

Dear

It is with shock and a deep sense of urgency that I am writing this letter to you with regard to the sentences imposed upon Wilfred Wong and his Co-defendants. The sentences handed down by Judge Nicola Jones are harsh, excessive and completely disproportionate for the following reasons:

1. Nobody was physically hurt in the commission of the offence.
2. Many who have physically hurt others in the commission of their offences have received sentences that were far more lenient than those imposed on Wilfred Wong and his Co-defendants.

Please see the following links for irrefutable evidence of the above. This small sample includes an unduly lenient sentence given by the same Judge Nicola Jones, who presided over the Wong and Co-defendants' case.

These lenient sentences were imposed despite previous admissions of "a number of offences relating to making and distributing indecent images of children, causing a child to engage in a sexual act and voyeurism."

<https://www.leaderlive.co.uk/news/19594837.engineer-jailed-child-sex-offence-indecent-images/>

The following link includes several case summaries that show that, despite previous convictions and physical harm

done, the sentences given were extremely lenient – in sharp contrast to the harshness and severity of the sentences imposed on Wong and Co-defendants.

<https://www.walesonline.co.uk/news/wales-news/dangerous-women-wales-crimes-jailed-21852033>

3. All the defendants in the Wong case are essentially first-time offenders, but this has not been properly considered in the sentences given. Instead, they have been treated, in effect, as though they were repeat offenders, which they are not, who would offend again if they were given lenient sentences.

Please note: All except one of Wilfred Wong's co-defendants have no previous convictions.

The exception is one whose previous convictions were of an altogether different nature to the matter she was convicted for in this case.

Here are the sentences in descending order:

- Wilfred Wong: 17 years' imprisonment with a licence extension of 5 years
- Janet Stevenson: 15 years' imprisonment with a licence extension of 5 years
- Anke Hill: 14 years and 5 months' imprisonment with a licence extension of 5 years
- Edward Stevenson: 8 years' imprisonment

- Jane Going-Hill: 4 years and 8 months' imprisonment
- Kristine Ellis-Petley: 4 years' imprisonment

4. Wilfred Wong and Co-defendants all genuinely believed that they were rescuing a child from severe sexual abuse, torture and possibly even death.

They had good reason to believe this as follows:

There is a lot of evidence that the boy had been subjected to extensive Satanic ritual abuse, including 400 pages of notes regarding the boy's abuse disclosures, many drawings by him and an independent analyses of the child's drawings by a qualified art therapist, who concluded that in her professional opinion his drawings indicated that he had been sexually abused.

The mother shared the notes of the boys' disclosures and his drawings with the police, but the allegations were never thoroughly investigated by the police.

In conclusion: The sentences against Wilfred Wong and Co-defendants are excessive and hugely disproportionate.

The defendants have been treated as if they were hardened repeat offenders. They have been treated as if they had already committed offences that have caused serious physical injury, or even death, even though no one was physically hurt in the commission of their offences.

As they were strongly convinced that the child needed rescuing and had good reason to believe this, they should not be detained any longer in prison and should be released.

Justice demands that we stop treating Wilfred Wong and his co-defendants as if they are hardened criminals and repeat offenders. There is no evidence whatsoever to justify such an approach.

Justice also requires that we ask why the alleged abusers have never been thoroughly investigated by the police?

The call is for Wilfred Wong and Co-defendants to be immediately and unconditionally released. Prison should be for child sex abusers, not citizens who attempted to rescue a child from abuse.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Kind regards

It is very important that you send the suggested letter individually (i.e. four emails in total) to the following ministers and officials, namely:

a) The Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) for Wales
CSPPrivateoffice@cps.gov.uk

Mark for the urgent attention of Max Hill QC - IMPORTANT: State that you are writing to him in his capacity as DPP

b) The First Minister for Wales
Correspondence.Mark.Drakeford@gov.wales

Mark for the urgent attention of Rt Hon Mark Drakeford MS - IMPORTANT: State that you are writing to him in his capacity as First Minister for Wales

c) The Minister of Justice
brandon.lewis.mp@parliament.uk

Mark for the urgent attention of Brandon Lewis MP - IMPORTANT: State that you are writing to him in his capacity as Minister for Justice

d) The Attorney General
correspondence@attorneygeneral.gov.uk

Mark for the urgent attention of Victoria Prentis MP - IMPORTANT: State that you are writing to her in her capacity as Attorney General

It is quite likely that your email will not be responded to, nevertheless, the ministers will see that there is widespread support.