



JUDICIARY OF  
ENGLAND AND WALES

**R**

**-v-**

**Aman Vyas**

**Croydon Crown Court**

**Sentencing Remarks of Mr Justice Bryan**

**20 August 2020**

1. Aman Vyas, you have been found guilty of the rape and murder of Michelle Samaraweera, your fourth victim, the inflicting of grievous bodily harm with intent and rape of your third victim, multiple rapes of your second victim, following your earlier admission of guilt to the rape of your first victim, all in 2009, when you were 24, and a young Asian man from India living in Walthamstow.
2. I must now sentence you for this series of increasingly violent rapes against lone women very much older than you, late at night, that culminated in your rape and murder of Michelle Samaraweera.
3. In the spring of 2009, there was a stranger rapist prowling the streets of Walthamstow in East London looking for his prey. You were that rapist. This series of increasingly violent rapes, which occurred over a relatively short period of time, all took place late at night on women close to both where you and they lived in Walthamstow. This series of rapes involved four female victims, the last of whom died in the course of your attack upon her.
4. I have changed the names of your first three victims who, as victims of rape, are entitled to anonymity. However it would be an injustice to them if they were reduced to anonymised letters or simply referred to as victims 1, 2 and 3. They are individuals who lived through the trauma of your offending, and who have had to live with the consequences of your offending for over ten years and will no doubt continue to do so for the rest of their lives. I will refer to them as April, May and June.
5. Your semen was found either in or on your victims, or on items close to each of your victims, but your DNA profile was not on the UK database. However, your first victim, April, had produced an E-Fit which was a remarkable likeness of you, and you had also been captured on CCTV in the Somerfield petrol station shop that Michelle Samaraweera had just been shopping in, near to where she was to die at your hands. The incidents later featured on Crimewatch. The net was closing in around you. Just two days later you fled to India via Dubai on a one-way ticket bought for cash just hours before, with you giving your work address in Westminster no doubt to avoid any reference to Walthamstow where you

lived, and where you knew the police were undertaking door-to-door DNA testing of all Asian men in the area with a view to catching the rapist before he struck again.

6. You might have evaded justice forever but for the fact that your previous employer in London (for whom you were working illegally on a student visa) recognised you. He still employed your brother and managed to obtain a water bottle bearing DNA from his saliva which he provided to the police. A sibling DNA profile match to the DNA found in or on your victims was established. A ten-year battle followed as you fought tooth and nail to avoid extradition to England, but extradited you eventually were to stand trial for your heinous crimes.
7. You did not, however, admit your guilt and spare those victims who were still alive the painful ordeal of giving evidence and reliving the sordid and vile sexual assaults you perpetrated on them. Far from it. Forced to admit your guilt to the anal rape of April, your first victim, due to your semen being found inside her, you concocted a tale as to how this was a consensual sexual encounter gone wrong, rather than the violent rape it was, and you put her through the ordeal of giving evidence, as you did your second victim, May denying being the man who anally, vaginally and orally raped her in an alleyway concocting unlikely stories as to how your semen was found on her knickers and (with advances in DNA analysis in 2020) inside her. Your third victim, June, was so badly beaten by you, left for dead in her own excrement, that she could not even remember being beaten and raped by you and denied she had been. All that saved her from the ordeal of giving evidence was the very ferocity of your attack upon her rendering her unable to recall events. Your last victim Michelle Samaraweera could not give evidence as she had died at your hands – providing you with the opportunity to concoct an implausible tale of allegedly consensual sex gone wrong on the ground in a children’s play area in the dark after one o’clock in the morning, as she had been making her way back to her nearby home with her shopping.
8. You first struck on the night of 23 March 2009. April was a 59-year-old stroke victim living in a flat in Walthamstow relatively close to your home address at the time. Shortly before midnight she had left her flat and gone to the Sainsburys cashpoint as she knew that money went into her account at midnight. After withdrawing some cash, she returned home to her flat, collected her electric meter key and walked, in the event, to the Jet Petrol station on Blackhorse Road where she was able to top up her meter key and pay her rent.
9. April then made her way home. Your suggestion that she had previously met you and invited you to her home if you were ever passing is, I am sure, a cock and bull story on the evidence I have heard, as is the suggestion that she had already been beaten up when you encountered her in the lobby of the flats as she topped up her electricity meter. In all likelihood you followed her from the garage shop (something of a modus operandi for you as it appears from events concerning June and Michelle Samaraweera), and certainly a figure is seen following her back towards her flat on the CCTV footage. Whether you did so or not, I am satisfied that you were not an invitee, that you were high on drugs at the time, and were intent on getting in her flat and “giving her one up the bum” as you indicated to her even before pushing your way past her into the flat after she had made clear that she did not want you in her flat.
10. Once in the bedroom, and when she screamed, you punched her 4 times to the face and also punched her to the buttock, tore off her shirt ripping it in the process with one of the buttons

being later found on the floor, took off her trousers and when you were yourself naked and you had pulled her down onto the bed face down you anally raped her without a condom. This was no consensual sexual encounter as alleged in your defence case statement with you going too far by anally penetrating her when she objected to the same, proceeded by consensual foreplay and vaginal sex (events that you were to make up for the first time in the witness box). Rather, based on April's evidence, which I accept, it was a brutal anal rape preceded by physical violence, with you ejaculating inside her (as demonstrated by the anal swabs) despite your denial of the same, and your departure with her shirt as a memento (again despite your denial of that).

11. The finding of a DNA match between the semen on her anal swabs and your DNA profile, was at least one billion (one thousand million) times more likely if the DNA related to April and you, as opposed to April and an unrelated male. Whilst this was no doubt why you admitted anally raping her, that did not stop you concocting the contrived version of events that I have had no hesitation in rejecting, it being inconsistent with the evidence that has been heard. Similar such DNA matches with other victims merely led you to attempt to explain away the presence of your semen based DNA, tailoring your evidence, as best you could, as the scientific evidence mounted against you. One alleged sexual encounter that went wrong is one thing, the presence of your semen at the respective scenes of what were accepted to be the brutal rapes of May, and the brutal assault (and as the jury found rape) of June, was quite another. These encounters you could not admit, and so chose to deny, as you scabbled around in an attempt to explain away the associated, and damning, DNA evidence.
12. The next attack occurred about a month after you had anally raped April and took place a very short distance from her flat. Your next victim May, aged 46 at the time, was living in a hostel when you encountered her when she was walking nearby, as she could not sleep, at around 11.50pm on the night of 21 April 2009. You approached her and asked her if she knew where you could "score" (i.e. buy drugs). She did, and it was agreed that you would go together to the St. James' Street area of Walthamstow to purchase them – you claimed not to have enough money to go by bus as well as buy the drugs and so you both went on foot adopting a route by the back streets. May was not concerned as she thought you were simply a drug user looking to score.
13. However as you approached an alleyway (that there was no reason to go down) she became concerned, and screamed, and you punched her so hard in the face that she saw stars. Once inside the alleyway, you told May to take off all her clothes and put them in a pile which she did as she was frightened. In due course she was to say that this frightened her more than the horrendous rapes that followed as she thought this meant she was going to die. She lost her glasses in the incident which only added to her distress.
14. Once she had taken her clothes off, you asked her to bend over facing a fence and you then anally raped her – she compared the pain to the pain of childbirth. Once you had stopped, you came round so that you were facing her and she was forced to perform oral sex upon you which caused her to heave. You then made her lie naked on a filthy mattress dumped on the floor where you vaginally raped her, before making her get on her knees to enable

you to anally rape her one again, all without a condom. After you had ejaculated you wiped your penis clean on her knickers before departing the scene.

15. Your semen was found on her knickers, again with a 1 in 1 billion match. Initially though it was not possible to obtain any DNA profile from semen on the anal (i.e. internal) swabs. You denied you were the rapist. However with advances in DNA techniques in 2020 a Y-STR test match (which detects male DNA) was made to your DNA, the frequency of occurrence of that Y-STR profile being obtained within a relevant population being 1 in 13,500 unrelated individuals. A combined sample from external intimate swabs using a newer DNA-17 test also showed that it was 70,000 times more likely that the DNA was from you and one other person, than if the DNA was from two individuals but none of the DNA had originated from you.
16. You now needed an explanation for the presence of your semen on internal swabs and so you invented, I am satisfied, a story that you knew May, and indeed had had consensual sexual intercourse with her, in the hostel, in 2008-2009 and that you signed your name in the hostel register (no doubt assuming the register would be long since lost). However unfortunately for you, the register was found, your name was not in it, and May gave evidence that she had not met you before. That was reinforced by your inability even to identify what floor she lived on or when you allegedly had consensual sex with her. That lie exposed, you fell back in the witness box on, I am satisfied, a new lie that you had had, coincidentally, unprotected vaginal sex to ejaculation with two separate female prostitutes, on that very mattress, although you were wholly unable to recall the season or even the year (2008 or 2009) when such risky sex took place. In convicting you of the rapes against her the jury clearly rejected your concocted explanations for cross-contamination and were satisfied so they were sure, that you raped May in respects alleged.
17. Your third victim, June, was 32 at the time you brutally attacked and raped her as the jury have found. The attack occurred just a week after the attack on May and at a location about 800 metres from the alleyway where May was attacked and very close to where you were to attack and murder Michelle Samaraweera. On 29 April 2009, once again in the early hours of the morning, June left her house and walked to the Cansin supermarket. She recalls that en-route to the shop, an Asian man grabbed her by the arms and asked if she was alright. She told him she was fine and told him to leave her alone. She recalls seeing the same man in the shop as she waited to pay for her drink. You accepted before the jury that the man in the shop caught on CCTV looked like you. I am satisfied it was you. The man left first, and whilst June was en-route home she passed St. Saviour's Church. This is the last thing she can remember before waking up in hospital. She was found in a clearing in undergrowth in that churchyard with her trousers around her ankles and her lower half covered in excrement. A red London ambulance service blanket that was put over her bore traces of semen with a 1 in 1 billion DNA analysis match to you near to faecal staining on the blanket.
18. June had been brutally attacked, her jaw had been broken in multiple places, and she had suffered a head injury. She was found unconscious and unresponsive having been left for dead by you. Indeed she might well have died but for her continuing moans of pain heard by a neighbour who called the police. So severely injured was she that she had no recollection of events and did not even accept she had been physically assaulted or raped.

She was to remain in hospital for over a month, receiving physiotherapy, before being transferred to a rehabilitation unit.

19. You inflicted those appalling injuries with intent to cause her really serious harm, as the jury have found and you proceeded to rape her as the jury has also found, be that vaginal or anal rape, the weight of the evidence pointing once again to anal rape which was also the view of the attending paramedic. Whilst you denied your involvement to the bitter end, you stated when you gave evidence that you had never been to that undergrowth, still less ejaculated there, leaving in tatters any possible argument based on theoretical cross-contamination that had been foreshadowed by your defence counsel in the cross-examination of others. You were the assailant and rapist, but even when faced with overwhelming evidence, you insulted the intelligence of the jury by maintaining you had nothing to do with this brutal physical assault and rape.
20. Your fourth and final victim was Michelle Samaraweera, who was 35 years old at the time of her encounter with you just after 1am on 30 May 2009 after she left the Somerfield store attached to the Texaco petrol station on Markhouse Road as she walked home along Queens Road, past an area where a children's playground is situated in a small park area, next to a community centre. She was carrying two Somerfield bags for life filled with £16 worth of groceries, comprising mainly snacks such as crisps, creme eggs and biscuits.
21. Some hours later, at 5.45am Michelle Samaraweera was found by a lady walking her dog lying dead in the play area, on her back in a "starfish" position with her arms and legs wide apart, naked from the waist down, with an area of her blood found nearby, blood on her hands, and scratches on her face consistent with her own nails clawing to remove something that was impeding her breathing. Semen was detected on a vaginal swab that in due course proved to be a match for your DNA. The cause of her death was "interference with the normal course of breathing".
22. Faced with that evidence, your case was that you had a chance encounter with Michelle Samaraweera, a lady you alleged you had met briefly twice before, and a chat on a bench in a playground in the early hours of the morning as she was returning home with her shopping, led on to consensual unprotected vaginal sexual intercourse, in the dark, on the ground, in the play area with Michelle leaving her shopping nearby, all in circumstances where she only lived nearby and indeed on your account (itself no more plausible and which I reject) she had invited you to go to her house to partake in sex. According to your evidence, the vaginal sex was face to face, Michelle was moaning, and then she stopped moaning and did not respond and you realised she was unconscious. Far from checking if she was breathing and still alive, attempting CPR, calling 999 on your mobile or even putting her in the recovery position (all surely actions any innocent person would take faced with such a turn of events), you fled the scene leaving her in a "star fish" position naked from the waist down with her genitalia exposed, and had no further contact with her. You could offer no plausible explanation for how she came to become unconscious or cease breathing other than due to your actions.
23. The reality was rather different as is reflected in the jury's verdicts. I am satisfied so that I am sure, that, on the evidence, including the CCTV evidence, you were deliberately stalking

her that evening as she went to Somerfield, that you waited outside, and when she did not emerge you then went in to check she was there. You entered 4 minutes after her and left 4 minutes before her without buying anything. If you were walking home you would have been well past the play area when she got there. I am satisfied that the attack was both planned and pre-meditated, you stalked her and then lay in wait for her adjacent to the playground where you attacked her. That is why a number of witnesses heard 3 screams, that is why her blood was on the ground and on her hands, and that is why she had injuries to her face as she fought for her life. You raped her, and you killed her.

24. The precise mechanism by which you killed her will never be known but the evidence of Dr Poole was that the application of a soft broad ligature and/or a neck hold could account for her death and the absence of demonstrable neck trauma, the neck hold either being a bar hold by you from behind with a straight forearm across her throat or a V Type hold with both forearms applied to her neck. Either could have proved fatal if maintained for at least 15 seconds. It was also conceivable that further airway obstruction might have been effected by a hand being placed over her mouth and nose. You in fact admit placing your hand over her mouth "for support" although you say she kissed your hand and then pushed it away (an account I also reject as inherently implausible and inconsistent with the abrasions on her face and blood on her hands).
25. You were not some good Samaritan discussing your own problems with Michelle leading to consensual unprotected sex on the ground, an inherently improbable scenario given that she was on the way home with her shopping and lived nearby and, in all probability (contrary to your lies), had never met you before. The reality, as reflected in the jury's verdict, is that she had the misfortune to meet a violent rapist on her way home, was physically and sexually assaulted and, like June, left for dead, but on this occasion your victim paid with her life.
26. Quite apart from such tragic loss of life, you left behind you a trail of physical and psychological injuries. One only has to read the victim impact statements to see the life-long harm that you have caused to April, May and June. April's home was turned into a prison for her, she was afraid to go out, she suffered flashbacks and depressive thoughts, and she has been unable to have a physical relationship to this day, despite her being in a loving relationship for the last four years. May explains that her life has been destroyed by you, she has flashbacks of the rapes, she cannot sleep properly and she suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder. June's evidence is that she had to learn to eat, walk and even go to the toilet again, and to this day has problems with her speech, walking and writing, and is scared to go out alone in the evening. She has been medically diagnosed as disabled and has suffered from depression.
27. I have also had careful regard to the victim impact statement from Michelle Samaraweera's sister which makes painful reading, and which I bear well in mind. The family has suffered terribly as a result of your actions, and they will never get over what you did to Michelle. I only hope that attending the trial and hearing the jury's verdicts has given them at least some closure, knowing that you have been brought to account for your actions.

28. 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.
29. I am required to specify the minimum term, pursuant to Section 269 and Schedule 21 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, which must elapse before you can be released on licence.
30. It would be open to me to impose multiple indeterminate or determinate sentences that run consecutive to the minimum term for the life sentence in relation to your other offending and your convictions for rape and grievous bodily harm. However it is common ground that the most desirable approach is to impose a minimum term in relation to the offence of murder that properly reflects the totality of your offending, and to impose concurrent sentences in relation to all other offences.
31. The first step, in determining the minimum term, is for me to assess the seriousness of your offending. Under paragraph 5(2) of Schedule 21, where murder involves sexual conduct, the seriousness of the offending will normally be regarded as particularly high, and the appropriate starting point in determining the minimum term will be 30 years. I am satisfied that your murder of Michelle Samaraweera involved sexual conduct in the form of your rape of her, and that, in all the circumstances, your offending is properly to be categorised as particularly high. Accordingly the appropriate starting point for the minimum term is 30 years.
32. Having chosen that starting point I am required then to take into account the aggravating and mitigating factors in your case to the extent that these have not been allowed for in choice of starting point (the rape of Michelle Samaraweera has already been taken into account in my adoption of a 30 year starting point).
33. Paragraph 10 of Schedule 21 sets out a non-exhaustive list of aggravating features. These include a significant degree of planning or premeditation.
34. I am satisfied that there are the following aggravating factors in the present case that relate specifically to your murder of Michelle Samaraweera:-
  - (1) There was a significant degree of planning or premeditation in your actions that night. I am satisfied that you followed Michele Samaraweera, then went into the Somerfield shop to ensure that was where she had gone, and then lay in wait for her on Queen's Road choosing a location (by the children's play area) that offered a degree of seclusion and cover (albeit not one that could prevent her screams being heard until you succeeded in silencing her). Although the defence accept that this was an aggravating feature it is suggested that there was some mitigation on the basis that it was a plan to rape as opposed to a plan to murder. I reject that suggestion. You had carried out serious sexual assaults accompanied by serious (and escalating) violence upon your previous victims, having left your previous victim June for dead. I am satisfied that when you stalked Michelle you planned to inflict, at the very least, really serious harm upon her in furtherance of rape, not caring whether she lived or died in consequence, and then, when you attacked her, and she screamed, you intended to kill her to silence her once and for all (as I address further below).



(2) Whilst Michelle was not particularly vulnerable because of age or disability, the circumstances of your offending as a whole in the form of an attack on a lone woman, in the early hours of the morning, in a secluded area where you were less likely to be disturbed than if you had carried out your attack on the street also increase its seriousness. These are also features of your modus operandi against your other victims as addressed further below.

35. The most serious, and very significant aggravating factor, however, is the sequence of, and facts of, your other offending that were escalating in seriousness and which stand to be taken into account when sentencing for the totality of your offending with concurrent sentences being passed for that other serious offending:-

(1) The rape of April was itself Category 1A offending under the Sexual Offences Guideline with, in relation to harm, the additional degradation owing to the anal rape, the violence and the forced entry into her home placing this in Category 1 with a significant degree of planning placing your offending in category A in terms of culpability, with aggravating factors including the timing of the offence, the vulnerability of your victim and ejaculation (starting point at trial 15 years' imprisonment with a range of 13 to 19 years' imprisonment).

(2) The multiple rapes of May were themselves yet more serious Category 1A offending involving, in relation to harm, violence followed by a sequence of forced penetration that was sadistic, degrading and humiliating in nature (forced oral penetration after forced anal penetration followed by vaginal penetration followed by anal penetration to ejaculation) leading to severe psychological harm (with a diagnosis of PTSD) amounting to Category 1 offending, with once again planning and pre-meditation as you lured your victim to an alleyway under the pretext of a drugs deal amounting to culpability A, with aggravating factors including the location and timing of your offending, ejaculation and the vulnerability of your victim (starting point 15 years' imprisonment with a range of 13 to 19 years' imprisonment).

(3) The rape and grievous bodily harm with intent of June. The rape was itself Category 1A offending, in relation to harm there was very significant physical violence (consistent with multiple blows with a fist or a weapon) resulting in very serious injuries from which the victim could have died, the additional degradation of an anal rape, and the particular vulnerability of the victim, coupled, in relation to culpability, with the significant degree of planning and premeditation in following the victim, with aggravating factors including the location and timing of the offending and ejaculation (starting point 15 years' imprisonment with a range of 13 to 19 years' imprisonment). Whilst being careful to avoid any double counting (as I have been), and bearing well in mind totality, there is also the causing of grievous bodily harm with intent, which was Category 1 offending under the Assault Guideline; in terms of greater harm the injury was serious in the context of the offence, the victim was particularly vulnerable and there was a sustained or repeated assault on the victim (Dr Poole giving evidence that there were at least two blows). In terms of culpability there was a significant degree of premeditation and the deliberate targeting of a vulnerable woman. The offence is further



aggravated by the location and timing of your offending and the ongoing effect on your victim (starting point 12 years' imprisonment with a range of 9 to 16 years' imprisonment).

36. I consider that in relation to each victim the multiple harm factors taken together with the aggravating factors justify an uplift towards the very top of the sentencing range and I bear in mind that I am sentencing for multiple rapes in relation to different victims and not one offence of rape. I also note that the Sexual Offences Guidelines state that, "Offences may be of such severity, for example involving a campaign of rape, that sentences of 20 years and above may be appropriate". It would not over-state your conduct to describe it as a campaign of rape. On any view determinate sentences at the very top of the range would be entirely appropriate. So far as count 1 (the anal rape of April) is concerned, you pleaded guilty albeit your denial of violence led to April having to give evidence and relive her ordeal as a result of which the available discount stands to be reduced.
37. When considering the minimum term I bear well in mind that in relation to a determinate sentence you would ordinarily be released after serving one half of that sentence, and I have given very careful consideration to the totality principle. Bearing such matters very well in mind, these other offences remain a very serious and very significant aggravating factor which necessitates a very substantial increase from the 30 year starting point.
38. Turning to mitigating factors. Paragraph 11 of Schedule 21 outlines a non-exhaustive list of mitigating factors.
39. The first is if you had an intention to cause serious bodily harm rather than to kill as is suggested on your behalf. When considering intention one looks to what you did or did not do and the effect of your actions having regard to your actions before, at the time of, and after the death of Michelle Samaraweera. All these things have the potential to shed light on what your intention was at the time of Michelle's death. I have no doubt whatsoever, and am sure, that at the moment you interfered with Michelle's breathing you intended to kill her. You had already been responsible for a series of serious assaults of increasing ferocity, and you had left your previous victim for dead, not caring, I am satisfied, whether she lived or died. You were willing to kill in pursuit of your sexual perversions, and in Michelle you found a victim who screamed for her life, and fought back as testified by the blood on her hands and abrasions on her face. She had to be silenced, and silenced she was. You continued to interfere with her breathing at a time when she must have made clear she was struggling for breath and maintained that interference until she was dead. Had you only intended to cause her serious bodily harm to facilitate your rape of her, then when she became unresponsive you would surely have checked for breathing, put her in the recovery position, and ensured that the emergency services were made aware of her plight whether or not you remained on scene. You did none of that. On the contrary, you left her naked, exposed and, I am satisfied, dead, at your hands, as you intended. There is no mitigation here.
40. You have shown neither compassion nor remorse for your victims throughout your trial, putting those who were alive, and could remember events, through the ordeal of reliving events, whilst you continued to protest your innocence to the bitter end, concocting ever

more fanciful versions of events, as you struggled to explain away the weight of the evidence against you. There is no mitigation here either.

41. You were 24 at the time of the offences, and your age does operate as a mitigating factor which I have taken into account. Indeed it is the only mitigating factor of any real substance. However there is nothing to suggest that you were immature for your age or that you were in any way intellectually impaired. On the contrary, you were a university graduate who had previously been married and you were in a steady relationship with a current girlfriend when you saw fit to carry out a series of rapes against different victims culminating in the murder of Michelle Samaraweera, and you were holding down a customer facing role at work, and by all accounts doing well at that.
42. For the murder of Michelle Samaraweera (Count 9) I sentence you to life imprisonment. Having regard to the aggravating and mitigating features in your case, and having careful regard to totality, I am satisfied that the appropriate minimum term is one of 37 years. From this must be deducted the number of days you were kept in custody in India awaiting extradition (173 + 290 days) and the days you were remanded in custody in connection with this offence (320 days to today's date), a total of 783 days or 2 years and 53 days. The minimum term is accordingly 34 years and 312 days.
43. 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 will be released at that time, or at any particular time thereafter. It is then only if the Parole Board decides you are fit to be released that you will be released. It is possible you may never be released. Moreover, if and when you are released you will remain subject to licence for the rest of your life, and may therefore be recalled to continue your life sentence. It is in these ways that a life sentence protects the public for the future. To ensure that the Parole Board is fully apprised of the circumstances of your offending I order that these Sentencing Remarks are placed on your prison file and accompany you throughout your time in prison.
44. In relation to your other offending, that offending is so serious that only a custodial sentence is appropriate. After considering the aggravating and mitigating features of your offending, and having careful regard to totality, on Count 1 the rape of April, the sentence is one of 16 years and 5 months' imprisonment (after an appropriate credit for guilty plea), on Counts 2, 3 and 4 the rapes of May, the sentence on each count is 18 years and 6 months' imprisonment, on Count 6 the rape of June, the sentence is 18 years and 6 months' imprisonment, on Count 7 the grievous bodily harm with intent the sentence is 14 years' imprisonment, and on Count 8 the rape of Michelle Samaraweera the sentence is 18 years and 6 months' imprisonment. The sentence passed on Counts 1 to 4 and 6 to 8 are concurrent to each other and to the sentence passed on Count 9 (the murder).
45. As a consequence of your convictions for rape, upon any release you will be subject to notification requirements to the police, and you will or may be barred from particular regulated activities.