

ROYAL COURT

2nd August, 1991

112.

Before: The Deputy Bailiff, and  
Jurats Coutanche and Bonn

---

The Attorney General

- v -

DL

---

Bail Application.

---

The Attorney General.  
Advocate S.J. Habin for the applicant.

---

**JUDGMENT**

**THE DEPUTY BAILIFF:** We agree with the Attorney General's interpretation of Article 16(2) of the Children (Jersey) Law, 1969. There is a remand in custody for sentence. Thus there is a strong presumption that the accused will remain in custody until he receives sentence.

There are a number of reasons why we should not interfere with that presumption.

Firstly the gravity of the offence is sufficient ground by itself to refuse bail.

Secondly a custodial sentence is virtually inevitable.

Thirdly Mr. Habin has been unable to point to anything which could be regarded as an exceptional circumstance.

Fourthly it is rare indeed to grant bail after conviction.

We are conscious of the support given by DL's mother and family and we commend them. We are also aware of DL's mainly good character and the very good references provided. But the drugs problem is a serious one and these are very serious offences. We regret that age cannot be used as a factor to avoid custody in such cases. Young people must know that if they meddle with drugs they will lose their liberty.

The application is refused.

No authorities cited.