

SEX OFFENDERS

RELEASE FROM PRISON

&

POST-RELEASE SUPERVISION

Scottish Executive Justice Department
April 2005

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	3
Background	
Related work	4
Number of Offences, Mode of Trial, and Disposal	5
Objectives	5
Which Offenders are we targeting?	6
Should sex offenders simply receive longer sentences?	6
Options	
Short-term	7
Medium-term	9
Longer-term	11
Summary of questions for the Sentencing Commission	13
Table 1 - Persons with a charge proved for selected offences, 2002	14
Table 2 - Persons given an extended sentence for selected offences, 2002	16

SEX OFFENDERS: RELEASE FROM PRISON & POST-RELEASE SUPERVISION

Introduction

1. The purpose of this document is to invite the Sentencing Commission's views on options for changing early release and post-release supervision arrangements for sex offenders.

2. On 25 November 2004, the First Minister announced in response to an oral Question from Paul Martin MSP:

“We believe that there is a strong case for ending automatic early release of sex offenders and are examining the effectiveness of the sex offenders notification scheme at an operational level. We aim to deliver better public protection through closer supervision of sex offenders in the community and will legislate to promote joint working between the police, prisons and criminal justice social work in assessing, monitoring and managing the risk posed by sex offenders.”

3. The Sentencing Commission is currently engaged on a review of early release as part of its wider remit. However the Scottish Executive wishes to identify options ahead of that wider review to deal specifically with concerns about sex offenders. This document is being copied to a range of interested bodies but we would be particularly grateful for comments by the Commission in view of its wider study of this area.

4. The concerns have intensified as a result of certain cases involving repeat offending by sex offenders which highlighted weaknesses in the arrangements. The involvement of child victims is a particular concern. In particular, for sex offenders serving less than 4 years in custody, there is no discretion about the timing of release and, for the majority, no compulsory supervision on release and therefore no opportunity to recall them to custody should their behaviour pose a risk to public safety. Even for those serving an 'extended sentence', including a period of supervision in the community, following a sentence of less than 4 years, there is no discretion about the timing of release. For offenders serving longer sentences, there is discretionary release on the recommendation of the Parole Board for Scotland between one half and two thirds of sentence but there is similarly no discretion about release on licence at the two thirds point.

5. The cases that came to public attention in 2004 featured some of these drawbacks, but the concerns about early release and supervision are not limited to the circumstances of those cases. This document looks at options for changes to the sentencing, early release and supervision arrangements for sex offenders so as to reduce the gaps which could put potential victims at unnecessary risk. We recognise that until a comprehensive review of early release is undertaken, there may be limits to the potential for a radical overhaul of the system for sex offenders alone. Despite these limits, the need to deliver better public protection, both of victims and potential victims, we must take steps to tighten the system and lessen the likelihood of re-offending.

Background

Related Work

6. This review forms part of wider work of the arrangements for protecting the community from sex offenders. That work includes several related strands, including-

- ◆ **An independent review** of the operation and effectiveness of the sex offender notification regime, led by Professor George Irving. This review is due to report by early summer;
- ◆ Implementation of the report of the **Expert Panel On Sex Offending** published in 2000 (the Cosgrove Report). Recommendations on the integrated management of sex offenders through joint arrangements, including information sharing, are to be implemented in the Management of Offenders etc. (Scotland) Bill;
- ◆ The arrangements for the **prosecution of sex offences** are being reviewed by the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service. This review is chaired by the Solicitor General, and is expected to report in the course of 2005;
- ◆ The **law on rape and other sexual offences** is subject to a separate review by the Scottish Law Commission, which is expected to report in 2007; and
- ◆ the **Protection of Children and Prevention of Sexual Offences (Scotland) Bill** introduces Risk of Sexual Harm Orders, which can be used to restrict the movements of an adult whose behaviour indicates that s/he may be a risk of sexual harm to a child or children, and extends the use of Sexual Offences Prevention Orders.

7. The Scottish Executive recognises that there is no system of public protection that can eliminate totally the risk of predatory sexual offending but we believe that everything possible must be done to ensure that adequate safeguards are in place and that the public authorities have closed gaps and loopholes that could result in avoidable victimisation. This document should not be seen in isolation but as part of a package of measures and complementary to the list described above.

8. We also recognise that the Commission is working on a wider review of early release and that it may consider it unnecessary to introduce a radical new approach for just one class of offender, which might shortly afterwards have to be changed again to fit the wider picture. Given that, the resource implications of wide reaching changes could be significant. Therefore we advocate an approach in stages, that allows for immediate short term changes, medium term measures, and longer term solutions that emerge from the wider review of early release.

Present arrangements

9. At present the following sentencing options apply to sex offenders-

9.1 Non-custodial sentences of various kinds;

9.2 Short-term prison sentences of less than 4 years, which result in automatic and unconditional release at half sentence;

9.3 Long-term prison sentences of 4 years or more, which result in parole consideration at half sentence, and automatic release at two thirds of sentence (if not already granted parole) in either case release being on licence, subject to social work supervision and recall to custody in case of breach until sentence expiry;

9.4 Extended sentences, in which the sentencing court may impose an extended period of supervision whether passing a short-term or a long-term sentence. The prisoner remains on licence and subject to supervision and to recall for breach, for the duration of the specified extension; and

9.5 Discretionary life sentences, in which the sentencing court imposes a life sentence with a specified punishment part. This will shortly be replaced by the Order for Lifelong Restriction (OLR) under which there will be enhanced risk assessment and management procedures involving the recently established Risk Management Authority.

Number of Offences, Mode of Trial and Disposal

10. Table 1 sets out statistics on sexual offences prosecuted in 2002, showing the court procedure and the disposal. The Table also includes other offences where a sexual aggravator was recorded by SCRO, and certain non-sexual offences against children. The Table shows the wide range of offences, and the wide range of disposals they attract. Table 2 provides some further detail on persons given an extended sentence in 2002.

Objectives

11. The objectives of any changes in the early release and supervision arrangements will be to ensure that-

- ◆ Except in cases generally agreed to be low risk, no sex offender is released into the community without some form of post-release supervision aimed at public protection;
- ◆ There is discretion about the timing of release for anyone serving a custodial sentence of significant length for a sexual offence, to ensure that risk can be minimised;
- ◆ There is no unnecessary increase in the prison population;

- ◆ The extra demands on resources are commensurate with the benefits expected; and
- ◆ The system harmonises with other changes that are taking place to assess and reduce the risk posed by sex offenders.

Which offenders are we targeting?

12. We suggest that the simplest way to proceed would be to apply the new arrangements to any offender who will be subject to the notification requirements in the Sexual Offences Act 2003. As already noted, sexual offending against children is a particular concern. However not every person who poses a risk of sexual offending will be charged with a sexual offence against a child. Experience shows that some persons convicted of an offence against a different age group, or a non-sexual offence against children, may be at risk of sexual offending against children. We should recognise that our understanding of risk factors is far from complete.

13. Special provisions for specified sexual and violent offences, and offences against children, are already included in a number of statutes, including provisions on extended sentences, victim notification and the notification requirements of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. These specified offences, and the application of existing special provisions could be used as the trigger for any new arrangements. Otherwise it would be necessary for the court to exercise a discretion based on the facts and circumstances of each case, which would add to the burdens on the court.

14. In this document we refer to the offences covered by it as ‘sex offences’ and the offenders as ‘sex offenders’, but accept that if a wider target group is appropriate, then different terminology will have to be found.

Question 1: We would welcome the Commission’s views on the best way of defining the offenders and offences to which any new arrangements should apply.

Should sex offenders simply receive longer sentences?

15. Our key concern must be to reduce the risk to victims and potential future victims of sexual offences. It is important that offenders should receive a just sentence in terms of punishment and retribution. In some cases, this will be a long determinate sentence, or an indeterminate sentence with a long punishment part, which will contain the offender and prevent reoffending for a number of years. But a longer period in custody is not necessarily the best way to minimise the long-term risk posed by the offender. For some offenders, a community disposal may be more effective at reducing their risk. While research has shown that the likelihood of reoffending and reconviction for sex offenders is no higher than for other offenders, the sorts of offences involved and their impact on victims mean that the risk has to be taken seriously¹.

¹ See *Recidivism Amongst Serious Violent and Sexual Offenders – Scottish Executive Social Research 2002* - <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library5/justice/rsvo-00.asp>

Options

16. This document sets out a range of options for improving the early release and supervision arrangements for sex offenders. These are divided into short-, medium- and longer-term options as follows-

- short-term options, which would not have knock-on effects elsewhere in the system although they would require resources and training;
- medium-term options involving greater resource implications and more complex interactions with other parts of the system; and
- longer-term options which should only be considered in the context of a wider review of early release, which would certainly require primary legislation and would generally be resource intensive.

For all of the options, careful consideration would need to be given to the impact on the prison system, criminal justice social work and other agencies as well as to the likely effectiveness.

Short-term options

17. These are options that could be accomplished in the short term by legislation, which would have resource and training implications, but which would be relatively self-contained and not affect the operation of the rest of the system in advance of the wider review of early release being conducted by the Commission.

Require short-term prisoner sex offenders to be released on licence rather than unconditionally

18. The main criticisms of sentences for sex offenders can be levelled at short-term custodial sentences (ie less than 4 years) and would apply equally to short-term sentences for other crimes and offences. There is no discretion about release at half-sentence and there is no provision for post-release supervision unless the offender is given a supervised release order (not available for sex offenders) or an extended sentence.

19. This option would simply change unconditional release at half-sentence for short-term prisoners to release on licence in relevant cases. The licence requires social work supervision, and might include other conditions. Failure to comply with the conditions could result in the licence being revoked and the offender being recalled to prison. It would not involve any discretion about the timing of release, but would have the advantage of introducing supervision in all cases.

20. This option would have resource implications by adding to the number of prisoners being released under supervision, by imposing new requirements for formal throughcare, and by potentially increasing the prison population as a result of recalls.

21. The Management of Offenders etc. (Scotland) Bill already includes provisions to improve monitoring arrangements for sex offenders in the community. It places a duty on the police, criminal justice social work and the Scottish Prison Service to establish joint

arrangements for assessing and managing the risk posed by sex offenders, including the power to share information. These provisions complement this option by providing the framework within which enhanced supervision and monitoring can occur.

22. We propose that the new arrangements apply to all short-term prisoners sentenced to between 6 months and 4 years. According to Table 1, in 2002 this would have involved 80 new prisoners being liable to eventual release on licence, on the basis of those sentenced to periods of this length who did not also receive an extended sentence. This would omit those sentenced for very short periods for offences such as indecent exposure, or minor sexual assault not suggesting any serious danger to the public.

23. We estimate that this would result in between 50 and 75 additional licences to be supervised at any one time; and assuming that 25% of such licencees are recalled to custody for breach of conditions, there could be an increase of 5-10 in the average prison population.

24. We propose to implement this option in the Management of Offenders etc. (Scotland) Bill recently introduced into the Scottish Parliament, by way of amendments at Stage 2.

Question 2: We would be grateful for the Commission's views on the option of changing the regime for release of short-term prisoners sentenced to between 6 months and 4 years so that sex offenders are released on licence instead of unconditionally at half sentence.

Change the definition of long-term prisoner for sex offenders

25. The option described above would not involve any discretion about the timing of release, so would not fully meet the objectives. However, having identified that automatic release is a weakness in these arrangements, finding a way to introduce discretion that is informed by a meaningful assessment of risk is not without difficulty. There is a danger that an element of discretion, exercised using limited information, could provide a false sense of security.

26. The Parole Board process for considering whether to release a prisoner on parole is necessarily a time-consuming one and a short custodial period would leave little time for the offender to be properly assessed and to demonstrate progress in addressing offending behaviour and risk before the Parole Board considers the case. However we consider that the possibility of reducing the definition of 'long-term prisoner' to, say, 3 years, with parole consideration after 18 months is worth further examination. To change the definition of 'long-term prisoner' in this way for sex offenders alone would require primary legislation. It would create a different expectation of release for those sentenced to between 3 and 4 years for a sex offence compared with others serving a similar sentence for a non-sexual offence. Only sex offenders in that bracket would come to the Parole Board and, if not granted parole, would serve between 6 and 8 months longer than other prisoners.

27. This option would not provide a comprehensive solution but would be one simple way of putting discretion and post-release supervision in place for sex offenders serving sentences of 3 or more years, which would be likely to be imposed where the crime had been fairly serious in nature. It is a measure that would impose additional burdens on criminal justice social work to make reports to the Parole Board and to supervise those released on

licence. However these would not be significant on top of the resource implications of changing unconditional release of short-term prisoners to release on licence as set out above.

Question 3: We would be grateful for the Commission's views on the desirability of bringing sex offenders sentenced to 3 years or more within the long-term prisoner arrangements.

Compliance with notification requirements as a licence condition

28. For relevant offenders, compliance with the notification requirements in the Sexual Offences Act 2003 could be incorporated as a licence condition. That would allow the revocation and recall arrangements in the Prisoners & Criminal Proceedings (Scotland) Act 1993 to be used to enforce compliance, which might be swifter than dealing with the offence of failing to comply with the requirements. This might however have to be coupled with legislation or directions requiring the Parole Board to recall for such breaches, as otherwise the Board would apply its normal 'risk to life and limb' test and might not consider this test to be satisfied purely for failure to comply with the notification requirements. Even if the Board does not recall, the offence of failure to comply with the notification requirements would still apply.

Question 4: Would the Commission favour adding compliance with the sex offender notification requirements as a licence condition in cases where the offender is subject to the notification requirements?

Medium-term options

29. These are options which would carry more significant resource implications and have implications elsewhere in the system.

Compulsory electronic monitoring for released sex offenders

30. Electronic monitoring can be a valuable addition to supervision. It can tell us where an offender is (or is not) at any given time. This can be used to curfew an offender to a particular place, or to alert the authorities when he gets close to e.g. a victim's house or a school. The Parole Board could be encouraged to impose a requirement that the licence conditions for released sex offenders (whether long-term prisoners or under an extended sentence) should include a curfew condition to be monitored electronically. Alternatively, primary legislation could be used to add such a requirement across-the-board. We need to recognise that electronic monitoring is not the solution to all problems. It cannot physically prevent an offender from reoffending or from breaching his conditions, although it may make it easier to detect and deal with this. If these limitations are not recognised, the use of electronic tagging could provide a false sense of security and serve to reduce public protection. Nevertheless, there is certainly scope for greater use of electronic monitoring as an additional safeguard.

Question 5: We would be grateful for the Commission’s views on the option of making electronic monitoring compulsory for all sex offenders released on licence. Or if not for all, how the use of electronic monitoring might be targeted?

Expand Orders for Lifelong Restriction

31. The Order for Lifelong Restriction may offer a model that could be adapted for a wider range of offenders. The risk assessment is carried out by an accredited risk assessor using methods accredited by the Risk Management Authority (RMA). If the risk criteria are met the court has no option but to make an OLR. The OLR will have a punishment part, upon the expiry of which the offender has a right to have his case referred to the Parole Board for Scotland. If the Parole Board is satisfied that it is not necessary for the protection of the public that the offender be contained, it must direct his release.

32. Any offender subject to an OLR must have a Risk Management Plan approved by the RMA. These will follow the offender through his time in prison or hospital to supervision in the community. The Plan will become an important part of the dossier that is presented to the Parole Board to inform the release decision and the Board is obliged to have regard to the Plan.

33. When the OLR becomes available to the courts it may be used more widely than the present discretionary life sentence. However it will remain a High Court disposal and would not be available to the sheriff solemn court except upon referral to the High Court. It would be possible to apply the OLR to a wider range of offenders by relaxing the criteria for its imposition. Basically this would involve removing the requirement that the offender pose a risk of serious harm, by removing the word ‘serious’. However we have no experience yet of operating these complex provisions, or of how effective they will be in improving public protection, and take the view that it is premature to change the criteria until we have such experience and the OLR has been evaluated.

Question 6: We would be grateful for the Commission’s views on whether it is too early to extend the OLR by reducing the risk criteria?

Add requirement for risk management planning in respect of long-term prisoners

34. Secondary legislation could be used to add a requirement in the case of sex offenders who are long-term prisoners that risk management plans should be prepared as for those under the Order for Lifelong Restriction. This would involve about 70 additional risk management plans each year being drawn up and submitted to the Risk Management Authority for approval. This would be cumulative – 70 in first year, 140 in second year etc. This would obviously have resource implications for local authority criminal justice social work, for SPS and for the RMA. This option would provide additional safeguards in relation to long-term prisoners only. Such prisoners are already released on licence and discretion about the timing of release is exercised by the Parole Board. It would be an additional challenge to the RMA to approve risk management plans for all such offenders. On present plans they will only be doing this for a handful of OLR sentences each year. It could be argued that to add in long-term prisoners in the near future would force the pace too much for the RMA, putting at risk the quality of its work and its impact on public protection; or it

could be argued that it would enable the RMA to build up expertise more quickly than would be possible if its remit remained confined to those on OLRs. It would also be a challenge to SPS and local authorities, who might not be ready to respond to a need for risk management planning in such a large number of cases in the short term, again risking diluting their efforts to reduce the risk posed by the smaller number of prisoners who have been identified through the OLR process as presenting a particularly high risk. This option would not apply to short-term prisoners as this would risk being disproportionate and diluting further the work on higher risk prisoners. All prisoners will in any event be covered by the provisions for joint risk assessment and management in the Management of Offenders etc. (Scotland) Bill.

Question 7: We would be grateful for the Commission's views on the option of extending risk management planning as a principle to all sex offenders serving long-term sentences.

Longer-term option

A new sex offender sentence

35. Any alternative option to the present long-term determinate sentence would have to allow for discretion about the timing of release and also for post release supervision whenever release took place. A possible new sex offender sentence could draw features from the OLR but instead of being indeterminate, it could be designed to last for a fixed period.

36. The sentence would be in three parts-

- A minimum punishment period (to be served in custody);
- A further discretionary period in custody; and
- A period of supervision in the community during which the offender would be subject to recall.

The decision on release between the end of the punishment period and the end of the discretionary custodial period of the sentence would be under control of Parole Board.

37. For example, the court might pass a 7-year sex offender sentence comprising 3 year punishment period, 2 years discretionary custodial period and an extended supervision period of 2 years on licence. The effect would be as follows-

- If the offender is released at the end of the punishment period (ie after 3 years), the offender would spend 4 years on licence.
- If he is released after 4 years, he would spend 3 years on licence.
- If he remains in custody for the full custodial period and is released after 5 years, the offender would spend 2 years on licence.

38. The offender would be liable to recall during the licence period but could be re-released on the direction of the Parole Board.

39. The use of a new sex offender sentence could be triggered by conviction for certain categories of offence, taking into account the facts and circumstances surrounding the index

offence and the accused's previous record. This would include a risk assessment, perhaps based on the OLR model or on section 21 of the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 2003.

40. The benefits of this model are:

- ◆ An end to compulsory release after two-thirds of sentence. The punishment period, however long, would be served in full;
- ◆ Transparency in the meaning of sentences. The sentencing judge would spell out the meaning of the 3 components at the time of sentencing; and
- ◆ Removal of the arbitrary distinction between short-term and long-term prisoners. The punishment part could be quite short (eg 1 year, or 18 months).

41. While we consider that there may be some advantages in working up a model for a sentence along these lines, we are doubtful whether it would be appropriate to do so for sex offenders in isolation. There are benefits to the model but it is doubtful whether it is so superior over the present arrangements for long-term prisoners that it would be worth investing in its development in isolation from the wider changes that the Commission may in due course be recommending to early release.

Question 8: We would be grateful for the Commission's comments on the possibility of introducing an entirely new style of sentence consisting of custodial, discretionary and community components, as part of its wider review of early release.

Summary of Questions for the Sentencing Commission

Question 1: We would welcome the Commission's views on the best way of defining the offenders and offences to which any new arrangements should apply.

Question 2: We would be grateful for the Commission's views on the option of changing the regime for release of short-term prisoners sentenced to between 6 months and 4 years so that sex offenders are released on licence instead of unconditionally at half sentence.

Question 3: We would be grateful for the Commission's views on the desirability of bringing sex offenders sentenced to 3 years or more within the long-term prisoner arrangements.

Question 4: Would the Commission favour adding compliance with the sex offender notification requirements as a licence condition in cases where the offender is subject to the notification requirements?

Question 5: We would be grateful for the Commission's views on the option of making electronic monitoring compulsory for all sex offenders released on licence. Or if not for all, how the use of electronic monitoring might be targeted?

Question 6: We would be grateful for the Commission's views on whether it is too early to extend the OLR by reducing the risk criteria?

Question 7: We would be grateful for the Commission's views on the option of extending risk management planning as a principle to all sex offenders serving long-term sentences.

Question 8: We would be grateful for the Commission's comments on the possibility of introducing an entirely new style of sentence consisting of custodial, discretionary and community components, as part of its wider review of early release.

TABLE 1**Persons with a charge proved for selected offences (where main offence) in 2002***

(figures shown in brackets relate to number of extended sentences)

Main offence	Total	Sentence							Court Procedure			
		Custody (to 6 months)	Custody (over 6 months to 2 yrs)	Custody (over 2 up to 4 yrs)	Custody (4 yrs+)	Community sentence	Financial penalty	Other sentence	High Court	Sheriff solemn	Sheriff summary	District
Total	1,998	122 (-)	385 (17)	106 (9)	229 (23)	678	321	157	321	765	897	15
Sexual Offences	508	34	66 (15)	28 (9)	66 (13)	193	74	47	103	94	303	8
Abduction	28	2	5	1	3 (1)	5	8	4	4	8	26	-
Assault with Intent to Ravish	12	-	3	1	6 (3)	1	-	1	9	3	-	-
Brothel keeping	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-
Defilement of girl under 13	4	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	1	2	-	1
Defilement of girl under 16	38	2	4	3 (1)	3 (1)	12	6	8	5	6	27	-
Handling obscene material	17	1	2 (1)	1	-	10	3	-	-	8	9	-
Homosexual acts	13	-	-	-	2	1	10	-	2	-	6	5
Incest	9	-	-	1	5 (1)	3	-	-	7	2	-	-
Indecent Assault	64	1	9 (3)	4 (2)	2	20	15	13	11	7	46	-
Indecent exposure	63	7	1 (1)	-	-	33	12	10	-	1	61	1
Lewd and libidinous practices	230	20	42 (10)	15 (6)	22 (3)	103	17	11	37	57	136	-
Offences related to prostitution	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Rape	27	-	-	2	23 (4)	2	-	-	27	-	-	-
Other Offences against Children												
Children & young persons offences (not elsewhere classified)	12	-	-	-	-	4	5	3	-	-	11	1
Cruelty (neglecting &c) to & unnatural treatment of children	155	9	2	-	-	70	21	53	-	2	153	-
Violent Offences												
Murder	37	-	-	-	37	-	-	-	37	-	-	-
Culpable homicide (common law)	31	-	2	3	22	-	-	4	31	-	-	-
Serious Assault	1,219	75	315 (2)	75	104 (10)	398	208	44	150	669	396	4

Main offence	Total	Sentence							Court Procedure			
		Custody (to 6 months)	Custody (over 6 months to 2 years)	Custody (over 2 up to 4 years)	Custody (4 years & over)	Community sentence	Financial penalty	Other sentence	High Court	Sheriff solemn	Sheriff summary	District
Other (with sexual aggravator)												
Breach of the peace **	30	2	-	-	-	13	11	4	-	-	28	2
Failure to notify police/provision of false information **	4	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	4	-
General attempts to defeat/pervert the course/ends of justice **	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
Housebreaking with intent to steal **	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Total (excl Serious Assault)	779	47 (-)	70 (15)	31 (9)	125 (13)	280	113	113	171	96	501	11
** offences with a sexual aggravator recorded on SCRO.												

* Figures may be underestimates due to late recording of disposals on SCRO, particularly for the High Court

TABLE 2

**Persons given an extended sentence for selected offences, 2002*
by length of custodial and supervision elements**

	Total	Custodial sentence up to 2 years				Custodial sentence of 2-4 years				Custodial sentence of 4 years or more				
		Total	Supervision in months			Total	Supervision in months			Total	Supervision in months			
			Up to 1 year	>1 to 2 years	>2 to 3 years		>1 to 2 years	>2 to 3 years	Over 3 years		Up to 1 year	>1 to 2 years	>2 to 3 years	Over 3 years
Total	49	17	4	4	9	9	3	4	2	23	0	4	3	15
Abduction	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Assault with Intent to Ravish	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Defilement of girl under 16	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Handling obscene material	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Incest	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Indecent Assault	5	3	1	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indecent exposure	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lewd and libidinous practices	19	10	2	3	5	6	1	3	2	3	0	0	0	3
Rape	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	2
Serious Assault and attempted murder	12	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	0	3	1	5

* Figures may be underestimates due to late recording of disposals on SCRO, particularly for the High Court.