IN THE CROWN COURT AT MANCHESTER
R -v- PAUL QUINN

SENTENCING REMARKS OF MR JUSTICE BRIGHT
5 June 2026

Paul Quinn, you were born on 08.04.1974 and are 52 years of age. You were found guilty by the jury on four courts, for which I now sentence you:

Count 1	Attempting to Choke, Suffocate or Strangle, contrary to section 21 of the Offences against the Person Act 1861
Count 2	Causing Grievous Bodily Harm with intent, contrary to section 18 of the Offences against the Person Act 1861
Count 3	Vaginal rape, contrary to section 1(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956
Count 4	Anal rape, contrary to section 1(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956

For all four counts, the maximum sentence for the offence is life imprisonment.

The hero

It has long troubled me that our judicial system has utterly inadequate terms for the person to whom the crime is done.

We use the word “complainant”; but this sounds like a kvetch griping about a trivial grievance.

We use the word “victim”; but this sounds like someone with no agency, who merely passively endures whatever is inflicted on them and lacks the gumption to do anything about it.

Using these terms is demeaning. No crime ever feels trivial to the person affected by it. The crimes dealt with in this court are all very far from trivial. Cases like this are serious as it gets.

Moreover, anyone who supports a prosecution that is brought to trial is far from passive. It is a lengthy and demanding process that requires courage, persistence and will-power. Far from lacking agency, such people have gumption by the truckload.

Rape cases are perhaps the most striking examples of this. The people – usually women, but not always – who suffer a rape, which then results in a trial, go through a very great deal to help our judicial system. Every single one of them should be thanked and admired, unstintingly, by every single one of us.

Much has been said in the last several years about how uncomfortable our processes are for people who have endured rape, having to tell their story over and over again, to the police, to the CPS and ultimately to the jury. I am well aware that, in fact, there are, nowadays, scores of carefully trained and sensitive professionals, in the police, in the CPS, in witness support, and in several other bodies, who go to great lengths to care for and help the people affected. I wish that the excellent work they do were better publicised.

Nevertheless, it is an undeniably uncomfortable process. The people who put themselves through it are, in my view, heroic. For me, the only word for them is not complainant or victim; nor, even, survivor. It is hero.

That is how I choose to think of the woman at the heart in this case. She, not you, Paul Quinn, is the person, from this case, whom I will remember for the rest of my days. She is, truly, a hero. That is the term I use to refer to her, from this point – in part because I do not wish to use her name, but mainly because she deserves it.

Our hero gave evidence in the first trial, in 2004. That will have been hard enough, and she must have thought at the time that that particular ordeal, at least, was over and done with. But a few years ago the police had to break the news to her that it seemed the wrong man had been convicted, so she might have to go through the whole process again.

She came here and she did exactly that.

It was obvious to everyone here how excruciating she found it to come back to court a second time, and how much it took out of her. Remarkably, she gave her evidence in plain sight of you, Paul Quinn, without asking for the protection of a screen. She gave her evidence clearly, in an entirely straightforward and direct manner, with no histrionics and no obvious rancour. But every step through the courtroom to the witness box looked agonising, and she clearly suffered horribly as she retold what happened – which she did, with quiet dignity, but through a constant stream of tears. No-one who watched that can have been left unmoved.

She is a remarkable person and I say all this to give public tribute to her, and to others like her. They do not come here for vengeance, which we do not give them. They do not come expecting closure, which is a largely mythical phenomenon, especially after an event such as rape. They come because they want the truth to be heard and because they know it is the right thing to do. Without them, it would not be possible to bring the guilty ones to justice.

This is why she, far above any of the police or the lawyers or the DNA scientists, is the hero of this story.

The critical events

In July 2003, our hero was about 30 years told. It was a Friday. She finished work early that afternoon and went to her boyfriend's house. There was a small social gathering, which went on for some hours.

After it ended, she decided to walk back to her own house. This was quite a long journey – longer, I suspect, than she realised when she started walking.

The route required her to walk along Peel Lane, then along Armitage Avenue, and then along Cleggs Lane, to the bridge that passes over the M62. By the time she got to this part of the journey, she had been walking for quite a long time. It was now after 4.00 in the morning.

It must have been around this point, Paul Quinn, that you first saw her. You were walking in the opposite direction. You had been out drinking, dancing and taking drugs in Farnworth – first in the some of the pubs there, then in a club. You had gone there with a friend, but it seems that he left before you did (as he sometimes would) and you were walking home by yourself. You walked across the bridge over the M62, down Cleggs Lane and then down Armitage Avenue towards your home in Little Hulton.

By this point you were not very far from home. But you interrupted your journey, because you saw this young woman, out late at night, walking by herself.

She first became aware of you as she passed an area on Armitage Avenue with some bushes, opposite the Woodlands Hospital. She did not see you at this point but she heard someone with a voice which she described in terms similar to the way she described your voice, calling her from the bushes, threatening her and telling to come and join her in the bushes. This must have been you. And this means you must have seen her coming, got into the bushes and concealed yourself, before she got there,

She walked on. You then turned around and followed her, now walking away from your own home. We know this because two witnesses who passed twice along the road saw her, and a man following her who must have been her attacker - in other words, you – walking behind her. The first time they saw you both, you were about 30 yards behind her. The second time, you were much closer. By this point she was aware that someone was following her and she was beginning to be anxious.

She carried on walking. As she neared the bridge, you pounced. By this time, you had been following her for at least 0.9 miles – which, when a policeman later walked the same route, took him just over 16 minutes. You must have been watching her for slightly longer (from, at least, just before the moment you first hid in the bushes, waiting for her to get there). You waited until the perfect moment, when no-one else was about, and you waited until she arrived at the perfect point in the road, which you knew very well as this was where you had lived nearly all your life.

You raced at her from behind and bundled her off the road, over or through some wooden railings, and down a steep embankment, to a level grassy area which was sufficiently far from the road, and sufficiently below it, to be completely out of sight.

You dragged her through the undergrowth, wrestling with her, to get to this particular spot. You again threatened her, and took her phone off her when she tried to use it to get help. You put your hands on her neck and strangled her. She thought she was going to die. She passed out. This is the s. 21 offence in count 1.

While she was unconscious, you hit her – possibly with your hand, but your hand does not appear to have been injured, so possibly with an object. You hit her face so hard that you broke her cheekbone. It was so badly shattered that she later needed surgery. Her face is still somewhat disfigured. She sees the injury every time she looks in a mirror, and is reminded of what happened.

You removed or disarranged her clothing. At some point you had access to her breasts. You bit her left breast so severely that the nipple was partially severed and hanging loose. This caused profuse bleeding.

The injuries to her face and to her left breast give rise to the s. 18 offence. I say again, this was committed while she was fully unconscious because you had strangled her into unconsciousness.

Again, while she was fully unconscious, you raped her – not once but twice, in the vagina and in the anus.

Before she lost consciousness, she remembered you ripping her knickers. When she regained consciousness, they were completely torn and were hanging off one ankle. You had left and she could not find her phone. You appear to have taken it away, presumably to stop her from using it.

It is not clear how long she was fully unconscious. We know that she sent a text message from her phone at 04:26, from a location so close to the site of the attack that it can only have been a very few minutes before the attack occurred. We know that she regained consciousness some time before 5:30, which was approximately when, having managed, after several efforts, to get back to the top of the embankment and onto the road, she encountered an early morning dog-walker who came to her assistance.

It therefore is conceivable that she was fully unconscious for up to an hour, although perhaps about 30 minutes is a more likely upper limit, bearing in mind her evidence that she drifted in and out of full consciousness for a while, and it took her some time to get to the top of the embankment. She was certainly fully unconscious long enough for you to commit all the offending in counts 2, 3 and 4 and then get clear of the scene; so it hard to see that the period of unconsciousness can have been much less than about 10 minutes.

After she met the kind dog-walker, he took her to his house, nearby. The police were called from there at 5:40, and arrived at 5:55. It was on this occasion that our hero gave her first account to the police. Her evidence has been essentially consistent ever since, and, in the main, was not really challenged in the course of this trial.

As is well known, the attention of the police swiftly focussed on Mr Andrew Malkinson, who was the subject of the original prosecution and trial in relation to these matters. Following his conviction in 2004, he remained in prison until December 2020.

Mr Malkinson's attempts to have his conviction overturned did not gain much publicity until his release. The journalist who principally championed his cause, Ms Emily Dugan, published her first article on the subject on 13 December 2020, in The Times.

This was followed by a series of podcasts and increasing media coverage though 2021 and 2022, until Mr Malkinson's successful appeal in 2023.

The Prosecution were not able find evidence covering your activities over much of the period from 2003 to 2020. However, it is notable that cloud records of your phone activity reveals that, on 12 September 2019, you visited an old news story filed on the Manchester Evenings News website back in 2004, concerning Mr Malkinson's conviction. You were interested in that story when very few other people yet were. On the same date, you also searched for "wrongly convicted cases uk"; although very few people then thought that Mr Malkinson had been wrongly convicted.

The Prosecution case against you was primarily based on DNA evidence, which it is not necessary to summarise for the purpose of considering your sentence.

However, the Prosecution also relied on the internet searches I have just mentioned, as well as other evidence regarding your search history. They said that it demonstrated that you were aware all along that Mr Malkinson had been convicted of the offences committed on Cleggs Lane in July 2003, and that you were also aware all along that he had been wrongly convicted: because those offences were in fact committed by you.

I have no doubt that the Prosecution were right. This means that you knew not only what you had done to the woman you so savagely attacked and raped, but you also knew of the knock-on effect on Mr Malkinson.

Neither of these things appears to have troubled you at any point during the 20-plus years that have passed – not even during the trial, nor when you were interviewed by probation for your pre-sentence report.

Previous convictions

You have been convicted of 6 previous offences on 4 occasions, all when you were young.

In 1991, you were convicted of 2 offences involving sex with a 13-year old girl. You committed the offences when you were 15 or 16. You were sentenced to 180 hours' community service.

In 1993 you were convicted of arson endangering life. You set light to a plastic wheelie-bin, then placed it against the back door of your ex-girlfriend's property whilst she and her children were in bed. The back door of the house burnt through to the kitchen but, fortunately, the fire spread no further and no-one was injured. You were sentenced to 2 years in a young offenders institution.

I can see that in 1992 you were convicted of 2 offences of ABH, however I know nothing of the circumstances save that you were sentenced to a 12-month probation order and 100 hours' community service.

You incurred no convictions between 1993 and the commission of these offences in July 2003; and none since July 2003, either.

The offending under counts 1 and 2

Both Mr Price KC for the Prosecution and Ms Wilding KC for you agreed that the best approach, in principle, was to treat one of the rape offences as the lead offences, as the most serious; and to pass concurrent sentences on counts 1 and 2, with adjustments for totality.

This is undoubtedly the best and most convenient course, which I am happy to adopt. Furthermore, it is also undoubtedly correct that the two rape offences are the most serious.

However, it would not be right for the other offences to be glossed over too quickly, as if they were mere 'also-ran' items. Considered in their own right, each of them is extremely serious.

Count 1: the s. 21 offence

As regards the s. 21 offence under count 1, while it is not clear precisely how long the period of unconsciousness was, which resulted from the strangulation that you inflicted, it must have been several minutes. Furthermore, it was an unconsciousness so profound that the heroic woman you put through this remained fully unconscious, despite the extreme nature of what happened in the course of counts 2, 3 and 4. The pain involved in the injuries to her face and her breast, and in the forced penetration of her vagina and anus, must have been extreme. That she nevertheless remained unconscious throughout all this, and until some time after you had left, makes this a very unusual and serious case, within the context of s. 21.

It resulted in all the classic indications of manual strangulation – bruising to the neck and petechial bruising in and around the eyes and in other typical locations. However, the reality is that the woman who I say is a hero is very lucky she did not die, and luckier still that she did not suffer significant brain damage, given the oxygen deprivation that must have occurred, in order for such long-lasting and profound unconsciousness to have resulted.

You were not charged with attempted murder, and I have no doubt that you had no intention to kill. However, you were unquestionably reckless, in the sense of paying no heed whatsoever as to the very obvious risk that what you did might cause death (or very serious and long-lasting injury).

There is no sentencing guideline applicable to the s. 21 offence. However, I was helpfully taken to a number of relevant authorities, including *R v Enstone* [2002] EWCA Crim 1375 (where the victim was not quite rendered unconscious and a sentence of 6 years was upheld), as well as the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Northern Ireland in *R v Stewart* [2020] NICA 62 (which emphasised the extremely dangerous nature of such offending). In addition, I have considered *R v Woodbridge* [2018] EWCA Crim 1537 (where the sentence after trial would have been 15 years, but that case involved considerably more planning and the s. 21 offence was the lead offence and was sentenced as such, so the sentence on that count was increased for totality).

I consider this a serious case of the s. 21 offence class, and the strangulation that was effected was extreme, as was the unconsciousness that it caused. Taken in isolation – i.e., if you had committed it intending to rape, but had not then gone on to commit rape or any other offence – and considering matters without regard to aggravating features such as your extreme intoxication at the relevant time, my sentence would have been 12 years.

Count 2: the s. 18 offence

As regards the s. 18 offence under count 2, I again find it helpful to consider this if approached in isolation – i.e., on the basis that injuries to the face and left breast were committed with intent, but as if you had not committed the other offences.

The fact remains that these injuries were intentionally inflicted on a woman who lay on the ground, unconscious and completely defenceless. They were serious injuries by the standard of the offence (albeit not the most serious), which have resulted in permanent scarring, as described in the victim personal statement read to the court. They were inflicted on someone who was utterly vulnerable.

The offending falls into category A2 for the purposes of the sentencing guideline, with a starting point of 7 years and a range of 6 to 10. It follows that, if considered in isolation, and without regard to aggravating features, my sentence would have been 7 years.

The two rape offences

It is convenient to deal with the two rape offences together, i.e., counts 3 and 4; albeit I will ultimately have to reflect that this case involves two rape offences, not merely a single one.

They were necessarily charged as offences under the 1957 Act, not the 2003 Act, but the current sentencing guideline is nevertheless informative and relevant.

As regards harm:

- This incident has unquestionably resulted in severe psychological harm.
- The injury to the left breast constituted additional degradation/humiliation. You wanted to leave your mark on her, which you did by inflicting a severe injury to one of the most intimate parts of her body.
- There was an element of abduction, in that you deliberately bundled her off the road and down the embankment to a location where you would not be seen or disturbed.
- It is unclear how long the rapes lasted. For that reason, I do not treat this as a prolonged incident, albeit it must have lasted for more than mere moments.
- It was unusually violent, even by the standard of stranger rapes.

As regards culpability:

- The Prosecution have suggested that there was significant planning. I do not quite accept this in direct terms, as it seems unlikely that the idea of committing rape occurred to you much before the incident in the bushes.

- However, turning away from home, and pursuing someone for almost a mile, indicates commitment to the idea once it formed, and persistence. It seems that, from that moment, you knew exactly where you should make your move.
- In considering culpability, I find it impossible to ignore the significance of the s. 21 offence. Raping someone who has first been strangled into unconsciousness, in the extreme way that you did, with the specific intention of then committing rape, is a very distinct manifestation of culpability – even if not one that is canonically recognised in the sentencing guideline.

In saying this, I of course recognise that it is important not to double-count, by adding to the rape counts to reflect totality when I have already had regard to the other counts 1 and 2 when assessing harm and culpability.

Ultimately, both counsel accepted that the two rape offences should be treated as falling into category A1, with a starting point of 15 years and a range of 13 to 19 years.

I consider that the gravity of the harm caused and of your culpability are a long way above the norm for an offence of this kind. I therefore would consider a sentence significantly above the starting point, even before considering the effect of other aggravating factors and of totality (there being two rape counts, as well as counts 1 and 2).

Harm to Mr Malkinson

One unusual feature of this case is that, while the person most directly affected by the offences was the woman you attacked so viciously and raped, there have also been dire effects on Mr Malkinson.

The Prosecution say that I should increase the sentence to reflect the harm done to him. The Defence say that this would be unfair: his wrongful conviction is not attributable to anything you did or said, but to the mistakes made by the police and/or the CPS and/or the scientists previously involved.

It is not for me to venture any opinion as to what mistakes were or were not made in relation to Mr Malkinson. However, I find myself unable to ignore the extraordinary circumstances involved, from your perspective. As I have explained, it is utterly clear that you knew, throughout, that another man had been arrested, charged, convicted and imprisoned. You knew that his conviction was wrongful. You also knew that it was extremely useful to you. It must have preyed on your conscience that another man was in prison, in effect serving your sentence; it certainly should have preyed on your conscience. But you were only too willing to sit back and take advantage of his misfortune.

It is true that you never did anything positive to implicate Mr Malkinson. However, but for your offending, he would never even have been questioned. But for the care with which you made sure there was no evidence connecting you to the scene, and that your shirt was disposed of, he would never have been suspected, because the police would readily have identified the true culprit. But for your decision to allow his trial to unfold, and his conviction to stand, he would not have remained in prison for the period he did.

It would be entirely wrong to compare the indirect evil that you have done to Mr Malkinson with the direct, physical evil that you have done to the heroic woman who suffered at your hands that night. I do consider your conduct to both of them evil, and the harm done to both of them must be reflected in your sentence.

Factors increasing seriousness

The previous convictions for sexual offences are somewhat concerning, but not really comparable.

The arson conviction is more concerning, because it indicates a complete disregard for the risks caused to others – so there is a resonance with the s. 21 offence for which I now sentence you. However, I recognise that the arson offence occurred a long time before these offences, when you were (I think) 18 or 19.

Of more immediate significance are the following factors:

- First, our hero's vulnerability. She was a lone woman
- Second, timing. This happened in the dead of night
- Third, location. The precise place of the initial attack, and of the spot where you then committed the offences, was a matter of careful selection
- Fourth, you took the mobile phone in order to prevent her from calling the police or otherwise getting help
- Fifth, in fact, when you left her, she was still unconscious and obviously seriously injured, in an isolated spot where no-one would come to assist her. You effectively left her for dead. If she had not come to and then managed to make it to the top of the embankment – which she found difficult – she would have died.
- Sixth, you disposed of evidence. Your shirt went missing after this night, presumably because it was bloodstained. The evidence on this point from your ex-wife was very compelling and I am certain that it counted heavily with the jury
- Seventh, intoxication. In your police interview you accepted that you would have been drinking heavily, and probably also taking cannabis and/or speed and/or ecstasy. When you went out on these clubbing evenings, you did so with the express intention of getting drunk and high, and then having sex. You were described by one witness as obviously "off his head"

As already indicated, I will also have to increase the sentences on the two rape counts, to reflect the fact that there were two rape offences, and to reflect totality in general (subject to all the points already made about not double-counting, in so far as they have been taking into account).

Personal mitigation

You have been diagnosed with Pulmonary Sarcoidosis, which will require treatment and monitoring whilst you are in prison. However, this is not a reason for not imposing a custodial sentence.

I have read the important and useful letter from your current partner, Lisa Palmer, who speaks very well of you, at least over the period she has known you. I have also read the similar letters from your niece and from your father.

It is always good for the court to be reminded that any sentence that is passed does not affect only the person in the dock. It also affects everyone in their immediate family circle.

However, this cannot and does not deter me from imposing significant custodial terms for all these offences. That is, simply, the unavoidable consequence of criminal conduct of this kind. The fact that this will have dreadful consequences for others, perhaps especially Ms Palmer, is nobody's fault but yours.

Your apparent good conduct since 2003, or at least since 2017

Your counsel has very correctly emphasized to me that you have had no convictions since 2003. You have acknowledged that you had involvement in the production of cannabis – you received a caution in 2013 and in your interview by probation you accepted involvement in a cannabis grow in 2016.

However, the real force of all this is that your life changed significantly after about 2017. Until that point, your lifestyle continued unaltered, going out at weekends looking to get intoxicated and have sex. Indeed, in some respects it worsened, because you developed a serious cocaine habit. However, in 2017 you appear to have belatedly grown up. You moved away from Manchester, essentially left your old habits behind and formed a new relationship with, which appears to be stable, and healthier.

Ms Wilding KC has drawn my attention to the Sentencing Council's guideline on historic sexual matters, which states that an absence of further offending over a long period of time, especially combined with evidence of good character, may be treated by the court as a mitigating factor. She has also directed me to *R v H (J)* [2012] 1 WLR 1416 at [47], which is to similar effect.

I acknowledge this, but such matters require careful attention to the context. The Sentencing Council's guideline also notes that, the more serious the offence, the less the weight that should be attributed to this factor.

Furthermore, I fully accept that it is often salutary for the court to know how the defendant has behaved since the date of the offence, because this may well provide good evidence of the defendant's character: if the offending behaviour was anomalous or a blip, that is useful information and very often leads to a different approach when sentencing. Furthermore, defendants sometimes can be seen to have taken charge of themselves, in response to the offence and/or the resulting investigation, which often shocks them into making spontaneous efforts to alter the way they live and behave. This too is important when sentencing.

The facts here are quite different. You may not have committed any further rapes since 2003, but your behaviour continued to be poor for a very long time; indeed, in some respects – your burgeoning cocaine habit – it got worse. I see no sign

whatsoever that you have ever repented of what happened that night in July 2003. Rather, the lengthy passage of time that has followed simply allowed you, eventually, to become a little older and wiser. This happens to almost everyone. It is not an indication of anything unusual or particularly creditable.

Furthermore, in inviting me to ignore your unchanged lifestyle up to 2017, but give credit for the way you changed your ways thereafter, Ms Wilding KC is effectively asking me to give credit for a process that took place over the years while you were out of prison and Mr Malkinson was serving his sentence. You were only able to develop in the way that you did because you sat back and enjoyed your liberty, at the expense of another, innocent, man. In reality, Ms Wilding KC is asking me to reduce your sentence for something that only happened because you managed to evade justice for so long – and at someone else's expense. I cannot accept this submission.

However, I do accept that your altered lifestyle and behaviour are relevant to the assessment of dangerousness, which I turn to next.

Dangerousness

The Prosecution have suggested that the offending in this case was so serious that I should impose a life sentence.

If you had been charged shortly after July 2003, and I was sentencing you as a 29 or 30 year old man whose future was still unwritten, I might well have acceded to this suggestion.

However it is here that your altered lifestyle, since 2017, really assists you. I cannot say that I consider you will present a significant risk of serious harm to the public for the whole of the rest of your life.

However, assessing exactly what risk you will present, and for how long, is difficult.

You are a cause for concern, primarily because of the incredibly grave circumstances of these offences. However, I am also troubled by your general behaviour over a long period of time, which involved deliberate, frequent intoxication, an attitude that you were entitled to sex from others (you boasted in interview of never having any trouble getting women to have sex with you, giving the impression that you expected it of them) and periodic episodes of loss of temper and violence, generally directed towards women (as with the arson offence, and some alleged incidents of domestic abuse directed at your ex-wife).

I asked for a pre-sentence report specifically because it was obvious that I would need to assess your dangerousness, and that this was likely to be troublesome. It is significant, and a matter for concern, that the probation service officer who interviewed you and provided the report clearly also finds this difficult. This is because your stance remains that you deny committing the offences. That is, by definition, not a stance I can accept, but it means that, as you appear before me today, you remain apparently without remorse or regret and you appear to have no readiness to tackle and address the causes, characteristics and circumstances that led to the offending.

I have to consider what, if any danger you will present to the public, when released from prison. In all the circumstances, I consider that you will present a significant risk of serious harm – not indefinitely, but for a period of some years. This is a case where an extended sentence is justified and necessary. In assessing its duration, I have in mind your age, and the age you will have reached at the date of your release and at the date of the completion of the custodial term.

My sentence

Taking the two rape counts as the lead offences, I will impose the same sentence for each. The sentence for count 3 and for count 4 will be as follows:

- There will be a custodial element of 21 years. I recognise that this is above the normal guideline range, even for a rape in the A1 category, but I consider this unavoidable given the extreme and unusual circumstances of this case.
- Added to this is an extension period of 3 years, on account of dangerousness.
- This makes a total of 24 years

As already indicated, the sentence on count 1 is 12 years.

The sentence on count 2 is 7 years.

The sentence on each count is concurrent with the sentences on the other counts.

The effect of this sentence

I have imposed a total sentence of 24 years. You will serve two-thirds of the custodial period in prison – in other words, 14 years – before the Parole Board will consider whether it is safe to release you, and if so on what terms.

The time that you have served on remand will count towards this. I have been told that it is agreed that this comes to 633 days.

Following your release, the remainder of the sentence will be served on licence in the community. You must comply with all the conditions of your licence, failing which you will be at risk of recall to prison to serve the remainder of the term in custody.

Ancillary orders

I certify that you have been convicted of a sexual offence so that you must, for an indefinite period, keep the police informed at all times of your personal particulars, the address at which you are living and any alteration in the name you are using. You will be given full details of these requirements on a form at the end of this hearing.

The offence of which you have been convicted is one which will make you subject to barring from working with children or others for an indefinite period. You will be told of the restrictions under the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006 by the Disclosure and Barring Service.