

JERSEY / JUDGMENT

AG -v- Read [2012] JRC 004 (05 January 2012)

[2012] JRC 004

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

JUDGMENT

THE DEPUTY BAILIFF: 1. The Court has found this to be a sad case. You are a man of 30 years old of substantially good character and you are here before us for sentence on a number of drug offences which are serious drug offences. Production of cannabis is a trafficking offence and treated like an importation. It is a serious crime and what we have here is an operation that was carefully planned and clinically operated. 2. I should tell you that the Court has found the Crown's concession that this was a social supply to be surprising. It is not obvious that production on this scale would be only available for supply to your partner as quasi-medical treatment. But the Crown has accepted that and we are sentencing you on that basis. 3. We have taken into account that you have pleaded guilty; that the Crown has accepted that this is a social supply which I emphasise is being treated in the sense that it is a supply to your partner for quasi-medical reasons; that you have cooperated with police; that you are of substantially good character, and we have read carefully the references which you have put before the Court. But at the end of the day we feel that a custodial sentence is inevitable. The authorities charge us to look at a starting point of up to 2-6 years' imprisonment depending on the amount of the production which might have been possible; we have taken a starting point of 2½ years' imprisonment and we have given credit for the various items of mitigation which I have mentioned. In the circumstances we think that the right sentence on the production charge is 15 months' imprisonment. 4. I would like to add something in relation to the utensils charge which your counsel has criticised on the basis that the utensils charge is inevitable where there is a charge of production or cultivation. In the Court's view that is not necessarily the case; if one looks at the record in the future it will show that the scale of cultivation was rather more sophisticated than simply growing one or two cannabis plants in the vegetable patch outside. This was a planned, clinical operation. All the sentences on the other counts of the Indictment are going to run concurrently and we therefore are going to follow what the Crown suggests, other than the reduction on Count 1. 5. On Count 1; 15 months' imprisonment, on Count 2; 12 months' imprisonment, on Count 3; 12 months' imprisonment, on Count 5; 12 months' imprisonment, on Count 6; 1 month's imprisonment and they will all run concurrently, making a total of 15 months' imprisonment. 6. We order the forfeiture and destruction of the drugs and all the utensils and equipment. Authorities AG-v-Jeffrey 1996/2. Campbell-v-AG

[1995] JLR 136 . AG-v- MacKenzie

[2011] JRC 173A . AG-v-Hansen

[2007] JRC 055 . AG-v-Bisson

[2009] JRC 151 . AG-v-Williamson

[2011] JRC 232 . AG-v-Mills

[2009] JRC 235 . Page Last Updated: 13 Sep 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/2012/>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/jersey/ag-v-read-2012-jrc-004-05-january-2012>

Prepared on 26 October 2026 · Esheria