



House of Commons
Home Affairs Committee

Draft Sentencing Guideline: Robbery

Second Report of Session 2005–06



House of Commons
Home Affairs Committee

Draft Sentencing Guideline: Robbery

Second Report of Session 2005–06

*Report, together with annex and formal
minutes*

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed 28 February 2006*

Home Affairs Committee

The Home Affairs Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration and policy of the Home Office and its associated public bodies; and the administration and expenditure of the Attorney General's Office, the Treasury Solicitor's Department, the Crown Prosecution Service and the Serious Fraud Office (but excluding individual cases and appointments and advice given within government by Law Officers).

Current membership

Mr John Denham MP (*Labour, Southampton, Itchen*) (Chairman)

Mr Richard Benyon MP (*Conservative, Newbury*)

Mr Jeremy Browne MP, (*Liberal Democrat, Taunton*)

Colin Burgon MP (*Labour, Elmet*)

Mr James Clappison MP (*Conservative, Hertsmere*)

Mrs Ann Cryer MP (*Labour, Keighley*)

Mrs Janet Dean MP (*Labour, Burton*)

Nick Harvey MP (*Liberal Democrat, North Devon*)

Steve McCabe MP (*Labour, Birmingham, Hall Green*)

Mr Shahid Malik MP (*Labour, Dewsbury*)

Gwyn Prosser MP (*Labour, Dover*)

Mr Richard Spring MP (*Conservative, West Suffolk*)

Mr Gary Streeter MP (*Conservative, South West Devon*)

Mr David Winnick MP (*Labour, Walsall North*)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publications

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at www.parliament.uk/homeaffairscom. A list of Reports of the Committee since 2001 is at the back of this volume.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Dr Robin James (Clerk), Mr Mark Etherton (Second Clerk), Kate Akester (Adviser (Sentencing Guidelines)), Martha Goyder (Committee Specialist), Ms Arabella Thorp (Inquiry Manager), Mr Ian Thomson (Committee Assistant), Jenny Pickard (Secretary) and Alison Forrester (Senior Office Clerk).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Home Affairs Committee, House of Commons, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 3276; the Committee's email address is homeaffcom@parliament.uk.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Report	
1 Introduction	3
2 Background	3
Robbery defined	3
Some recent statistics	4
Police recorded crime	4
British Crime Survey	4
Prosecutions and convictions	5
3 The draft guideline	5
Seriousness	5
Sentencing ranges for young offenders	6
Sentencing ranges for adults	6
Aggravating and mitigating factors for adults and young offenders	7
Dangerousness	7
4 Specific issues	8
Differentiation between adult and young offenders	8
Referral orders	9
Youth courts: jurisdictional issues	9
Drug Treatment and Testing Orders/drug rehabilitation requirements	10
Restorative measures	10
Use of knives	10
Custody	10
Deterrent effects of sentencing	11
Conclusions and recommendations	12
Annex	14
Formal minutes	15
Reports from the Home Affairs Committee since 2001	16

1 Introduction

1. The draft guideline on robbery was published by the Sentencing Guidelines Council (hereafter “the Council”) on 28 November 2005. It took into account advice it had received from the Sentencing Advisory Panel (published in May 2004), based on wide consultation initiated by its Consultation Paper of 9 April 2003. It is open to any member of the public or organisation to respond to the Panel’s consultations; and the Committee had the benefit of reading the 39 responses received. We received our own responses (listed in Annex A) to the draft guideline after publication, and are grateful to those who supplied them. We express our thanks to Professor Rod Morgan, Chair of the Youth Justice Board, for addressing us on the significance of the draft guideline for young offenders.

2. In the last Parliament the Home Affairs Committee agreed to a request from the Government that it should undertake regular scrutiny of draft sentencing guidelines issued by the then new Sentencing Guidelines Council. The Committee’s role is consultative. In the last Parliament our predecessors produced a report on the first two draft sentencing guidelines.¹ No report on the third draft guideline was possible because it was issued at a time when the Committee was un-nominated following the 2005 General Election.² The draft guideline on robbery is the fourth to be issued by the Council.

3. We generally endorse the structure and flexibility of the draft guideline. It is based on three levels of seriousness, with helpful lists of aggravating and mitigating factors which create the fluidity necessary for proportionate sentencing for offences where the range of conduct is wide. We note that the impact on victims is explicitly taken into account. The Sentencing Advisory Panel recognised the need for separate guidelines for adult and youth offenders, and different sentencing ranges are accordingly presented. There have been several significant changes since the Panel gave its advice: the Council has produced a guideline addressing the assessment of seriousness, and the provisions on the sentencing of dangerous offenders (in the Criminal Justice Act 2003) have come into force. This Report does not aim to comment in detail on all aspects of the draft guideline, but to set out some basic background and then focus on issues of particular concern.

2 Background

Robbery defined

4. According to the Theft Act 1968, “a person is guilty of robbery if he steals, and immediately before or at the time of doing so, and in order to do so, he uses force on any person or puts or seeks to put any person in fear of being then and there subjected to force”.³ Robbery is an indictable offence, meaning that it can be tried only in the Crown Court. Under 18-year-olds are tried in Youth Courts, but can be committed to the Crown

1 Home Affairs Committee, Fifth Report of Session 2003–04, *Draft Sentencing Guidelines 1 and 2* (HC 1207), published on 4 November 2004. The guidelines were on ‘reduction in sentence for a guilty plea’ and ‘Overarching principles: seriousness / New sentences: Criminal Justice Act 2004’.

2 On ‘Manslaughter by reason of provocation’.

3 Section 8 (1)

Court if a sentence of two years or more may be warranted (Youth Courts have jurisdiction to impose sentences up to and including two years).

5. Robbery covers a wide range of behaviour. It could be a spur of the moment snatch or an elaborately planned and very violent attack in the course of taking valuable property or large amounts of money. Whatever the circumstances, force will always be used or threatened, and injury or the real risk of injury, whether physical or psychological, will be occasioned. At the bottom end, there may be a very fine line between robbery and theft from the person; and British Crime Survey statistics suggest that 62% of robberies resulted in no injury.

Some recent statistics

6. Robbery is predominantly a young man's crime. Recent Home Office research shows that over 50% of offenders convicted of personal robberies were aged between 16 and 20, and 46% of victims were aged between 11 and 20.⁴ 96% of suspects were male, as were 76% of victims. Young black defendants are overrepresented, and in 2003 they formed 52.8% of those dealt with by Youth Offending Teams for robbery.⁵ It is a crime predominantly committed in metropolitan areas. In 2004–05, 44% of robberies were recorded by the Metropolitan Police, while nearly two-thirds of all robbery offences were recorded by Greater Manchester, West Midlands and Metropolitan Police force areas.⁶

Police recorded crime

7. The police in England and Wales recorded 88,710 robberies in 2004–05: 7,926 of these were of business property, and 80,784 of personal property. This is the lowest total for five years and a fall of 12% on 2003–04.⁷

British Crime Survey

8. The British Crime Survey can be argued to give a better indication of trends in crime over time than police recorded crime, because it is unaffected by changes in levels of reporting to the police and in police recording practices. Estimates for 2004–05 suggest that there were 255,000 robberies in England and Wales. This is 25% lower than in 1995 and the lowest since the 1993 survey. Figures indicate a general decrease in robbery over the last decade, with a fall of a quarter since 1995. 62% of robberies resulted in no injury; and the most common types of injuries were: minor bruising/black eye (25%), severe bruising (16%), scratches (16%) and cuts (15%). A hospital stay was required in 1% of cases.⁸

4 Jonathan Smith, *The nature of personal robbery* (Home Office Research Study 254, January 2003)

5 Commission for Racial Equality statistics (Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System—2004)

6 Home Office Statistical Bulletin 11/05

7 *ibid.*

8 *ibid.*

Prosecutions and convictions

9. In 2004 12,404 people were prosecuted for robbery in England and Wales. 35% of them were over 21, and 34% of them were between 15 and 18 years old. 7,514 of these people were convicted: 67% were sentenced to immediate custody and 30% to community sentences (3% were fined or conditionally discharged).⁹

3 The draft guideline

10. Robbery is divided into categories to reflect the different levels of offending that the broad definition incorporates. The five generally accepted categories of robbery are: street robbery or “mugging”; robberies of small businesses; violent personal robberies in the home; less sophisticated commercial robberies; and professionally planned commercial robberies.

11. The first part of the guideline deals with three of these:

- (1) **Street robbery or ‘mugging’;**
- (2) **Robberies of small businesses, and**
- (4) **Less sophisticated commercial robberies.**

The second part covers:

- (3) **Violent personal robberies in the home, and**
- (5) **Professionally planned commercial robberies.**

The Council has decided that there is currently no need to issue a guideline for these two categories, as the existing Court of Appeal guidance is thought to be sufficient.

Seriousness

12. The Council refers to the principles developed to assess seriousness, noting that “exceptional circumstances may justify a non-custodial penalty for adults and, more frequently, for a young offender”.¹⁰ It lists the relevant factors as: the degree of violence and injury to victims, the amount of force and fear caused, the use of force and the level of the threat of force, and the actual or threatened use of a weapon.

13. It details three levels of seriousness applying to all categories of the offence:

- Level 1 the threat and/or use of minimal force;**
- Level 2 use of a weapon to threaten and/or use of force to cause injury, and**
- Level 3 use of a weapon and significant force, resulting in serious injury.**

9 Criminal Statistics 2004, Home Office Statistical Bulletin 19/05

10 Draft guideline page 4 para D

The relative seriousness of each level is determined by the individual details of culpability and harm caused, and the aggravating and mitigating factors that may apply.¹¹

Sentencing ranges for young offenders

14. The draft guideline proposes the following sentencing ranges for young offenders (below the age of 18):

1. *Threat and/or use of minimal force: starting point is a community order and the range is up to 12 months' detention and training order*
2. *Use of a weapon to threaten and/or use of force to cause injury: starting point is three years' detention, and the range is from 1–6 years' detention*
3. *Use of a weapon and significant force, resulting in serious injury: starting point is seven years' detention, and the range is from 6–10 years' detention.*

15. These starting points are based upon a first-time offender of 17 who has pleaded not guilty. Sentencers are required to consider whether lower starting points should apply to younger offenders. The draft guideline specifies that immaturity, as well as age, should be taken into account.

Sentencing ranges for adults

16. The draft guideline proposes the following sentencing ranges for adults:¹²

1. *Threat and/or use of minimal force: starting point is 12 months' custody and the range up to 3 years*
2. *Use of a weapon to threaten and/or use of force to cause injury: starting point is 4 years' custody, and the range 2–7 years*
3. *Use of a weapon and significant force, resulting in serious injury: starting point is 8 years' custody, and the range 7–12 years.*

17. The sentencing ranges and presumptive starting points apply to all three categories of robbery listed above, and are based on a first-time offender pleading not guilty. Mitigating factors and/or personal mitigation can take a sentence below the starting point, and thus non-custodial penalties are possible for adults committing minor robberies. Equally, if the aggravating factors are very serious, the case may move to a higher level of seriousness, and therefore a longer sentence.

¹¹ Listed on pages 4–9 of the draft guideline

¹² See tables on page 12 of the draft guideline

Aggravating and mitigating factors for adults and young offenders

18. Having established the category of robbery and the level of seriousness, the next step for the sentencer is to look at aggravating and mitigating factors. There is a list of generally applicable factors already in existence, set out in the *Overarching Principles: Seriousness* guideline which we reported on in 2004.¹³ In the context of robbery, the Council has singled out as aggravating factors:

- the degree of force and level of the threat;
- the use of weapons;
- the vulnerability of victims;
- the number and roles of offenders;
- the value of property taken;
- the time of the offence (victims are likely to be both more vulnerable and more frightened at night), and
- the wearing of a disguise (balaclava or mask, for example, as this may indicate a degree of planning).

19. Mitigating factors are:

- lack of planning;
- peripheral participation;
- the voluntary return of property taken;
- evidence of remorse, and
- co-operation with the police.

Both types of factor could be present in the same offence, and must be balanced out. Personal mitigation has then to be taken into account, and the circumstances of each offender considered. The draft guideline requires that courts should also take into consideration whether this is a first offence of violence, and response to any previous sentence. Guilty pleas will attract some reduction, in varying degrees, depending on when they were entered.

Dangerousness

20. The Criminal Justice Act 2003 contains new provisions aimed at protecting the public from offenders posing a significant risk.¹⁴ Put very briefly, where serious (punishable by 10 years' or more imprisonment) or specified offences (there are 153 listed categories of

¹³ See Home Affairs Committee, Fifth Report of Session 2003–04, *Draft Sentencing Guidelines 1 and 2* (HC 1207)

¹⁴ Sections 224–30

violent or sexual offences)¹⁵ are committed, indeterminate sentences will result if there is also finding of significant risk of serious harm (death or serious physical/psychological injury) from further similar offending.

21. Previous convictions for specified offences entitle courts to assume (a ‘rebuttable assumption’) that the significant risk threshold has been passed. However, the Court of Appeal, in an important test case, has noted that these provisions are subject to reasonable interpretation, bearing in mind that the intention cannot have been for people convicted of relatively minor offences to serve indeterminate sentences.¹⁶ It is likely that a significant number of those convicted of robbery will be sentenced under these provisions, but the nature of their impact is not yet known. The robbery guideline will provide guidance for the length of minimum terms to be served before the Parole Board can consider release in these cases.

22. Under 18-year-olds will receive extended or indeterminate sentences in similar circumstances, and minimum terms will be set in the same way as for adults. However, the courts are not entitled to assume the risk threshold has been passed where there are previous convictions. A very recent Court of Appeal judgement indicates that courts must be rigorous before concluding that there is significant risk: and that wherever possible trial should be in youth courts, which are best designed for the specific needs of under 18-year-olds.¹⁷

4 Specific issues

Differentiation between adult and young offenders

23. We are pleased to note that the draft guideline recognises the need for separate guidelines and sentencing ranges for adult and young offenders. However, the aggravating and mitigating factors set out in the guideline are identical for both sets of offenders. We think this is unfortunate. For example, peer pressure, the influence of adults, and the very uneven rates of development for 10 to 17-year-olds might be mitigating factors for younger offenders in particular. Group activity, much more common among the young, may need to be viewed in a different way. Young offenders are capable of rapid change; and delayed development may be an argument for more intensive requirements to tackle individual difficulties at an early stage, and to encourage individuals’ progress towards maturity and responsibility. **We recommend that aggravating and mitigating factors should be set out separately for adults and young offenders, so as to recognise the different philosophy and statutory purpose of the youth justice system, add clarity to the guideline (which already provides for different sentencing ranges), and allow for the varying significance of these factors for different ages.**

24. **We also recommend that there should be more specific guidance on the proportionate (and appropriate) sentencing of younger offenders, given that the**

15 In schedule 15 CJA 2003

16 In R v Lang and others (2005) EWCA Crim 2864

17 R (on the application of the DPP) v South East Surrey Youth Court AC 8 December 2005

sentencing range is based on a 17-year-old pleading not guilty. However, such guidance should not start from the assumption that the appropriate response to immaturity or challenging family backgrounds is necessarily a discounted length of sentence. Rather guidance should aim to ensure that the sentence contains all the elements necessary to ensure the successful rehabilitation of the offender.

Referral orders

25. Referral orders must be made in relation to first-time young offenders who plead guilty, unless either an absolute discharge or a custodial sentence is justified.¹⁸ They take the form of contracts with young offenders, and for those convicted of robbery they would be likely to include a substantial element of reparation, and whatever other conditions are assessed as needed to address the causes of the behaviour, and to prevent re-offending. Educational, drug misuse, and family needs are often prominent factors. Victims may participate, and the fulfilment of the contract is supervised by a Youth Offender Panel. Referral orders were imposed in roughly 25% of youth court robbery cases in 2004–05.¹⁹ Referral orders are not specifically mentioned in the draft guideline, being subsumed within the wider category of community orders. **For the sake of clarity, and because of their common use, we recommend that explicit mention of referral orders be made on the face of the guideline.**

Youth courts: jurisdictional issues

26. We wish to raise one issue which goes beyond the contents of the draft guideline. ‘Grave crimes’ (those attracting 14 years or more imprisonment where committed by adults) can be dealt with more severely in the Crown Court, and youth courts may decline jurisdiction if it appears that their sentencing powers (of up to two years’ detention) may be insufficient for dealing with such crimes. The ‘plea before venue’ provisions set out in the Criminal Justice Act 2003 would enable youth courts to take account of both the plea and any personal mitigation before deciding whether to commit for sentence in the Crown Court.²⁰ This would enable them to deal with more cases more effectively (because they are specialised courts for young people), and at less cost to the taxpayer. These provisions have not yet been implemented. **We see no reason why the ‘plea before venue’ provisions should not be brought into force with immediate effect, and recommend that the Government should take the necessary steps to do so.**

27. We also note that the draft guideline ignores the significance of the two-year threshold for youth court jurisdiction decisions. **We recommend that the guideline should explicitly address the jurisdictional boundary between youth courts and the Crown Court in relation to each sentencing range for young offenders.**

18 Referral orders were introduced under the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999.

19 Youth Justice Board statistics: robbery sentencing outcomes—April 2004–March 2005

20 Schedule 3 of the Act

Drug Treatment and Testing Orders/drug rehabilitation requirements

28. Research indicates that the overall incidence of ‘acquisitive offending’ has fallen very markedly when Drug Treatment and Testing Orders are in force.²¹ Under the new sentencing structure, these have now been replaced. Community orders with specific requirements are now available, and there is a drug rehabilitation requirement which may be attached to orders in appropriate circumstances **We urge sentencers, in cases where non-custodial sentences can be justified, to impose more community orders with drug rehabilitation requirements where the evidence indicates that drug treatment would make a significant difference to offending behaviour.**

Restorative measures

29. Restorative measures offer victims an opportunity to confront offenders with the consequences of their actions, receive apologies, and reparation. They potentially open the way for a change of attitudes, so that fear may be reduced for victims, and offenders may have more understanding of their behaviour, and therefore incentive to discontinue. Experience of the use of such measures is increasing and appear to be generally positive. **We recommend that the draft guideline should be amended to provide that, in less serious cases and where fear or risk is successfully reduced by restorative measures, and reparation made with the agreement of the victim, this should be a mitigating factor.**

30. **We further believe that in appropriate cases sentence might be deferred for restorative processes to take place, to promote the interests of victims and the prevention of re-offending. We recommend that the Council should consider adding to the guideline specific mention of such an option—which should also make clear that custodial sentences may well result in any event. If restorative measures have previously been used this may not be a suitable course of action.**

Use of knives

31. We are especially concerned about the use of knives. There have been a number of fatal stabbings recently, some of them in the course of robbery; and we are conscious that knives are carried far too commonly, with potentially extremely serious consequences. In view of this, and of the understandable public disquiet caused, **we recommend that there should be an additional aggravating factor of premeditation shown by pre-arming. We believe courts are well able to identify where this is deliberate.**

Custody

32. We consider it appropriate that a majority of adults convicted of robbery should be sentenced to custody. However, some offenders will receive relatively short sentences. Whilst custodial sentences may well be appropriate in many cases, the Committee has in the past been critical of the effectiveness of short sentences in promoting the rehabilitation of offenders. It is all the more important therefore that the National Offender Management

21 Turnbull PJ, McSweeney T., Hough M., Webster R and Edmunds M. “Drugs Treatment and Testing Orders: Final Evaluation Report”. Page 70–71 Home Office Research Study 212

Service takes further action to ensure that such sentences do include appropriate measures of education, drug treatment, prison work and effective resettlement.

33. In its report on *Rehabilitation of Prisoners*, published in January 2005, our predecessors in the last Parliament drew attention to the gross inadequacy of educational and rehabilitative provision in our prisons.²² **We support our predecessors' call for a major rethink of policy, and redirection of resources, towards effective rehabilitative work in prisons. We also recommend that the draft guideline on robbery should require sentencers, when they explain their reasons as to why a particular custodial sentence has been imposed, to make an explicit statement as to the levels of education and drug treatment that they expect to be provided within prison as a necessary part of that sentence.**

Deterrent effects of sentencing

34. We note that the new dangerousness provisions are likely to affect a considerable number of people convicted of robbery, as well as other violent and sexual offenders. They provide an additional sentencing framework where significant risk is identified. It is unclear as yet what their impact will be, and we recommend that the Council commission research into this, and into their deterrent effect. These provisions should be monitored, and guidance from the Council, to complement the Court of Appeal decisions, would be helpful.

35. We accept that there is evidence that exemplary sentencing has no long-term deterrent effect.²³ However, we believe it may well be the case that such sentencing may have an effect at times when particular types of crime are increasing. We feel this issue merits further consideration. **We recommend that the Council should commission research into the deterrent effects both of exemplary sentencing and of the new sentences for dangerous offenders.**

22 First Report of Session 2004–05, HC 193

23 Von Hirsch, Bottoms, Burney, and Wikstrom: *Criminal Deterrence and Sentence Severity* 1999

Conclusions and recommendations

1. We recommend that aggravating and mitigating factors should be set out separately for adults and young offenders, so as to recognise the different philosophy and statutory purpose of the youth justice system, add clarity to the guideline (which already provides for different sentencing ranges), and allow for the varying significance of these factors for different ages. (Paragraph 23)
2. We also recommend that there should be more specific guidance on the proportionate (and appropriate) sentencing of younger offenders, given that the sentencing range is based on a 17-year-old pleading not guilty. However, such guidance should not start from the assumption that the appropriate response to immaturity or challenging family backgrounds is necessarily a discounted length of sentence. Rather guidance should aim to ensure that the sentence contains all the elements necessary to ensure the successful rehabilitation of the offender. (Paragraph 24)
3. For the sake of clarity, and because of their common use, we recommend that explicit mention of referral orders be made on the face of the guideline. (Paragraph 25)
4. We see no reason why the ‘plea before venue’ provisions should not be brought into force with immediate effect, and recommend that the Government should take the necessary steps to do so. (Paragraph 26)
5. We recommend that the guideline should explicitly address the jurisdictional boundary between youth courts and the Crown Court in relation to each sentencing range for young offenders. (Paragraph 27)
6. We urge sentencers, in cases where non-custodial sentences can be justified, to impose more community orders with drug rehabilitation requirements where the evidence indicates that drug treatment would make a significant difference to offending behaviour. (Paragraph 28)
7. We recommend that the draft guideline should be amended to provide that, in less serious cases and where fear or risk is successfully reduced by restorative measures, and reparation made with the agreement of the victim, this should be a mitigating factor. (Paragraph 29)
8. We further believe that in appropriate cases sentence might be deferred for restorative processes to take place, to promote the interests of victims and the prevention of re-offending. We recommend that the Council should consider adding to the guideline specific mention of such an option—which should also make clear that custodial sentences may well result in any event. If restorative measures have previously been used this may not be a suitable course of action. (Paragraph 30)
9. We recommend that there should be an additional aggravating factor of premeditation shown by pre-arming. We believe courts are well able to identify where this is deliberate. (Paragraph 31)

10. We support our predecessors' call for a major rethink of policy, and redirection of resources, towards effective rehabilitative work in prisons. We also recommend that the draft guideline on robbery should require sentencers, when they explain their reasons as to why a particular custodial sentence has been imposed, to make an explicit statement as to the levels of education and drug treatment that they expect to be provided within prison as a necessary part of that sentence. (Paragraph 33)
11. We recommend that the Council should commission research into the deterrent effects both of exemplary sentencing and of the new sentences for dangerous offenders. (Paragraph 35)

Annex

The Committee received informal comments on the draft guideline from:

Rob Allen, International Centre for Prison Studies

Mark Ashford, Youth Court Solicitor

Professor Sue Bailey, Adolescent Forensic Psychiatrist

David Faulkner, Oxford Centre for Criminological Research

HM Council of Circuit Judges (Criminal subcommittee)

Ben Lyon, Restorative justice practitioner

NACRO Youth Crime Unit

Nicky Padfield, Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge.

Restorative Justice Consortium

Smart Justice

Youth Justice Board

Formal minutes

Tuesday 28 February 2006

Members present:

Mr John Denham, in the Chair

Mr Richard Benyon	Nick Harvey
Mr Jeremy Browne	Steve McCabe
Colin Burgon	Mr Shahid Malik
Mr James Clappison	Gwyn Prosser
Mrs Ann Cryer	Mr Richard Spring
Mrs Janet Dean	Mr David Winnick

Draft Report (Draft Sentencing Guideline: Robbery), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the Chairman's draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 35 read and agreed to.

Annex agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Second Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134 (Select committees (reports)).

[Adjourned till Tuesday 7 March at 10.00 am

Reports from the Home Affairs Committee since 2001

The following reports have been produced by the Committee since the start of the 2001 Parliament. Government Responses to the Committee's reports are published as Special Reports from the Committee or as Command Papers by the Government. The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

Session 2005–06

First Report Draft Corporate Manslaughter Bill (First Joint Report with Work and Pensions Committee) HC 540

The following reports have been produced by the Committee in the 2001–05 Parliament.

Session 2004–05

First Report	Rehabilitation of Prisoners	HC 193 (<i>Cm 6486</i>)
Second Report	Work of the Committee in 2004	HC 280
Third Report	Home Office Target-Setting 2004	HC 320 (<i>Cm 6592</i>)
Fourth Report	Police Reform	HC 370 (<i>Cm 6600</i>)
Fifth Report	Anti-Social Behaviour	HC 80 (<i>Cm 6588</i>)
Sixth Report	Terrorism and Community Relations	HC 165 (<i>Cm 6593</i>)

Session 2003–04

First Report	Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants, etc.) Bill	HC 109 (<i>Cm 6132</i>)
Second Report	Asylum Applications	HC 218 (<i>Cm 6166</i>)
Third Report	The Work of the Home Affairs Committee in 2003	HC 345
Fourth Report	Identity Cards	HC 130 (<i>Cm 6359</i>)
Fifth Report	Draft Sentencing Guidelines 1 and 2	HC 1207 (<i>HC 371</i>)

Session 2002–03

First Report	Extradition Bill	HC 138 (<i>HC 475</i>)
Second Report	Criminal Justice Bill	HC 83 (<i>Cm 5787</i>)
Third Report	The Work of the Home Affairs Committee in 2002	HC 336
Fourth Report	Asylum Removals	HC 654 (<i>HC 1006</i>)
Fifth Report	Sexual Offences Bill	HC 639 (<i>Cm 5986</i>)

Session 2001–02

First Report	The Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Bill 2001	HC 351
Second Report	Police Reform Bill	HC 612 (<i>HC 1052</i>)
Third Report	The Government's Drugs Policy, Is it Working?	HC 318 (<i>Cm 5573</i>)
Fourth Report	The Conduct of Investigations into Past Cases of Abuse in Children's Homes	HC 836 (<i>Cm 5799</i>)