

R
-v-
Erik Feld

Central Criminal Court
Sentencing Remarks of Mr Justice Bryan
14 June 2023

1. Erik Feld, you have been found guilty of the murder of Ranjith Kankanamalage, and I must now sentence you for this horrific, and abhorrent, murder.
2. When I make factual findings in these sentencing remarks I am satisfied so that I am sure of such facts having presided over your trial and seen the overwhelming evidence against you.
3. In the early hours of 16 August 2021 Ranjith Kankanamalage was walking in the Tower Hamlets Cemetery Park in East London which is both a park and a graveyard. It is very secluded at night being neither lit, not benefitting from CCTV. There are extensive areas of trees and dense undergrowth interspersed with gravestones. Your own view of the park, as you recounted to the jury, was that it was a creepy, gothic and monochromatic place at night. That no doubt fitted in well with your fantasies and the opportunities it presented in order to carry those fantasies into effect.
4. The park is frequented by a variety of people at night, some just passing through to or from night shifts, others for drinking, for drug taking, and also as a place where men go to meet up socially and (in certain parts of the park, though not the part where the offence occurred) as a venue for cruising, a pattern of behaviour whereby men meet each other for casual sexual encounters during the hours of darkness. I have no doubt that you would have known that there would have been people in the park for one or more of those reasons on any night. I am satisfied that why they were there did not matter to you. In particular it was not a matter of significance to you what the sexuality of those in the park was. Rather you knew that there would be individuals in that park even late at night for purposes of their own, and which would provide an opportunity for you to carry out your own, and very different, purpose.
5. Ranjith Kankanamalage had the severe misfortune to encounter you in that park that night. Why he was there will never be known, and I am not in a position to make any factual findings in that regard. I am satisfied, however, that you were not in the park for any of the purposes for which it is well known. Rather you had gone to that park equipped with a claw hammer with the intention of hammering to death any man who you might randomly encounter, knowing that there were likely to be potential victims in the park at that time.

6. On the evidence of the forensic pathologist, Dr Chapman, you hit your victim to the head with a claw hammer at least 12 times in what was clearly a frenzied attack. At least 3 of those were severe blows requiring severe force to be used. Such blows shattered the victim's skull and penetrated through the coverings of the brain to the brain itself. On the unchallenged medical evidence, any one of those blows would have immediately rendered your victim unconscious, and have taken him to the ground, before causing death, yet it is clear that you continued to deliver at least two more such murderous blows, all three blows being fatal in their own right.
7. Sadly, it is all too clear that such blows were not the first blows inflicted upon your victim due to the defensive injuries to your victim's hands and arm. He must therefore have suffered terribly as you wielded your hammer, and as he tried, in vain, to shield his head from your murderous blows (further evidence that you were the aggressor) no doubt increasingly realising what fate awaited him.
8. You invented a cock and bull story that you had the hammer with you to strike trees in the park to help you sleep and relieve your tensions, and were acting in lawful self-defence in killing Mr Kankanamalage in a contrived defence case statement having offered no reply in interviews (despite knowing you were in that park that night, equipped with a hammer and had killed Mr Kankanamalage), such story being invented after you were notified of the fact that there had been a one in one billion match to your DNA under Mr Kankanamalage's fingernails (left, no doubt, as he fought for his life).
9. Mr Kankanamalage was unarmed, and meant you no harm. He did not attack you and I reject your suggestion that you feared an attack. Nor could the force used by you ever have been regarded as reasonable, and the jury rightly rejected your incredible account. This was not, in any event, a case of excessive self-defence but of a murderous assault perpetrated by you as the aggressor throughout upon an innocent and defenceless victim.
10. I have to consider whether the murder was aggravated by hostility related to sexual orientation. In the circumstances I identify below, I do not consider (and certainly could not be sure) that the murder was aggravated by hostility related to sexual orientation and I do not consider (and certainly could not be sure) that at the time of committing the offence, or immediately before or after doing so, you demonstrated towards Mr Kamkanamalge hostility based on his presumed sexual orientation (see Schedule 21 paragraph 2(1)(a)(g) and Section 66 of the Sentencing Act 2020). The prosecution agree, as they made clear in both their Note for Sentence and in Mr Cavin KC's oral opening for sentence today.
11. Whilst at your trial you expressed deeply offensive homophobic comments (as evidenced by your bigoted outbursts whilst being cross-examined) I do not consider that you targeted your victim by reference to hostility related to their sexual orientation or that you demonstrated at the time of committing the offence or immediately before or after doing so a hostility based on your victim's presumed sexual orientation, for reasons that will become apparent.
12. A time came when you encountered Mr Kankanamalage in the park. If he engaged with you at all, and I cannot be sure about that, I have no doubt he would have approached in a

perfectly friendly manner and engaged you in conversation. That seems consistent with all I know of him from what I have heard including in the victim personal statements, and indeed would accord (in this limited respect) with your own account. He may or may not have touched you on the shoulder whilst so engaging (there is only your word for that), but you encountering Mr Kankanamalage, who was behaving in a perfectly friendly way, was all that was needed for him to be selected by you as your victim, something you had been steeling yourself to do since you entered the park that night, having gone off a path into dense undergrowth to (as you put it), “challenge yourself”, coming out to encounter Mr Kankanamalage.

13. The reason I am satisfied that this was not a murder aggravated by hostility relating to sexual orientation, and that at the time of committing the offence or immediately before or after doing so you did not demonstrate towards the victim hostility based on his presumed sexual orientation, is because that night you carried into effect your long-held, and deeply disturbing, fantasy to kill a random stranger with a hammer be that stranger male (or indeed female) and regardless of their sexual orientation (whatever that might be). It is clear that the sexual orientation of your victim played no part whatsoever in such fantasies, or in the appalling videos of real footage of people (mainly males) being hammered to death that it was found you regularly accessed on your mobile phone.
14. As far back as 2016, when you were in a secure mental institution (having been transferred there from prison), you confided to your treating psychiatrist, Dr Minoudis (in the context of the preparation of a report for a Mental Health Tribunal), that *“I used to go out with a hammer, screwdriver or razor blades, hoping to catch someone unawares- down alleyways.... I would just kill them and leave them...At the time I was regularly... looking at people through windows and following some on the street, feeling envious/jealous when I saw couples and sometimes going out with a weapon (eg: a hammer) in case an opportunity presented itself.”*
15. Whilst the reference to killing them and leaving them (precisely what you did on the night in question) had not at that stage been carried into effect, I have no doubt that this was a candid admission that you had, indeed, previously gone out equipping yourself with a hammer with the hope that an opportunity would present itself whereby you could catch a stranger or strangers unawares and kill them. What is more, and for you to be making such admissions, and expressing such fantasies in 2016, your associated conduct, and associated fantasies, clearly pre-dated 2016.
16. When your mobile phone was successfully accessed following your arrest (notwithstanding your refusal to provide the PIN), the police not only found Google searches including “FBI definition of a serial killer”, “murder footage” and “murder videos”, but that you had visited numerous webpages with associated thumbnails and videos consisting of real-life graphic, and extreme, footage of people actually being murdered, the vast majority of which involved people being hammered to death.

17. A police officer viewed the thumbnails and the videos and concluded that they were actual footage (usually from CCTV footage or filmed on mobile phones) of people being murdered, including by hammer attack to the head. Such footage, and such thumbnail photos, were too graphic to show to the jury. However the titles of the webpages speak for themselves (as they would have to you, and to the jury). It would be inappropriate to identify the particular website that you frequented on numerous occasions between 16 July 2021 and 13 August 2021 using the search term “hammer”, and which produced the thumbnails and videos, but it suffices to recount some of the (less) graphic descriptions which included, “Hammer to the Head Murder Ends Discussion”, “Death by Hammer Back of Head” and “Female Bludgeoned to Death with Hammer”. Whilst the jury had the descriptions and pixelated thumbnails (too graphic to be viewed), even some of the descriptions (from 13 August 2021, and so only 3 days before the murder) had to be summarised in general terms given the truly appalling, and depraved, conduct being described. It would not be appropriate to set out such actual descriptions. How anyone could seek out, and watch, such material beggars belief. Shockingly such material is not confined to the dark web but is readily viewable from an ordinary Google search on the open web.
18. You also had a tendency to collect hammers, not for DIY use (despite your claims), but as part of your unhealthy fascination with hammers, and with a view to their use as weapons of assault. As you said to the jury by reference to what you had told Dr Minoudis and the question, “why hammers”, you viewed them as being “easy to come by, easy to use”. When first arrested, two photographs of you brandishing a claw hammer were found on your phone. The photo was taken by you in December 2020. That claw hammer has never been recovered. You told the jury you disposed of the claw hammer you used to kill Mr Kankanamalage in the rubbish at your flat. When arrested on 20 August 2021 two days after the murder (in fact for affray and possession of an offensive weapon when you brandished a further claw hammer at a security guard in a Poundland store, a claw hammer that you had only purchased that day), your flat was searched and two sledge hammers and two mallets were discovered (and confiscated). When arrested again on 21 January 2022 after you had been forensically linked to the victim by your DNA, a further hammer and a cut throat razor were found by your bed.
19. The jury also heard that whilst on remand at HMP Belmarsh you wrote a note which you gave to a supervising prisoner officer who passed it to the Governor in which you stated, amongst other matters (and by reference to other prisoners you were coming into contact with), “They’re triggering my moods that lead to my index offence (a random killing) committed against an unknown man”.
20. I am in no doubt whatsoever that your killing of someone in the park that night was both premeditated and preplanned, and you attended the park that night deliberately equipped with a claw hammer concealed in a bag not to hit trees but to carry into effect your long held fantasy to follow, attack, and kill a random stranger with a hammer, choosing to go so equipped to a park at night where you knew that there would be potential victims a plenty.
21. Mr Kankanamalage had the misfortune to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. As I have already noted there is evidence of defensive injuries and it is clear that he fought for his life. The terror that he must have faced as he realised his fate as he was attacked by you

armed with a claw hammer at night, and in a secluded location with no one to come to his aid, does not bear thinking about.

22. No one can but have been moved by the victim impact statements that have been read out today. His daughter describes Mr Kankanamalage as a very kind person who was very friendly with anyone he met – sentiments that are echoed in the statements from his friends in England who described him as a “very caring, gentle, kind [and] understanding” man, who was “very calm, quiet, respectful, and very kind” and who “hated confrontation, always giving people space to talk, without judging them”, a “beautiful, gentle, generous and caring soul”. Mr Kankanamalage came to England to further his education, already having been well educated, and with a view to becoming an accountant. He was in England to ensure that his former wife and children in Sri Lanka had the best life possible, and he sent a large part of his earnings back to them to ensure that.
23. All those who met him in England, including John with whom he was in a civil partnership for a time, speak highly of him. His three friends in England are all in touch with his family in Sri Lanka and have provided them with emotional and financial support. The dignity with which his family and friends have attended throughout the trial is in sharp contrast to your own behaviour during your evidence, including to his friends who attended in the public gallery only to receive abuse from you.
24. Unsurprisingly your selfish, callous and abhorrent actions played out to fulfil your own perverted fantasies have had a devastating effect on his family and friends both mentally and in the case of his family financially. Nothing can bring Mr Kankanamalage back, but I hope his family’s faith, and the sentence that I pass upon you today will give them closure safe in the knowledge that you will be in prison for decades and may in fact never be released on licence.
25. You are now 38. You are not of previous good character and have a number of relevant convictions. In this regard in 2012 you pleaded guilty to sexual assault, battery, possession of an offensive weapon and criminal damage. All these offences were committed on 26 June 2011 and took place on the London Underground. About 3.20pm on 26 June you grabbed a woman’s breast at the exit to Stepney Green station. Then about ten minutes later on an eastbound District line train you brandished an axe at passengers, pushing it into their faces and threatening them. Around 3.45pm, on a different eastbound District line train, you sprayed black paint on your face and then sprayed the word “Kill” on the carriage window. Other passengers were frightened by your actions. You alighted at Bromley by Bow station, then tried to force your way back onto the train. When police arrived you were banging your head and shouting profanities.
26. Only 2 days after the murder you visited a Poundland shop in east London on 18 August 1991. A security guard approached you suspecting you of shoplifting. There was a short argument then you left. You returned to outside the shop shouting, “Come out!”, producing a claw hammer from your rucksack and lifted it above your head threateningly, whilst shouting. On 19 August 1991 you pleaded guilty at East London Magistrates Court to offences of affray and possession of an offensive weapon.

27. I have before me a post conviction, and very detailed, psychiatric report from a Dr Stephen Attard who interviewed you before trial in April and May 2022, and after conviction for one hour by video-link on 5 May 2023. I have had very careful regard to that report. I have also had careful regard to the Sentencing Offenders with Mental Disorders, Developmental Disorders, or Neurological Impairments (the “Guideline”).
28. It is clear from Dr Attard’s report that you have a well-established diagnosis of personality disorder (both from self-reporting and the documentary information available), which is a characteristic and enduring pattern of inner experience and behaviour from the cultural norm, that is manifest in a number of areas of functioning, is pervasive, inflexible and maladaptive and is long origin in childhood, being considered severe in degree. Severe personality disorder is often associated with harm to self and others.
29. Dr Attard identifies that in terms of specific personality traits or characteristics, with regard to dissocial personality traits, in your case there is evidence that you derive feelings of self-esteem from power over others and there is an absence of prosocial internal standards. You display clear impairments in interpersonal functioning including in empathy, showing a lack of concern for feelings, needs, or suffering of others. There is a lack of remorse after hurting or mistreating others including animals (which you have previously maltreated – for example buying a kitten so as to kill it) and people which is particularly apparent in your description of the murder itself and an inability to sustain mutually intimate relationships. You experience persistent angry feelings, irritability in response to perceived slights and a low tolerance of frustration. There is also strong evidence of traits of an avoidant personality disorder including low-self esteem. In addition there is strong evidence of the presence of emotionally unstable personality disorder such as your frequently expressed belief that you are better than others. Dr Attard has not seen clear evidence in the contemporaneous records to suggest that you would meet the diagnostic criteria for schizoaffective disorder. That being said there is clear evidence of you having numerous perceptual abnormalities, over a period of many years, that could be psychotic in nature which appear to particularly coincide with times of stress. Dr Attard is of the opinion that your psychotic symptoms are best conceptualised within the context of your severe personality disorder.
30. Dr Attard is of the view that there was evidence to suggest that you were suffering a severe personality disorder when you murdered Mr Kankanamalage. He states that whilst dynamic and amenable to change, in your case the severity of your personality disorder was such that, after years of treatment, including within a secure personality disorder unit, the manifestations of your disorder likely remained present at the material time. The evidence from the contemporaneous medical records “is suggestive of [you] appearing relatively stable in the months both prior to and after the index offence” however at interview in 2022 you described experiencing a deterioration in your mental state and functioning at that time within the context of increased stress. Whilst you had not taken antipsychotic medication for two years prior to the murder, there is no evidence to suggest that you were acutely psychotic when you murdered Mr Kankanamalage.

31. While there is evidence from the documentary information to suggest that you were stable and indeed progressing at the time of the alleged index offence and there was no abnormality in mental state noted when assessed by Liaison and Diversion services on multiple occasions in the days following the index offence, you self-report struggling emotionally during that period and experiencing an escalation in behaviours, such as watching violent content online, viewing pornography and harming animals.
32. Within the context of what you characterised as worsening stress in the months prior to the alleged index offence you described an escalation in grievance thinking and thoughts of violence. In the past such an escalation in grievance thinking and fantasising about violence has accompanied your experience of stress. Dr Attard considers it of note that you were not taking antipsychotic medication and it has been commented historically that with medication there was a reduction in your experience of stress, the intensity of perceptual abnormalities and your preoccupation with violent fantasies. Dr Attard is of the opinion that this was likely the result of antipsychotic medication having a positive effect on your emotional dysregulation and ability to manage feelings of stress and distress, rather than treatment of frank psychotic symptoms. Dr Attard considered it important to note that you had been without antipsychotic medication for a period of two years and had progressed to low support and then independent accommodation over that time while apparently functioning relatively well in terms of daily living activities.
33. As the Guideline makes clear culpability may be reduced if an offender is at the time of the offence suffering from an impairment or disorder (which includes a personality disorder). Culpability will only be reduced if there is sufficient connection between the offender's impairment or disorder and the offending behaviour. In some cases, the impairment or disorder may mean that culpability is significantly reduced. In other cases, the impairment or disorder may have no relevance to culpability. What is necessary is to make a careful analysis of all the circumstances of the case and all relevant materials when considering whether your culpability is reduced which I have done.
34. In this regard the Guideline helpfully identifies a useful starting point to be to ask the questions identified in the Guideline. I have had regard to all such questions, however I consider the following to be of particular relevance:-
- “At the time of the offence did the offender's impairment or disorder impair their ability:
- to exercise appropriate judgement,
 - to make rational choices,
 - to understand the nature and consequences of their actions?”
35. I am greatly helped in this regard by the conclusions of Dr Attard at paragraph 243 of his report where he concludes:
- “243. In considering the above, it is likely that Mr Feld was experiencing a period of instability at the time of the index offence as a result of increased psychosocial stressors. The manifestations of his personality disorder were likely significant in regard his behaviour at the material time including his ability to exercise appropriate judgement, make choices and consider the nature and consequence

of his actions, **albeit not to a degree that substantially impaired his ability to understand the nature of his conduct, form a rational judgement or exercise self control.**” (emphasis added)

36. In such circumstances, and having heard all the evidence in the trial, and bearing in mind all that I know about you, whilst there was a reduction in culpability such reduction was only limited and certainly not significant not least given that the matters identified were not to a degree that substantially impaired your ability to understand the nature of your conduct or to form a rationale judgment or to exercise self-control.
37. I reject the submission that your disorder significantly reduced your culpability, and reject the submission that although your condition did not give rise to a defence of diminished responsibility the circumstances fell not far short of that.
38. In this regard I am satisfied that you understood perfectly well the nature of your conduct and that it was wrong to equip yourself with a hammer and to go out with the intention of killing a random stranger, that you retained the ability to form a rationale judgment as to just how wrong such conduct was, and I am satisfied that your ability to exercise self control was not substantially impaired. Rather, in such circumstances, you formed a deliberate intent to go out and carry into effect your long held fantasy to kill a random stranger for your own gratification.
39. There is only one sentence that the law allows to be passed for the offence of murder, that is a mandatory sentence of imprisonment for life. I am, however, required to specify the minimum term, pursuant to Schedule 21 to the Sentencing Act 2020, which must elapse before you can be released on licence.
40. Under paragraph 2(1)(a) if the court considers that the seriousness of the offence is exceptionally high then the appropriate starting point is a whole life order. That is not suggested in this case. Equally, and as is common ground, this is not a case where the starting point is elevated to 30 years, the murder not being aggravated by hostility in relation to sexual orientation (paragraph 2(1)(g) and at the time of committing the offence or immediately before or after doing so, you did not demonstrate towards the victim of the offence hostility based on the presumed sexual orientation of the victim (see section 66).
41. I agree with the prosecution and the defence that the appropriate starting point is one of 25 years in accordance with paragraph 4 of Schedule 21 given that you brought the hammer to the scene intending to commit an offence.
42. Turning first to the aggravating features of your offending:-
- (1) There was, I am satisfied, a very significant degree of planning and premeditation (a statutory aggravating factor – paragraph 9(a) of Schedule 21). As already identified there was evidence that your interest in hammer murders went back a number of years and that this was not a pure fantasy in that you had acted on that interest in the past, leaving home armed with a hammer (or other weapon) and looking for a victim to kill.

There was also evidence of your extensive viewing of horrific videos of hammer murders (including in the period immediately before the murder), as well as a fascination in the possession of hammers for offensive purposes (that you were prepared to use), culminating in you choosing to go out, at night, to a location where you knew that potential victims would be present (in a secluded and dark place) having first equipped yourself with a hammer and concealed it in a bag, so as to maximise your chances of carrying into effect your intention to murder a random stranger. I reject the submission that your personality disorder negates or reduces to any significant effect this aggravating factor in the circumstances that I have identified above. I am satisfied that you understood perfectly well the nature of your conduct and that it was wrong to equip yourself with a hammer and to go out with the intention of killing a random stranger, that you retained the ability to form a rationale judgment as to just how wrong such conduct was, and I am satisfied that your ability to exercise self control was not substantially impaired. Rather with such understanding you formed a rationale judgment to attack and kill a random stranger to carry into effect your long held fantasy to do so and that in that regard there was a very significant degree of planning and premeditation. Such very significant planning and premeditation necessitates and requires, in of itself, a substantial increase from the 25 year starting point.

- (2) There was extreme violence used in the killing (including a number of brutal blows to the head with a claw hammer each of which would be fatal), but I also have no doubt, as has already been identified, that Mr Kankanamalage suffered before death as evidenced by the clear evidence of defensive injuries (so the fatal blows were not the first struck). It matters not whether both ends of the claw hammer were used – each is capable of inflicting horrific injuries to the skull and brain, and such injuries were caused. There is, however, evidence that at least some of the wounds were consistent with being caused by the round head whilst others were consistent with being caused by the claw end. This was on any view a frenzied attack with but one object – to kill your victim, and to do so in a violent and horrific manner smashing Mr Kankanamalege's skull with a hammer and inflicting unsurvivable injuries as bone fragments from his skull were driven into his brain.
- (3) The attack was on a stranger in a public park, and a stranger who was vulnerable in the sense that Mr Kankanamalage was a solitary figure alone at night in a secluded park in the hours of darkness with no means to defend himself against attack and with little prospect of anyone coming to his aid if attacked.
- (4) You have relevant previous convictions (as already identified). I do not consider that they can simply be explained away by reference to your personality disorder. They remain serious relevant offending.

43. Such aggravating factors necessitate and require a very substantial increase from the 25 year starting point.

44. Other than your personality disorder there is very little by way of mitigation. Your intention was to kill not to cause really serious harm, and there is also a lack of remorse (albeit I view that, to an extent, through the prism of your personality disorder). You also knew perfectly well that you had murdered Mr Kankanamalege but that did not stop you causing additional pain and suffering to his family and friends by suggesting he was the attacker and that you were acting in reasonable self defence a preposterous suggestion that was rightly rejected by the jury. Nor can your personality disorder fully explain away your wholly inappropriate rant in the course of your cross-examination almost treating yourself as the victim by having the misfortune to come across Mr Kankanamalege. You have never apologized for your conduct even in the cold light of day and having had time to reflect upon your offending and the devastating impact on those around Mr Kankanamalege.
45. The only real mitigation, such as it is, is your personality disorder. In this regard Schedule 21 paragraph 10(c) of the Sentencing Act 2020 identifies, as possible mitigation, “the fact that the offender suffered from any mental disorder or mental disability” which “(although not falling within section 2(1) of the Homicide Act 1957) lowered the offender's degree of culpability”. I have already addressed your personality disorder in detail above. As there identified I consider that whilst there was a reduction in culpability such reduction was only limited and certainly not significant not least given that the matters identified were not to a degree that substantially impaired your ability to understand the nature of your conduct or to form a rationale judgment or to exercise self-control.
46. In this regard I am satisfied that you understood perfectly well the nature of your conduct and that it was wrong to equip yourself with a hammer and to go out with the intention of killing a random stranger, that you retained the ability to form a rationale judgment as to just how wrong such conduct was, and I am satisfied that your ability to exercise self control was not substantially impaired. Rather, in such circumstances, you formed a deliberate intent to go out and carry into effect your long held fantasy to kill a random stranger for your own gratification.
47. I reject the submission that your disorder significantly reduced your culpability, and reject the submission that although your condition did not give rise to a defence of diminished responsibility the circumstances did not fall far short of that. That is a brave submission, and one that is untenable on the evidence that I and this jury have heard.
48. I confirm that I have made an appropriate downwards adjustment from the substantially raised starting point to take account of your mitigation such as it is. I have also borne in mind that prison will not be easy for a person with your personality disorder but there are available prisons, programs and medication suited to your traits as identified by Dr Attard at paragraph 245 of his report and no doubt such matters will be given careful consideration by the prison authorities when considering where you will serve your sentence.

49. I am informed that you have spent 508 days on remand. Your days spent on remand count to reduce the minimum term. If the figure I have been given is inaccurate any correction can be applied administratively, and I so direct.
50. The sentence I pass upon you for the murder of Ranjith Kankanamalage is life imprisonment with a minimum term of 28 years less 508 days, that is life imprisonment with a minimum term of 26 years and 222 days.
51. It is important to emphasise, so that you and the public can understand the position, that the minimum term is just that - a minimum period which cannot be reduced in any way. After it is served, there is no guarantee that you would be released at that time, or at any particular time thereafter. It is then only if the Parole Board decided that you were fit to be released that you would be released (after which you would remain subject to licence for the remainder of your life). It is in these ways that a life sentence protects the public for the future. I direct that a copy of my sentencing remarks be provided to probation and accompany you to prison so that, in due course, the Parole Board are fully apprised of the circumstances of your offending, and the risks that are posed to the public by you.
52. The victim surcharge is imposed in the appropriate sum.