WARNING: reporting restrictions apply to the contents transcribed in this document, because the case concerned is a sexual offence. Reporting restrictions prohibit the publication of the applicable information to the public or any section of the public, in writing, in a broadcast or by means of the internet, including social media. Anyone who receives a copy of this transcript is responsible in law for making sure that applicable restrictions are not breached. A person who breaches a reporting restriction is liable to a fine and/or imprisonment. For guidance on whether reporting restrictions apply, and to what information, ask at the court office or take legal advice.

This Transcript is Crown Copyright. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part other than in accordance with relevant licence or with the express consent of the Authority. All rights are reserved.

IN THE COURT MARTIAL

held at

MILITARY COURT CENTRE, BULFORD

on the

9th day of September 2026

in the case of

REX

V

30379637 – Lance Corporal Terry DEADMAN

10 Queen's Own Gurkha Logistic Regiment

JUDGE ADVOCATE

Judge England

Assistant Judge Advocate General

SENTENCING REMARKS

JUDGE ADVOCATE: Lance Corporal Deadman, you can remain seated for now.

Having pleaded guilty before this court, for which you will get the requisite credit, it now remains for us to sentence you for one charge of disgraceful conduct of an indecent kind, and the facts of that offence can be briefly put.

On 24 July 2025, [Name Redacted]was in the corporals' mess bar socialising, as were you. You were not friends, indeed you barely knew each other, but for some reason you targeted her that night. You

made her the subject of unwanted attention throughout the night. She made it clear to you at every stage that she was married and not interested in you, but you persisted.

It started when she was listening to a voice note or a voicemail, and you came very close to her and put your head in to try to listen to it as well, which she thought was weird because she barely knew you. Later on, you grabbed hold of her hand and repeatedly kissed it, stopping her from pulling away from you. When she did get away, you subjected her to abuse.

You made sexual comments to her, asking her if she was shagging another service person. She said that she was not and she was happily married. You then said that she should leave her husband for you and told her the sexual things that you wanted to do to her. Later on, you approached her from behind, put your hands round her waist and kissed her on the cheek. All unwanted behaviour and all of which she made very clear to you was unwanted.

You then tried, in effect, to claim her, announcing to other people that they should keep away from her because, "She is mine." Later, she had gone back to the accommodation block. She should have been free from further harassment, but she was in a friend's room. You were banging on the door loudly, repeatedly, and shouting that she was a whore and a slag, that she was both scared and fuming. You threatened to punch her husband's head in and to do the same to her and, effectively, you had to be manhandled away.

You will have heard the prosecutor read out parts of the victim's personal statement and it is clear that there has been an impact on [Name Redacted]. Accusing a married person of having an affair, even when there is absolutely no foundation to it, almost inevitably leads the other spouse to question why somebody might be suggesting that their partner is having an affair. Also, almost inevitably, such behaviour by a male towards a female colleague causes the female colleague, and perhaps other females in the unit, to have trust issues. How are their male colleagues going to behave towards them on the next night out? It causes wider ramifications within the unit.

You are not responsible for how [Name Redacted] perceived her chain of command reacted to her. But if an allegation is made and if it is not immediately accepted, then very often people have to decide what sides to take. People find it very hard to remain neutral and that caused issues in this case. As I say, you are not responsible for how other people reacted, but it is your behaviour that led to people making decisions on how to behave.

You are 34 years old, so you do not even have what is often put forward as mitigation of being very young and immature and inexperienced. You are 34, you have got children of your own, you are certainly old enough to know better. You have got almost four and a half years' service. You have held your present rank since December 2024.

You have some previous matters. The cautions are of no relevance whatsoever. 2017 convictions for ABH and battery, again, not relevant particularly apart from one aspect. They were pre-you joining the Army. Joining the Army often changes a person. The only relevance of those convictions is that they were under the influence of alcohol, as was the instant offence.

There are no matters on your service disciplinary record and that is in your favour. Your character references, three of them, paint a very different picture of you. Professionally, you are extremely well regarded, you are good at your job, you are capable, you are dependable, you have a strong moral character. But for the mental health issues that you now have and these events intervening, it would have appeared that you had a good career going forward. But we do know that, of course, all those references refer to you in the work environment, an environment when you would not have been drinking.

We have listened very carefully to everything that Mr Cannon has said on your behalf. We take account of your guilty plea, that you regret your actions and you are sorry for them, that you have had some events in your life that have been challenging and that have impacted your mental health, although you may not have been aware of that at the time. Again, that does not surprise us and that is no fault of yours. Sometimes people do not know how they have been affected by events until they have really had to sit down and perhaps think, "Well, why am I behaving like this? Why am I drinking so much? Why am I getting myself into trouble when I am drinking?" Sometimes that helps us to reflect on what might be some, if not all, of the underlying causes.

We have read the probation officer's report. In the professional assessment of the experienced probation officer, you do take full responsibility for this offence. You do recognise the impact that your offence would have on your victim, that you are at a low risk of re-conviction, medium risk of causing serious harm, and the risk you pose can be managed in the community. We are not bound to follow any recommendations in the report or to accept those levels of risk, although we do accept the levels of risk in this case.

We have had regard to the offence-specific guideline, part of the Judge Advocate General's sentencing guidelines. We have also had regard to the imposition of community and custodial sentences guidelines and the reduction in sentence for a guilty plea guideline.

The first decision we had to make is whether you can continue to serve. Now, we note that you have no desire to continue to serve in the Army and it may be that you will be discharged as you are currently at P0 and have been for some time. But those are not matters that we take into account when reaching our dismissal decision. Dismissal is not what is in your interests, it is whether it is serious enough to warrant dismissal and whether dismissal is in the interests of the Service.

The charge is disgraceful conduct of an indecent kind and there is no doubt that your behaviour was both disgraceful and indecent on this occasion. Although you were both in the same unit, you had little to do with each other. Why you targeted her in such a way on this evening remains a mystery as you claim no recollection of the evening due to the amount you had to drink. But whatever your reasons, this was an appalling and disrespectful way to treat a colleague.

Often people are referred to as a female, but she was a female colleague. Making offensive remarks about her, making threats towards her and her husband, and ignoring her very clear instructions just to leave her alone. You did not. You persisted again and again, pushing your agenda on her. She should have been able to enjoy her evening in the mess but you made it unpleasant in the extreme.

It seems to us that the only conclusion that we can draw is that you did take a sexual interest in her and pursued her, hoping for some form of sexual activity with her, whether immediately or at some point in the future. We note, though, that it was not just words. You grabbed her and you kissed her and women in the Armed Forces should not have to put up with such behaviour. They should not have to go into a social environment constantly wary of how their male colleagues are going to behave towards them when they have had a few drinks. They should not be having to think, is this a point at the evening where I have to leave because my male colleagues are getting a bit lewd and a bit handsy and being offensive towards me. They should be able to enjoy their evening just as much as anyone else. They are entitled to be treated as an equal colleague, not to be treated as an object of sexual attention.

We do categorise this as high culpability and we do take into account the Judge Advocate General's guidelines that we must consider dismissal. We consider that any service person that behaves in such a persistent and disgraceful and offensive way towards their colleagues can expect to be dismissed and in this case, you are dismissed and as a consequence are reduced to the ranks.

So we said we categorise this as culpability A and we do so for the reasons stated by both the Crown and accepted by the Defence, that it was persistent and it was intentionally indecent. It could be seen in no other way. We do categorise it as medium harm. There was an impact on her. It was not a minimal or no impact, but neither do we consider it to reach the threshold of being a very high impact, so Harm 2.

So that categorisation gives us either 30 weeks of service detention or a service community order. We must sentence within that range unless there are reasons not to do so. So the range is ten weeks' service detention or a low-level community order up to six months in prison. We can put your mind at rest at this moment, Lance Corporal Deadman, and say that imprisonment is not a sentence that we are going to impose.

The aggravating matters are that the previous matter was under the influence of alcohol. This matter was under the influence of alcohol. It was a deliberate targeting of the victim, but we do not double count that because that also feeds into the fact that it was persistent that you pursued this one particular person. We cannot say that you decided that on this particular night [Name Redacted]was the person that you were going to target for this offence. It may have been that she was the only female there, it may have been that she was the first female you came across, it may have been for other reasons, but we cannot say that you deliberately targeted her.

But it is aggravating that, not content with doing this behaviour in a social open environment, you then pursued her in the accommodation block as well, but we accept not in her own room. But she should have been entitled to feel safe when she had retreated to a colleague's room.

Against those aggravating factors are the mitigating ones. We accept you are remorseful. We accept that you do have some mental health issues underpinning your alcohol consumption that is set out in the medical report. You have a good professional record. You have taken steps to address alcohol consumption. You tell the court that you have not drank for a year and there has been some considerable delay. We say that in this case a delay of seven months, on a relatively straightforward case between referral and direction, is not a delay that the court wants to see and it is difficult to see any good reason for that length of time being needed.

We do consider that the aggravating and mitigating features largely balance themselves out. So the question for us is should this be immediate detention in the Military Corrective Training Centre or should this be a service community order?

We have considered whether, if it is to be a sentence of detention, we could suspend it, but we do not consider that suspended detention would achieve the rehabilitative effect that we consider necessary in your case, whereas an immediate sentence of detention or a service community order would achieve that rehabilitative effect. After careful consideration we have decided that a service community order does best meet the purposes of sentencing in this case, providing both punishment and rehabilitation, and the dismissal contributing to the deterrent effect and reduction of service offending.

The service community order will be for 18 months, so six months longer than the recommended length. There will be three requirements. Up to 15 rehabilitation activity requirement days, those are to do the rehabilitative work with you. 120 hours' unpaid work, that is reduced to give you credit for your guilty plea. The range for high-level community order generally starts in the region of about 150 to 200 hours. There will be an alcohol abstinence monitoring requirement for 120 days.

So what does this mean for you? Well, you must meet your supervisor as and when you are told to. So every time they tell you that they want to speak to you on the phone, do a video conference with you or you have to go and meet them in person, either for work or for rehabilitation or for other aspects of supervision, you must turn up unless you have a good reason, unless you provide good evidence for the reason why you cannot.

If you fail to complete the unpaid work or do it properly and if you fail to cooperate with the directions you are given for the supervision and the rehabilitation activities, you will be breached on the order. That means you will be taken to a Crown Court and you could be given further requirements, you could be fined or you could be resentenced for this offence and that could result in the imposition of civilian custody. So although we are not sending you to prison today, if you do not do this order, you could be sent to prison.

In terms of the alcohol abstinence monitoring requirement, you tell us that you have refrained from alcohol for 12 months and so if you have, and if that is right, then this will not be an onerous requirement on you. But it will also help with your resolve to stay alcohol-free as we note that you have said that you are tempted, and your alcohol consumption is at least partly at the root of your behaviour that led to this offending.

So the tag will be fitted around your ankle. There is 24-hour monitoring of your alcohol consumption via the tag. Any alcohol you drink will be identified and if you breach any of the monitoring conditions,

the probation practitioner will know and will take appropriate action. That means if you try and mask the tag, if you wrap stuff around it, if you try and put three or four pairs of socks on so that the tag is not in contact with your skin, that will be flagged up by the monitoring system. You cannot get around it in that way. If you try to remove the tag, that would be in breach as well.

Now, in terms of that tag, it will be fitted by the electronic monitoring system at your home address. Let me just check. That will be, are you going back to [Redacted] tonight?

DEFENDANT: Not tonight, your Honour.

JUDGE ADVOCATE: So when are you going back then?

DEFENDANT: I have got to arrange obviously because I've got to see a [Redacted].

JUDGE ADVOCATE: Right.

DEFENDANT: So once I've had the [Redacted].

JUDGE ADVOCATE: Then you will be going, right. We will need to notify the -- we will have to put that on the notification for probation because normally you have to go into curfew for up to two days for them to have the opportunity to put the tag on.

We will make an exception in your case and say those two days can start from tomorrow night. But from tomorrow night, you have to remain at your home address for tomorrow night and the night after, and that is between 5pm and midnight. If your tag is fitted tomorrow night, then you do not have to be under curfew the next night. If your tag is not fitted, I do not think I am allowed to make you stay at home until they do get round to fitting it and that is why it is two days. The onus is on them to fit it in that two-day window. If they do not, it still has to be fitted but you do not have to observe the curfew.

In terms of service compensation, we have decided not to award service compensation. We feel that the impact of doing so will simply have the effect of prolonging the impact of your actions on the victim when she sees a relatively small amount of money drip into her bank account each month. So we do not award service compensation.

Commander Patterson, is there anything that we have omitted to mention in terms of the sentence or anything that, in your view, we have not adequately explained to the defendant?

CDR PATTERSON: No, thank you, your Honour.

JUDGE ADVOCATE: Mr Cannon, I know that you will go through this with the defendant and he will receive a notice before he leaves court with the community order requirements on it and I know that you will go through it with him as well.

MR CANNON: Yes.

JUDGE ADVOCATE: Thank you very much. Lance Corporal Deadman, would you please stand? The President of the Court will announce the sentence.

SENTENCE

PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD: Lance Corporal Deadman, service number 30379637. For the offence of disgraceful conduct of an indecent kind, you will be reduced to the ranks and dismissed from His Majesty's Forces and there will be a service community order in the terms outlined.