

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF VICTORIA

Revised Restricted Suitable for Publication

AT MELBOURNE
CRIMINAL DIVISION

Case No. CR-13-02189

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

v

GERALD FRANCIS RIDSDALE

JUDGE: Chief Judge Rozenes
WHERE HELD: Melbourne
DATE OF HEARING: 18 March 2014
DATE OF SENTENCE: 8 April 2014
CASE MAY BE CITED AS: DPP v RIDSDALE
MEDIUM NEUTRAL CITATION: [2014] VCC 285

REASONS FOR SENTENCE

Subject:

Catchwords:

CRIMINAL LAW – sentence – historical sex offences – priest – paedophile – position of trust – lengthy history of offending – large number of child complainants – indecent assault of a female or girl under 16 years – indecent assault of a male under 16 years – carnal knowledge – buggery – Serious Sexual Offender provisions

APPEARANCES:CounselSolicitorsFor the Director of Public
ProsecutionsMs S Borg
Mr J Livitsanos

Office of Public Prosecutions

For the Accused

Ms H. Spowart

Victoria Legal Aid

HIS HONOUR:

1 Gerald Francis Ridsdale, you have pleaded guilty to a total of thirty charges: four charges of indecent assault of a female under the age of 16; 24 charges of indecent assault on a male person under 16 years; one charge of carnal knowledge of a girl of or above the age of 10 years and below the age of 16; and, one charge of buggery of a male under 14 years. The offending is historical, spanning almost two decades between December 1961 and December 1980.

2 Given that these offences occurred over such a long period, the maximum penalty for some charges changed as amendments were made to the Crimes Act. Charges 1, 2, 5 and 28, charges of indecent assault of a female under 16 years, carry a maximum of 5 years' imprisonment; Charges 3 and 4, indecent assault of a male person under the age of 16, a maximum of 10 years' imprisonment. Charges 7 to 13 inclusive and 15 to 20 inclusive, also being charges of indecent assault of a male person under 16 but occurring later in time, carry a maximum penalty of 5 years' imprisonment. The charge of carnal knowledge of a girl of or above the age of 10 and below the age of 16 years, Charge 6, carries a maximum penalty of 10 years' imprisonment. Charge 14, buggery with a person under the age of 14 years, carries a maximum of 20 years' imprisonment. Each of these maximum penalties is such because, for the purposes of this sentence, you do not have any prior convictions. If you had, the maxima in each case would be higher.

3 The facts of the case were opened by Ms Borg, counsel for the prosecution, and are contained in the Prosecution Opening on the Plea, Exhibit A in these proceedings. Ms Borg, who appeared with Mr Livitsanos, helpfully provided a bundle of documents relevant to each charge in its historical legislative context, as well as information pertaining to each complainant's age at the time of the offending.

4 In brief summary, your offending was committed between 1 January 1961 and 31 December 1980 and during that period you worked as a Catholic priest throughout

Western Victoria. There are 14 complainants in total – three females and 11 males – all of whom were under the age of 16 at the relevant time. Your offending was a blatant breach of the trust that exists between priest and parishioner and, as is clear from the Victim Impact Statements (Exhibits B to P inclusive), that your offending had particularly devastating effects on your victims.

5 It is clear that you used your position within the Church to facilitate your offending, befriending the complainants under the guise of the ‘friendly priest’ before perpetrating various serious sexual acts upon them. I note that some of the complainants were extremely vulnerable, being Wards of the State or from separated parents. Your position, carrying with it a high degree of trust and, to some degree, power, coupled with inducements such as lollies, money, or a supposed enjoyment of common interests, provided a way for you to engage intimately with the complainants before abusing that trust to obtain sexual gratification.

The offending

6 It is noted that the sexual acts your young victims were subjected to range in seriousness from inappropriate touching and kissing, to performing oral sex on them and forcing them to perform oral sex on you, forced masturbation of them and them of you, through to digital and penile penetration. Many of the charges are representative of offending that you perpetrated against complainants on more than one occasion. I was also told of a number of criminal acts that are not the subject of any charge but that go to demonstrate a pattern of offending behaviour.

7 Your offending was not detected as a result of any disclosure or admission by you. Many complainants came forward following the recent Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry into the handling of church sexual abuse. It was submitted by Ms Borg that the Inquiry provided the complainants with a sense of safety and security in which they could finally disclose your abuse of them. Having heard some of the complainants read their own Victim Impact Statements in open court, I tend to

agree with that submission. I turn now to the circumstances of your offending against the 14 complainants in this matter.

8 V1, the first complainant, was made a Ward of the State at age 5 and spent her younger years moving around various institutions. Between the ages of 10 and 13 you offended against her on a number of occasions, in almost identical fashion. You would drive her to and from the institution in which she was residing and, during the trip, you would pull over and force her to fellate you while you penetrated her vagina with your fingers. On other occasions, you drove her and her sisters to the beach, separated her from her sisters, and forced her to fellate you while you digitally penetrated her vagina. On each occasion you ejaculated into her mouth. On each occasion she was crying and felt pain as a result of the digital penetration. You warned her against telling others of your offending and gave her lollies or ice cream in order to buy her silence.

9 The second complainant, V2, was aged between 9 and 10 years at the time of your offending against him. He was made a Ward of the State at an early age before he was placed into the care of the Nazareth Boy's Orphanage in Sebastopol. You befriended him and told him that you were going to make him your altar boy and that you wanted to groom him for that position. About 4 weeks after he arrived at Nazareth Boy's Orphanage, you corralled him into an empty room and locked the door. As he bent over to pick something up from the floor, you grabbed his buttocks, slid down his shorts, and penetrated his anus with your finger which, he says, "hurt like hell". He jumped up in an attempt to escape and you tried to grab him again, telling him that you were doing the "Lord's work". He managed to escape the room by climbing out the window. For more than a week after this incident he experienced bleeding from his anus.

10 V3, the third complainant, was aged 10 or 11 at the relevant time. His mother was a devout Catholic who regularly attended church and you were introduced to his family via the church. You often attended the family home after Mass. During this

time, he would accompany you on bird watching trips and, in February or March of 1966, after bird watching you both returned to the car, where you asked him to remove his clothes down to his underwear. You did the same. You lay across the back seat of the car and had him lie on top of you with your chests touching. You put your arm around him and he noticed that you were sighing and breathing heavily. You both remained in that position for a period of time before putting your clothes back on.

11 V4 is the fourth complainant. She was aged between 4 and 11 years when you offended against her. Her parents separated when she was aged 3 and she and her brothers lived between her father's and her aunt's place in Ballarat. You frequented the aunt's house and would enter her bedroom to ask her about her parents, take her to the milk bar and bought her lollies in order to gain her trust. You told her that she was "special" and that she was "God's little angel". In around 1966, when she was aged 4, she was sitting upstairs on a couch when you sat next to her and forced her to fellate you, causing her to gag. She does not remember whether you ejaculated on this occasion.

12 When aged 10 or 11, she followed you into your bedroom to look at your rock collection but she noticed a pornographic magazine and ran out of the room. You got angry, caught her and instructed her to bend over and touch her toes whereupon you pulled her down pants and penetrated her vagina with your penis, causing her a great deal of pain. After you ejaculated, you had her lick your penis. You told her to stop running away from you and warned her not to say anything to anyone because no one would believe her. Although it does not directly involve you, Mr Ridsdale, there is a further disturbing aspect to this incident, namely that this complainant believes another priest was present for a short time while you were sexually assaulting her and must have been aware of the assault but did not intervene. I raise this merely to make an observation: namely that this behaviour appears to be demonstrative of the church's approach to sexual abuse at the time which ultimately – and unfortunately, for your victims – allowed your criminal

behaviour to go unchecked for so long.

- 13 During the same period of time, whilst at her aunt's house in Ballarat, she fell over and scraped her knees. You gave her a piggy-back to the parish house and sat her on the kitchen bench where you removed her pants and started cuddling and kissing her inappropriately, something she described as "horrible". You carried her into a room with no beds and made her face the window with her back to you. You removed your belt and she tried to run. You returned her to the room, told her that she was naughty for trying to run away and that she had to be punished and repent for her sins. You made her bend over and touch her toes before you placed your hands on her hips and inserted your penis into her vagina, causing her pain. She does not recall whether or not you ejaculated on this occasion.
- 14 At the conclusion of the school holidays in 1973, she was aged 10 to 11 when she visited you at the presbytery. You told her she was wicked and naughty and needed to be punished and took her to the confessional box inside the church. You told her to kneel and say "Forgive me, Father, for I have sinned and with God's help I will not sin again. Oh my God, I am very sorry that I have sinned against you. Bless me, Father, for I have sinned". You then forced her to fellate you, an experience she described as "absolutely revolting". Afterwards, you gave her a bag of lollies and warned her not to tell anyone what had happened.
- 15 The fifth complainant, V5, was 10 or 11 years of age when he was sexually abused by you. He was the altar boy at the Star of the Sea Parish Church. Between 1974 and 1975 he went with you to the church the Wye River church to assist with clean up. While he was sweeping the floor, you came up behind him and hugged him tightly. He was squirming and trying to escape at which point you asked him, "Do you like this?" He responded, "Not really." You reached inside his trousers and fondled his genitals, held his penis and attempted to masturbate him. You were grinding your erect penis into his back as you did this. You repeatedly asked, "Do you like this?" to which he consistently answered "No." Afterwards you gave him a

packet of 'Cool Mints' and warned him that "this is a secret between us and you know not to talk about the game we have played?" He replied, "Yes, Father, it's a secret between us, Father."

16 In around 1974 you started up an after-school boys gathering, which you used as a means of perpetrating your sexual abuse. The method of your offending was similar in each case: you would isolate the boy and commit sexual acts ranging from fondling, mutual masturbation, and fellatio. On occasions, you penetrated the boy's anus with your finger or penis. You often used your interest in collecting rocks or panning for gold as an inducement and you often warned the boys against telling others of what you had done together.

17 You offended in this manner against V6 and his friends V7, V8, V9 and V10, the sixth through tenth complainants. On each occasion, the offending occurred in the context of the after-school boys' gatherings that you had organised.

18 The eleventh complainant, V11, was 9 or 10 at the time of your offending against him. He is the twin brother of V12, complainant twelve, and the brother of V13, complainant thirteen. All three siblings were victims of your sexual abuse. I was told during the course of the plea that, sadly, there was another brother, S, who committed suicide at the age of 21. Although it was not alleged that you had offended against S, the feeling amongst his siblings is that you did and that this contributed to him taking his own life. I raise this as an observation of how your abuse of your position within the church allowed your unfettered sexual deviance to be forced upon more than one child in a family.

19 Your offending against these three complainants took place in the January 1980 school holidays. You drove the three to Edenhope for a week-long stay. Your method of offending as against the two brothers was the same: you invited each boy to your bed to cuddle where you committed sexual acts upon them. These acts included fondling, fellatio, masturbation and digital anal penetration. You provided cash to the boys to buy their silence and called each of the boys your "special

friend". V13 was aged between 12 and 13 when you offended against her. You offended against her whilst she was on the same trip to Edenhope with her brothers in 1980 by kissing her inappropriately on the mouth on a number of occasions.

20 The fourteenth, and final, complainant is V14, whose parents separated when he was three. He was aged between 6 and 7 years at the time you sexually abused him. You commenced studies at the same institute as his mother and used this relationship to befriend the boy and to initiate sexual contact with him. On one occasion, he attended your cottage and the two of you were alone. You knelt beside him, removed his pants and underpants and fellated him. Shortly after this incident, you placed your erect penis into his mouth, trying to force him to fellate you. On another occasion, you and he went to a local beach and you kissed him, inappropriately, on the mouth.

Victim Impact Statements

21 A major aggravating feature of this kind of offending is that we now know that the effect on young victims is ongoing. This was made abundantly clear in the Victim Impact Statements of your complainants, who continue to suffer mental health issues, and have attempted suicide as a result of your abuse of them.

22 I was provided with Victim Impact Statements from all but one of your victims, Exhibits B to N. The Statements were read in court, either by the complainant themselves or by counsel for the prosecution. Additionally, Victim Impact Statements were provided by the mother of V11, V12 and V13, Exhibit O, and the mother of V9 and V10, Exhibit P.

23 I can only describe the contents of these Victim Impact Statements as powerful. Collectively they shared some common themes: a feeling of being exploited; feeling trapped, powerless, worthless and humiliated; anger at, and distrust of, the Catholic church; loss of faith and innocence; loss of the enjoyment of childhood; a sense of bewilderment and disbelief; and the fracturing of family relationships. Tragically,

many thought that they were to blame for your actions. To me, one of the most tragic comments I heard was that “if I had ‘taken my turn’ maybe my little brothers would have had happier lives”.

24 In their Victim Impact Statements, the mothers of some of your victims conveyed an understandable, but unjustified, guilt at having failed to protect their children. Mr Ridsdale, I sincerely hope that you now understand how your offending has not only affected your victims, but created a ripple effect that has touched upon all aspects of their lives. I commend all the victims for providing such articulate, well-written and modest Victim Impact Statements. I particularly commend those that bravely read their own Victim Impact Statements in court.

Personal circumstances

25 By way of background, you are now aged 79 years. You grew up in the Ballarat area, the eldest of eight children. At the age of 14 you left your secondary school, St Patrick’s College, to pursue employment as a clerk in a Ballarat accounting firm, where you were employed for three years. In 1953, you returned to St Patrick’s to complete your Year 11 Leaving Certificate before entering the Catholic Church as a trainee priest. Your training commenced in 1954 at the Corpus Christi College in Werribee, and you remained there for four-and-a-half years. In 1958 you travelled to Genoa, Italy, to continue your studies before completing your studies in Dublin, Ireland. In 1961 you returned to Australia and on 25 July 1961 were ordained as a Catholic priest, initially assigned to the Ballarat Diocese.

26 During your 30-year career as a priest, from 1962 to 1992, you were assigned to many parishes throughout Victoria, New South Wales, and the United States. It was during your time in Victoria that you befriended families in your parish, and inveigled young children into engaging in various sexual acts with you. Your sexual offending has been the subject of two previous plea hearings before this Court; one in 1994 and another in 2006. The offending now under consideration is effectively enmeshed with the offending for which you have already been sentenced.

27 Your counsel tendered a psychological report from Mr Ian Joblin dated 18 February 2014, Exhibit 3. Mr Joblin's involvement with you commenced in 1993 and he has provided reports to the court in your previous plea hearings. In his current report, Mr Joblin opines that you require continued rehabilitation and/or management and that you should not be released to your own resources. He states that you have exhibited signs of remorse and insight in relation to your offending. Apart from an undoubtable diagnosis of paedophilia, there was no evidence of any further psychological dysfunction apart from an apparent organic deterioration the normal result of the aging process.

28 In addition to the report of Mr Joblin, your counsel also tendered your comprehensive prison history, Exhibit 1, an extract from your Department of Justice medical file, Exhibit 2, and a folder containing submissions, your previous sentences and Mr Joblin's old reports, Exhibit 4.

29 On your behalf, Ms Spowart submitted that I take into account the following by way of mitigation:

- (1) That you are now aged 80 years and have been in custody continuously since 6 August 1994;
- (2) Your expected release date is currently 29 June 2019 and you will be aged 85 years upon completion of your sentence;
- (3) Your physical health has deteriorated and you suffer from a number of ailments making imprisonment more onerous;
- (4) Your advanced age means that your risk of committing further offences is decreased;
- (5) You have undergone offence-specific treatment whilst in custody, completing a sex offender program last year;
- (6) There was a delay in the complainants reporting your offending

which is not to lay blame on the complainants in any way but which now, given your age, impacts upon the sentence to be imposed;

(7) In accordance with the principles of totality, I should moderate the sentence I impose given the offending occurred during the same period of time as offending for which you have already been sentenced; and

(8) You pleaded guilty at an early stage in the proceedings and did not elect to have a committal hearing, sparing the complainants the ordeal of cross-examination.

30 Ms Spowart conceded that these are serious offences involving a grave breach of trust and that the impact of your offending on the complainants has been devastating. This was clear from the Victim Impact Statements to which I have already referred.

31 Your counsel's ultimate submission was that I should impose a sentence that is wholly concurrent with the sentence you are currently undergoing so as not to affect your current release date of 29 June 2019.

Sentencing considerations

32 The basic purposes for which a court may impose a sentence are punishment, deterrence (both specific and general), rehabilitation, denunciation, and protection of the community. In sentencing, I must have regard to a range of matters such as the seriousness of the offence, your culpability for it, your personal circumstances and those of the victim if any. I am required to balance the interests of the community in denouncing criminal conduct with the interests of the community in seeking to ensure that as far as possible offenders are rehabilitated and reintegrated into society.

33 The fact that you are now aged 79 years, in poor health, have spent almost the last

20 years in custody and that these events occurred over a period of period of time during which you committed other offences of a like kind against like victims for which you have already been punished and are still undergoing sentence produces a difficult sentencing exercise.

34 In October 1994 you were sentenced by Judge Dee in this court in relation to 48 similar charges committed between 1961 and 1982. You received a sentence of 18 years with a non-parole period of 15 years. That sentence was unsuccessfully appealed by you to the Court of Appeal in 1995. One of the Appeal Justices said that your offending was of “quite exceptional gravity, involving outrageous breaches of trust.”

35 You were then sentenced on 11 August 2006 by Judge White for a further 24 counts of indecent assault, 7 counts of gross indecency with a male, and 4 counts of buggery. These offences were committed between 1970 and 1987. At the time of sentencing you, Judge White said this at paragraph 29:

Having regard to your position of trust, the attitude of Catholic families at the time of placing priests on a pedestal, the power you were able to exercise over those families and their children and your vocation as a priest, there is no doubt your conduct plummets to the depths of evil hypocrisy. Your conduct has given rise to disastrous, catastrophic and at times tragic results. Your victims, their families, your family, practising Catholics and the church have all suffered. The Catholic church cannot escape criticism in view of its lack of action on complaints being made as to your conduct, the constant moving of you from parish to parish providing you with more opportunity for your predatory conduct and its failure to show adequate compassion for a number of your victims.

36 These comments apply equally to the offending for which I must sentence you, and I adopt the comments of Judge White in that respect.

37 You were sentenced by Judge White to a total effective sentence of 13 years imprisonment with a non-parole period of 7 years effective from that day. The effect of Judge White’s orders was that the head sentence he imposed was to be served concurrently with the sentence imposed by Judge Dee, effectively providing a combined head sentence of 25 years’ imprisonment which expires on 29 June

2019. The non-parole period passed on 14 August 2013 without you being granted parole.

38 As I said, the present offences were committed during the period of time covered by the sentences of Judges Dee and White. The prosecution rightly conceded, in my view, that had the present offences been brought to light at the time the other matters were dealt with, it is highly likely that similar sentences to those imposed on individual counts by the previous judges would have been imposed on these charges, and that a degree of concurrency would have been ordered. I want to make it clear that I am in no way critical of the fact that these offences were not disclosed at an earlier time. You certainly did not volunteer them to the authorities and it is regrettably well known that delay in the reporting of offences such as these is commonplace.

39 I am required to give effect to the totality principle which has particular application where, as here, there are a multitude of charges and where an accused has already served, and is still serving, a sentence for like offending. I am also required, where possible, to avoid the imposition of a 'crushing sentence'. That is, a sentence that destroys any reasonable expectation of a useful life after release from custody. It is the case however that in some circumstances a 'just and appropriate' sentence may very well amount to a crushing sentence having regard to the age of the offender.

40 I also need to recognise the separate harm caused to different victims. They are all important and are entitled to be separately recognised and represented in the sentence I impose. Given that some charges to which you have pleaded guilty are representative charges, I must give proper effect to the whole of the circumstances of the offending for each charge. The fact that a charge is a representative charge is an aggravating circumstance, as it denotes a pattern of repetitive offending. I also take into consideration, when looking at the whole of the circumstances of the offending, any uncharged acts which add further context to your offending.

41 Under s 6D of the Sentencing Act I am required to have regard to the protection of the community as the principle purpose for which a sentence is imposed. I may, in order to achieve that purpose, impose a longer sentence than that which is proportionate to the gravity of the offence considered in light of its objective circumstances, and any sentence imposed upon these counts must be served cumulatively unless otherwise ordered. The prosecution did not urge me to impose a disproportionate sentence and I have determined that, in this case, it is not necessary or appropriate to do so.

42 Further, under s 6B of the Sentencing Act you are defined as a serious sexual offender by virtue of your prior offending and, pursuant to s 6E, I must, unless I direct otherwise, order that the sentences I impose be served cumulatively. As I have already mentioned, I do not intend to order accumulation.

43 Your offending was particularly abhorrent. Your victims were amongst the most vulnerable in our community – children. The courts are tasked with the duty to protect children as they usually cannot protect themselves. Crimes such as these require the imposition of substantial custodial sentences in order to signify condemnation of that behaviour, to punish the offender, and to protect children from actual and potential abusers. As a consequence, your offending attracts the sentencing principles of just punishment, denunciation and general deterrence, which assume considerable significance. As was said by Vincent JA in *DPP v Toomey* [2006] VSCA 90, repeating what he said *DPP v DJK* [2003] VSCA 109 at [16]:

The imposition of a sentence often constitutes both a practical and a ritual completion of a protracted painful period. It signifies the recognition by society of the nature and the significance of the wrong that has been done to affected members, the assertion of its values and the public attribution of responsibility for that wrongdoing to the perpetrator.

44 He went on in *Toomey* to say, at [22], that

[i]t is well to bear in mind that the rehabilitation of the victim of sexual abuse may often be more difficult to achieve than that of the perpetrator. Frequently the damage will be profound and a long time will pass before it can be

addressed at all. In the meantime, childhood will be destroyed, self esteem damaged, educational and career opportunities lost and the capacity to form and maintain relationships seriously impaired.

45 I take into account that you pleaded guilty. Your plea avoided a committal and trial and further stress for the victims. I accept that it is also indicative of remorse and an acceptance of responsibility. I take into account the other matters urged upon me by Ms Spowart. I take into account the fact that you have spent the last 20 years in custody, that these offences are now quite old and that they were committed in the same time frame as those that gave rise to the sentences imposed by judges Dee and White. In particular, I take into account that you are currently serving a sentence of almost 25 years and will be 84 when that sentence is complete. Whilst the sentence I intend to impose will provide that you remain in custody for a period beyond the sentence you are presently serving, I will order as much concurrency as is possible as between individual sentences and with the sentence you are currently serving, so as to arrive at a sentence that is appropriate in all the circumstances.

46 Would you please stand up, Mr Ridsdale. On charge 14, the charge of buggery, you are convicted and sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 8 years. This is the base sentence. On charges 1, 2 and 28, charges of indecent assault of a girl under 16, you are convicted and sentenced on each charge to 2 years' imprisonment. On charge 4, indecent assault of a male under 16 years, and charge 5, indecent assault of a girl under 16 years, you are convicted and sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment on each charge. On charge 6, carnal knowledge, you are convicted and sentenced to 6 years' imprisonment. On charges 3, 7 to 13, 15 to 27, 29 and 30, you are convicted and sentenced to a term of 2 years' imprisonment on each charge. I order that each of the sentences I impose on charges 1 to 13 and 15 to 30 be served wholly concurrently with each other and with the base sentence. That makes a total effective sentence of 8 years' imprisonment. I must now fix a non-parole period. I order that you serve a period of 5 years before being eligible for parole. That, by my calculation, makes your earliest possible release on parole 8 April 2019.

47 Pursuant to s 6F of the Sentencing Act I direct that it be entered in the records of the court that I have sentenced you as a serious sexual offender in respect of all charges.

48 Whilst I appreciate that some members of the community might be critical of the fact that you have in effect only had an additional three years added to your sentence, it is important to understand that the principle of totality demands that when sentencing in circumstances such as yours, the law requires the moderation of individual sentences and orders as to concurrency to avoid a crushing sentence. In your case what needs to be kept in mind is that for the totality of your offending you have received an effective sentence of 28 years' imprisonment and, subject to parole, which is a matter wholly for the Adult Parole Board, you will be 88 years old when this sentence expires.

Sex offender registration

49 You are a registrable offender pursuant to s 6 of the Sex Offender Registration Act ("SORA") and have committed registrable offences under Classes 1 and 2 of the Schedule to the Act. I therefore order that, on the basis of your criminal history and the offences to which you have pleaded guilty, you be subject to reporting conditions for life.

s.6AAA

50 Section 6AAA of the Sentencing Act requires me to state the total effective sentence and the non-parole period that I would have imposed had you pleaded not guilty and been convicted. Had you been convicted after a trial, I would have sentenced you to 12 years' imprisonment with a non-parole period of 8 years.

51 Take a seat Mr Ridsdale. Does anybody have any comments in relation to this sentence?

52 COUNSEL: No, Your Honour.

53 HIS HONOUR: Mr Ridsdale can be removed from the court, thank you
