking. This Count involved Philip Clare. Mr Clare assisted Mr Fitzgerald by transferring two sums totalling £5,400, given to him by Mr Fitzgerald from the proceeds of drug trafficking, into the account in the UK of an Edmond Atkinson, the husband of the co-accused Karen Atkinson. The Crown accepts that it was on the making of the second payment that Mr Clare first suspected that these monies were the proceeds of drug trafficking and he stands to be sentenced on that basis. (iii) Count 3 - charges in relation to motor vehicles involving Mr Clare. Following the arrest of Mr Clare and on his being granted bail on 30 th August, 2006, the Police attended at the pier head at the Albert Quay after a report of suspicious behaviour and found Mr Clare on the driver's seat of a white Ford Fiesta with the keys in the ignition. The engine was cold. The Police formed the opinion that Mr Clare was under the influence of alcohol. Mr Clare provided a breath test the lowest reading of which was 108 micrograms of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath. He claimed in interview that he had no intention to drive. (iv) Count 4 - conspiracy to fraudulently evade the prohibition on the importation of drugs. This Count involved Mrs Atkinson, Mr Fitzgerald, Cedric Smith and Philip Goldstone. On 23 rd March Mrs Atkinson and a Bernard Gyimah, who has yet to

stand trial in relation to this matter, arrived in Jersey and booked into the Pomme D'Or using the same credit card for their expenses. The Police had placed audio equipment in Mrs Atkinson's room and monitored and recorded all of the conversations. She met Mr Fitzgerald and Mr Goldstone (the latter staying at the Pomme D'Or for one night using the same credit card) both in her room and at various pubs in St Helier. Various money transfers were made during this period. The transcript of the conversations in her room left no doubt that they related to drug trafficking. It is the Crown's position, as set out in detail in its case summary, that she was an organiser or facilitator for the conspiracy, her function being to have meetings with the local principals and collect money from them. Mr Fitzgerald's position in the conspiracy was to act as the Jersey link. His role was to meet up with Mrs Atkinson and go and collect the drugs once imported. He was also instructed when and where to send money. He was to distribute the cannabis once it had arrived. The Crown accepts that he did know how much cannabis he was to be entrusted with and that he should be sentenced on the basis that it would not have been more than 5 kilos, the amount he admitted receiving on the earlier occasion. Mr Goldstone's part in the conspiracy was limited to introducing Mrs Atkinson to Mr Fitzgerald for which he received £500. The Crown accepts that he did not know or have any contact with the co-accused Cedric Smith who carried out the importation. That importation was carried out on 31 st March, 2006, when Mr Smith arrived in Jersey on the Condor Vitesse driving a blue Ford Focus Zetec. He was stopped and a search revealed that he had 10 kilos of cannabis secreted in the spare wheel of his car. The Jersey wholesale value of that amount of cannabis was between £30,000 and £40,000 with a street value of £57,600. Mr Smith had on him the Western Union collection receipt for the sum of £500 transferred to him by Mr Gyimah on th March, 2006. When interviewed he denied any knowledge of the drugs and could offer no explanation as to how they got there. As to the receipt he said that Mr Gyimah owed him money but could not explain why it should have come to him from Jersey. Mr Fitzgerald, Mr Smith and Mr Goldstone pleaded guilty to this Count but Mrs Atkinson pleaded not guilty and was subsequently convicted by unanimous verdict of the Jury at an Assize held on 19 th March, 2007. (v) Counts 5-8: - driving without due care; uninsured; without a license and failing to provide a specimen. These Counts all involve Mr Goldstone. On 17 th March, 2006, after Mr Goldstone had been sentenced by the Royal Court to 12 months probation and 240 hours community service for importing 5.6 grams of cocaine, which we will come to later, he was observed drinking heavily at the Dog and Sausage public house in the company of Mr Fitzgerald. He was then seen to leave with another man and drive his VW camper van erratically, including going through a red light. He then crashed the vehicle into the wall of St Saviour's Parish Hall and hit another vehicle causing minor injuries to the driver. The accident caused £1,500 worth of damage to the wall and the other car, valued at £2,950, was written off. The Crown has not been requested to pursue any claim for compensation. Mr Goldstone refused to provide a sample of breath for analysis. The next day he admitted the offences but claimed he couldn't remember anything about the incident. He was presented to the Magistrates Court in relation to these offences on 20 th March, when he was given bail on condition inter alia that he did not leave the Island. (vi) Counts 9 and 10 - attempting to stow away and unauthorised presence in a restricted area. These Counts involve Mr Goldstone. On 15 th May Customs and Immigration Officers discovered Mr Goldstone and his girlfriend hiding behind the rear seats of his Land Rover, which

was being driven by two other men, prior to embarkation on to the ferry. Mr Goldstone did not have a ticket and when he was found the car was in the restricted area of the Port. He has subsequently informed the Probation Officer that he needed to go to St Malo to pick up a car he had left there, which was going to be driven back by one of the two other men. His bail was subsequently rescinded and he was remanded in custody. The Second Indictment. 3. This involved Mr Fitzgerald, Daniel Hennessey, Mark Shaw and Donald Goodman and concerns one incident. On 6 th May, 2006, Mr Hennessey, Mr Shaw and Mr Goodman arrived in Jersey on the Condor ferry. Mr Shaw and Mr Hennessey were foot passengers and Mr Goodman came in his blue BMW. 12 kilos of cannabis was secreted in the fuel tank. This quantity of cannabis would have had a wholesale value of £36,000 to £48,000 and a street value of £69,120. Whilst Mr Hennessey met up with Mr Fitzgerald, Mr Goodman and Mr Shaw went to the Victoria Inn car park where they removed 10.5 kilos of cannabis from the petrol tank. Packages containing the cannabis were wrapped in tape and beeswax. They then went to the Mountview Hotel where in their room they cleaned up 3 kilos of cannabis. Having completed this operation they met Mr Fitzgerald at the Don Inn from where they walked together to the Mountview Hotel. Mr Fitzgerald had agreed to pay £3,000 per kilo for the cannabis. The Police then observed Mr Goodman and Mr Fitzgerald lean into the boot of Mr Goodman's car and Mr Goodman place 3 kilos of cannabis into a carrier bag held by Mr Fitzgerald. The Police moved in and found the remaining 7.5 kilos in a holdall in the boot of the car. The subsequent search of the car revealed a further 1.5 kilos of cannabis still in the petrol tank. Mr Fitzgerald has admitted meeting Mr Goodman and Mr Shaw at the Don Inn and agreeing to pay £3,000 per kilo for the cannabis he collected from the car, but not any involvement in the importation and the Crown accepts he is to be sentenced on that basis. The Crown accepts that Mr Hennessey is to be sentenced on the basis that his role in the importation was to introduce Mr Goodman and Mr Shaw to Mr Fitzgerald. He knew that the importation involved what he thought was 10 kilos of cannabis. He was to be paid for his part but was not an organiser. Mr Shaw admitted his part in the importation, namely that he was employed to remove the cannabis from the petrol tank and clean it. Mr Goodman has similarly admitted his part in the importation. He had collected the cannabis in the beeswax and placed it in the petrol tank of his car. He had given Mr Shaw the money for the ferry ticket in Epping and Mr Shaw had booked the ferry. The Third Indictment 4. This involved Mr Smith and Khazara Khan and again concerns one incident. On 15 th November, 2006, Mr Smith and Miss Khan travelled to Jersey on the Condor Clipper and checked into the Sandranne Hotel. From there they went to the Bella Italia restaurant. They were under Police surveillance and because the Police were concerned that drugs had been transferred at the restaurant they moved in separating the two defendants. The Police found a sausage shaped package wrapped in two sanitary towels beneath the seat where they had been sitting. On analysis the package was found to contain 55.47 grams of heroin and 3.80 grams of cannabis resin. The heroin had a wholesale value of between £8,000 and £11,000 and could provide 11,000 street deals worth £55,000. The cannabis had a street value of £15 to £20 and was considered a personal quantity. In Interview Mr Smith admitted paying for the tickets but replied "no comment" to all pertinent questions on the importation of the drugs. Miss Khan confirmed she was a heroin user, but denied being involved in importation and provided "no comment" responses to questions put to her. On two occasions she was seen to

put her fingers into her vagina and she tried to destroy her knickers, inferring, in the view of the Crown, that she was aware of the possibility of forensic evidence linking her to the importation. In the Crown's view her actions were therefore aimed at destroying such evidence. Both defendants subsequently pleaded guilty. Policy of the Courts 5. Before turning to the sentences to be imposed on each defendant it is worth reiterating the policy of the Courts and the role they have in suppressing the evil of drug trafficking which has the capacity to wreck havoc with the lives of individual abusers and their families. The learned Bailiff when delivering a Judgment of the Court of Appeal in *Campbell -v- AG*

[1995] JLR 136 stated as follows on page 144: "We desire to make it absolutely clear what is the policy of the Courts in this jurisdiction in relation to the sentencing of offenders who import or deal in drugs on a commercial basis. That policy is that offenders will receive condign punishment to mark the peculiarly heinous and antisocial nature of the crime of drug trafficking." As will be seen we have had proper regard to that policy in the sentences we are about to impose. Sentences Mrs Atkinson 6. We now take the defendants in turn and start with Mrs Atkinson. We accept the view based on the Crown's detailed submissions that Mrs Atkinson was an organiser and a facilitator, overseeing the importation of just under 10 kilos of cannabis which occurred on 31 st March, 2006. The transcript showed her discussing inter alia large sums of money and sending sums to the UK. There were numerous conversations as to how large sums of money were to be shared out and what her other entitlements would be. 10 kilos is at the top end of the first band in the Campbell guidelines or at the bottom end of the second band. The Crown correctly view her involvement in drug trafficking as high, and thus have placed her in the second band, and have taken a starting point of 8 years. Mr Hopwood argued that as the precise weight of the cannabis was 9.61 kilos she came within the lowest band, band C, of the Campbell guidelines, and thus 6 years was the maximum starting point suggested under those guidelines unless there were exceptional circumstances. We reject that very precise approach to what are guidelines. When dealing with quantities which are close to the top of one band and the bottom of another the Court must have the flexibility to range between those bands in a manner which it feels properly reflects the involvement in drug trafficking of the particular defendant. In our view taking into account the involvement of Mrs Atkinson the appropriate starting point is, however, 7 years. She does not have the benefit of a guilty plea or of youth. She does, however, have the benefit of a clean record and is therefore of good character. We have considered the Social Enquiry Report, the references that have been provided and the submissions of her Counsel. Mrs Atkinson you are sentenced on Count 4 of the First Indictment to 6 years' imprisonment. Mr Fitzgerald 7. I now turn to Mr Fitzgerald. This defendant stands to be sentenced in relation to Counts 1 and 4 of the First Indictment and Count 6 of the Second Indictment. On the factual basis put forward, and which is accepted by the Crown, Mr Fitzgerald was to take possession of, and distribute, 13 kilos of cannabis arising out of three distinct importations. He was also involved in the collection and forwarding by bank transfer, or money gram, the proceeds to principals in the UK. We agree that we should follow the approach of the Royal Court in

AG -v- Gaish

[2006] JRC 109 and fix concurrent sentences, and that, taking into account the total amount of the drugs and the nature and scale of his repeated involvement, and applying the Campbell guidelines, the appropriate starting point is 8 years. We accept that in view of the historical nature of his record he should be treated as a man of good character. In terms of his guilty pleas he was caught receiving the cannabis from Mr Goodman, and the plea to Count 6 of the Second Indictment was therefore inevitable, but he is entitled to credit for the guilty pleas in relation to the First Indictment and in particular in relation to Count 1. He was co-operative in interview, although initial full and frank admissions were subsequently diluted, or diminished, through instructions provided to Counsel. We have considered the Social Enquiry Report, the Alcohol and Drug Service Report, the character references and the submissions of his Counsel. Mr Fitzgerald taking the First Indictment on Count 1 you are sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment, on Count 4 you are sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment, concurrent, on the Second Indictment on Count 6 you are sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment, concurrent, which gives a total of 5 years' imprisonment. Mr Clare 8. Mr Clare played a limited and specific, but important role in assisting Mr Fitzgerald transfer the proceeds of drug trafficking out of the jurisdiction. We agree that such assistance constitutes a serious offence, as it is through such assistance that those involved in the business of drug trafficking seek to receive the financial profits derived from their illegal activities. There are no guidelines for offences of this sort which are not susceptible to a starting point. Mr Clare went on to commit a further offence, whilst on bail, albeit of an entirely different nature and we agree with the Crown that his sentence for this further offence should be consecutive. Mr Clare is of good character but he does not have the benefit of youth, he is 47. He was co-operative at interview and pleaded guilty. We have considered the Social Enquiry Report and the references and the submissions of his Counsel. We are conscious that he has been on bail since May 2006 and that there has been a substantial delay during which time no offences have been committed. He is of course to be sentenced on the basis of the second payment only and he received no reward for his involvement. Mr Clare the Court agonised over how it should deal with you but on balance it has decided to spare you prison. You will be sentenced as follows: on the First Indictment, Count 1, you will serve 180 hours of Community Service, which is equivalent to 12 months' imprisonment; on Count 3 you will serve 50 hours of Community Service, consecutive, and that's equivalent to 1 month's imprisonment, consecutive. You will therefore serve Community Service of a total of 230 hours, or 13 months' imprisonment by way of equivalent sentence. We must warn you Mr Clare that we have given you an opportunity and if you, in any way, fail to complete the Community Service, or are in breach of its terms, you will be brought back to this Court where you will almost certainly be sentenced to the sentence of imprisonment which we would otherwise have imposed upon you. Mr Goldstone 9. I now turn to Mr Goldstone. Mr Goldstone has admitted being a party to the conspiracy to illegally import just under 10 kilos of cannabis which importation occurred on 31 st March, 2006. His role was to

provide the link, or introduction, between the English principal, Mrs Atkinson, and the Jersey principal, Mr Fitzgerald, for which he received £500. We agree with the Crown that the importance of this role should not be overlooked. It was an essential link in the chain that enabled the importation to go ahead. It also shows, in our view, that he was close both to the source of supply from the UK and the means of distribution in Jersey, although his involvement was a step below that of Mrs Atkinson. We note that the Crown have sought a starting point, for his level of involvement, of 7 years, which is one year less than that sought for Mrs Atkinson. In our view the appropriate starting point, taking into account Mr Goldstone's involvement, is 6 years. 10. Mr Goldstone also stands to be sentenced for the driving and other offences comprised within Counts 5 to 10 of the First Indictment. Dealing first with the motoring offences, we note that in relation to Count 6 this was his fifth offence of such nature and, as the Crown correctly point out, it is an aggravating factor that the motoring offences were committed on the very day the Royal Court released him on probation for the cocaine charge of 17th March, 2006. 11. Moving to the quite separate stow away charges, Counts 9 and 10, these were committed in clear breach of his bail conditions. We are prepared to accept the Crown's submission that they should be treated concurrently to the motoring offences, having regard to the totality principle. 12. By way of mitigation Mr Goldstone does not have the benefit of youth, he is 45, and he has a bad record including four drugs offences. On the other hand, he has the benefit of guilty pleas. The Court has considered the Social Enquiry Report, the Alcohol and Drug Service Report, the references, the other documents before the Court and the submissions of his Counsel. 13. Before turning to sentence, we want to deal with the Attorney General's representation and the fact that the offences to which Mr Goldstone has now pleaded guilty were committed in breach of the Probation and Community Service Orders imposed upon him by the Royal Court on 17th March, 2006, in relation to the importation of 5.6 grams of cocaine for personal use. The facts of that case are set out in a Judgment of the Royal Court and we will not repeat them here, suffice it to say that in passing sentence the Court indicated that the sentence of imprisonment it had considered passing was 18 months. In giving Mr Goldstone the opportunity that a Community Service Order represents, the Court expressly warned him that in the event of any breach there would only be one outcome. On that very day he went out and committed the motoring offences and he then involved himself in the conspiracy to illegally import just under 10 kilos of cannabis before attempting to stow away on the car ferry. Counsel has referred us to the case of *Graham -v- AG*

[1996] JLR 270 and we have considered whether we should, in our discretion, give credit to Mr Goldstone for the period he spent on remand prior to being sentenced for that matter, but we have no hesitation in agreeing with the conclusions of the Crown in this respect, namely, that he should serve the full 18 months. 14. Mr Goldstone your sentence as follows: on the First Indictment, on Count 4, you are sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment; on Count 5 you will be fined £300 or 1 month's imprisonment in default, concurrent to Count 4; on Count 6 you will be sentenced to 6 months' imprisonment, consecutive to

Count 4; on Count 7 you will be fined £500 or 6 weeks' imprisonment in default, concurrent to Counts 4 and 6; on Count 8 you will be sentenced to 4 months' imprisonment, concurrent to Counts 4 and 6; on Count 9 you will be fined £1,000 or three months' imprisonment in default, concurrent to Counts 4, 6 and 8; on Count 10 you will be fined £1,000 or three months' imprisonment in default, concurrent to Counts 4, 6, 8 and 9. In terms of the Attorney General's representation and the Count of cocaine possession you will be sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment, consecutive, and we revoke the Probation and Community Service Orders. You will therefore serve a total of 4 years' imprisonment, together with fines of £2,800 with appropriate sentences in default. Mr Hennessy 15. Mr Hennessey provided the link between the couriers, Mr Goodman and Mr Shaw, and the local distributor, Mr Fitzgerald. As with Mr Goldman we regard this as a vital and essential link in the chain that enabled the importation to go ahead. It shows that he was close both to the source of the supply from the UK and the means of distribution in Jersey. We agree with the Crown, however, that his level of involvement is a step below that of someone like Mrs Atkinson who was an organiser and facilitator. The Crown has submitted a starting point of 7 years but in our view 6 years more properly reflects his involvement. By way of mitigation he does not have the benefit of youth, he is 32, and he has a bad record, including two drug related offences for possession with intent to supply cannabis. He does, however, have the benefit of a guilty plea. We have read the Social Enquiry Report, the references and have considered the submissions of his Counsel. Mr Hennessey on the Second Indictment, Count 1, you are sentenced to 3½ years' imprisonment. Mr Shaw and Mr Goodman 16. I now turn to Mr Shaw and Mr Goodman who we take jointly. The Crown has taken these defendants together as they both fulfilled the role of courier and there is little to distinguish them. We agree that applying the Campbell guidelines and taking into account their level of involvement, 6 years is the appropriate starting point for both. By way of mitigation neither have the benefit of youth, Mr Shaw is 32 and Mr Goodman is 70, and neither is of good character. We have accepted that old age can be a factor to be taken into account but we are not prepared in the case of Mr Goodman to do so in order to reduce what we would otherwise have sentenced him to. We have read both Social Enquiry Reports and considered the submissions of both of their Counsel and, of course, the references which were handed up to us. Mr Shaw and Mr Goodman you are each sentenced on Count 1 of the Second Indictment to 3½ years' imprisonment. Mr Smith 17. Mr Smith was involved with two separate importations of illegal drugs worth £112,000 in which he fulfilled the role of courier. The method involved in the importation on 31 st March was sophisticated and we agree it would not be inappropriate to describe him as a professional courier. Taking the importation of cannabis first, and applying the Campbell guidelines, it is our view that 6 years is the appropriate starting point to reflect his involvement. In relation to the heroin importation, the relevant guidelines are to be found in Rimmer -v- AG

[2001] JLR 148, which gives a sentencing band of between 9 and 11 years for quantities of heroin between 50 and 100 grams. With regard to those guidelines it is our view that 9 years is the appropriate starting point in relation to this offence. Mr Smith does not have the benefit of youth, he is 56, and he has a bad record. Any credit for his guilty plea is diluted by the fact that he was caught on both occasions and really had little alternative but to plead guilty. He was not co-operative with the Police. We have read the Social Enquiry Report and the references and, of course, we have listened to the submissions of his Counsel. We do not regard the reported threats of violence as affording any mitigation, and note the irony of the assertions of Miss Khan that she herself was threatened by Mr Smith. As the Crown says such violence is an inevitable part of the antisocial and dangerous world of drug trafficking. We agree with the Crown that we should take each of the cannabis and heroin importation offences separately and then assess the total. On Count 4, therefore, under the First Indictment, that is the importation of the cannabis, we would impose a sentence of 4 years. In relation to the importation of heroin, that is Count 1 of the Third Indictment, we would impose a sentence of 6½ years. This gives rise to a total under those two Counts of 10½ years and applying the totality principle we are going to reduce that to 8½ years. Mr Smith you are therefore sentenced as follows: under the First Indictment, Count 4 you are sentenced to 3½ years' imprisonment; under the Third Indictment, Count 1, you are sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment, consecutive; on Count 2 you are sentenced to 1 month's imprisonment, concurrent; which gives a total of 8½ years' imprisonment. Miss Khan 18. Finally, we turn to Miss Khan who assisted Mr Smith by concealing the drugs on her person. She maintains that she was led to believe by Mr Smith that the drugs were cannabis. She asserted that whilst initially friendly Mr Smith became more threatening to ensure her compliance. Applying the Rimmer guidelines we agree with the Crown that 9 years is the appropriate starting point. A guilty plea, as with Mr Smith, was inevitable. She was not co-operative with the Police and apparently attempted to destroy forensic evidence. She does, however, have the benefit of her age, she is 23, although against that she has a bad record. In terms of her belief that she was importing cannabis, we can do no better than quote from the Judgment of the Court of Appeal in Rimmer when Mr Southwell said: "In our judgment, a courier who knowingly transports illegal drugs must be taken to accept the consequences of his actions. As the Attorney General put it, the moral blameworthiness is the same, whatever the nature of the drugs transported. Furthermore, viewed from the perspective of the community, the evil consequences flowing from the dissemination of Class A drugs are not mitigated in the slightest by the erroneous belief of the courier that he was transporting a Class B drug. There may be very exceptional circumstances in which a genuine belief that a different drug was being carried might be relevant to sentence. But in general we endorse the Royal Court's view in the case of Campbell that an erroneous belief as to the type of drug being carried is not a mitigating factor." We have read the Social Enquiry Report, the Psychological Report of Doctor Wade, Miss Khan's letter, the report from the Alcohol and Drug Service and the submissions of her Counsel. We are conscious that she has had a very troubled and abusive background and we note the very positive progress she has made in custody.

Notwithstanding the very serious nature of the offences we do feel able to reduce, by a small amount, the conclusions by way of encouragement to her. We also hope that she will take advantage of the opportunities that are clearly available to her while she is in custody. Miss Khan on the Third Indictment, on the First Count, you will be sentenced to 4 years' imprisonment; on the Second Count you will be sentenced to 1 month's imprisonment, concurrent; which gives rise to a total sentence of imprisonment of 4 years. 19. We order the destruction and forfeiture of the drugs contained in the Second and Third Indictments. 20. We would also like to mention all of the Police Officers, and indeed Customs Officers, involved in this investigation, who are to be commended for their dedication and hard work in providing the evidence which enabled these Defendants to be brought before the Court. And finally whilst we are grateful to all Counsel for their submissions, which indeed we are, we feel it appropriate to express our thanks to Crown Advocate Gollop for his very clear presentation of the facts before the Court and for his comprehensive sentencing bundle. Authorities Campbell -v- AG

[1995] JLR 136 . AG -v- Gaish

[2006] JRC 109 . AG -v- Goldstone

[2006] JRC 043 . Graham -v- AG

[1996] JLR 270 . Rimmer -v- AG

[2001] JLR 148. Page Last Updated: 20 Jul 2016 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/je/cases/UR/2007/>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/jersey/ag-v-atkinson-and-others-2007-jrc-090-30-april-2007>

Prepared on 28 October 2026 · Esheria