I have to sentence her in her absence. I shall deliver the sentencing remarks as if she was present to hear them, and I direct that she is provided with a transcript of my remarks and copies of the victim personal statements read to the court.

That was Mr Justice Goss at Manchester Crown Court. Goss was sentencing Lucy Letby, now among Britain's most prolific child killers, to a whole life order, the most severe sanction the British justice system can bestow. She will die in prison, never eligible for parole. But it made for a strange sight. For though the judge was reading his sentence as if to Letby, addressing it to her a catalogue of wickedness, he was talking to an empty dog. Letby was not in court to hear the sentence, nor the final account of the terrible toll her actions have wrought on its victims and their families. There was no power for the court or state to compel her to be there. But now politicians from the Prime Minister down think there should be. Was justice not fully done in Manchester today? Was Letby for one last time able to exercise power she had no right to wield? Welcome to the News Agents. The News Agents. I think it's cowardly that people who commit such horrendous crimes do not face their victims and hear first hand the impact that their crimes have had on them and their families and loved ones. We are looking and have been at changing the law to make sure that that happens. I think that we should change the law. We've made an open offer to the government. If they come forward with a proposal to change the law, we will support it. I think they just really now need to get on with it so justice can seem to be done. That was Rishi Tsunak and Keir Starmer, both saying they want to change the law so convicted criminals are compelled to appear in court and hear sentencing. The Justice Secretary Alex Chalk would seem to agree with them. He tweeted today that Lucy Letby is not just a murderer but a coward whose failure to face her victims' families, refusing to hear their impact statements and society's condemnation, is the final insult. We are looking to change the law so offenders can be compelled to attend sentencing hearings. Now that sounds perfectly sensible, right? Later on in the show, we're going to hear from a former old Bailey judge about how that could in fact be more complicated than it seems. But first today is a day about victims, or it should be. And it isn't just Letby's victims who haven't had that final resolution, that final day of reckoning they deserve. A string of other high profile prolific murderers, including the Manchester Arena bomber, refused to go to court to hear their sentences passed down. Martin Hibbert was one of the survivors of the Manchester Arena attack. He wanted that moment of finality. He didn't get it. He's joining us on the news agents now. Martin, tell us about your night at the Ariana Grande concert and how it ended with your daughter. As we were leaving, we went through the infamous city room and when Simon Iberdi detonated his suicide bomb, we were stood about six metres away and we were the closest survivors. Which is obviously horrendous. You and your daughter survived, but your daughter received very substantial injuries, didn't she? We've both suffered catastrophic injuries. I suffered a T10 complete spinal cord injury. I'm paralyzed now. And in a wheelchair, he's suffered catastrophic brain injury. She's the only person to survive that injury in the world. You'll need care and support for the rest of her life. And yeah, it's been it's been tough. We still live it through it, you know, every day through health complications and setbacks, you know, so every day, you know, albeit we are glad to be here and alive, you know, there are hidden things that you don't see. You know, when people say that you live, you know, day to day, that that's what you do when you are a survivor

of these atrocities, you know, every anniversary hurts still even six years on. And so obviously, there is the bombing and then there is the immediate health implications, hospital, yeah, all of that sort of thing. But then eventually, obviously, Iberdi comes to trial. Correct. You gave the impact assessment as part of that process. I did. And I actually at the inquiry, I gave evidence at the court, actually, where the Lucy Letby trials been, it was in the same building. It's tough, you know, obviously, I did a lot of interviews at the time, but, you know, to go through what we went through, I don't think people understand the strength that, you know, to actually go to court every day and hear that and hear what they did and what they planned, and that they were planning it months, if not years before, and that they were actually planning it to hurt children, you know, to hear that. And to have to relive it, presumably. Yeah, well, you do, you know, to, I mean, for somebody like me, you know, even like the Lucy Letby trial, you know, I've not been able to listen to it because I don't know how another human can do that, especially to babies. So I find it difficult anyway. But, you know, the strength that it takes to travel to court every day to put yourself through that, people don't understand what that takes. We did that for, you know, three, four months. And it was tough, you know, some days we would, we would come out crying, you know, and the media would be stood outside wanting to interview us, you know, some days you just wanted to walk straight past, you know, I didn't have the strength, you know, to think that another human could do that, you know, we'd drive home a friend of mine that was also injured at the blast, you know, we'd drive home and be silent because we couldn't, we couldn't understand what we'd heard that day. It's a tough thing to go through. So to think that, you know, that the culprits of those atrocities get to decide is something that I don't think I'll ever understand. Because we should say that you've just alluded to, even though the cases in so many ways are so different, but you've alluded to kind of feeling some parallels and some echoes watching the Letby process go on with what you and your family had to go through. And of course, in a sense, they've had a similar conclusion, because let bees refuse to go to the doctor today and hear the sentencing and obey the same thing. Correct, and there's been a few. And how does that feel? How does that feel? You know what, it's still like when I'm talking to you know, that the herds are standing up on my arms and neck, I get really annoyed, as I alluded to before, you know, the strength of character and mind, you know, to be able to get up every day and drive to a courtroom, not knowing what you're going to hear. I don't think I can put into words what that takes, you know, mentally and physically. So to think that the culprits of those atrocities don't have to stand in front of judge and jury and families. I don't think I'll ever understand how that is and why that is. I'm always one that, you know, if you commit a crime, then you should have to stand in front of judge and jury and families, you know. And I'd actually got the strength to, I was speaking to my police liaison officer at the time, and I said, look, you know, on the day of sentencing, I want to be there. I want to travel down to London. I want to look him in the eyes. And then when I was told that he might not be there, and that he, even if he was there, that he could potentially have a barrier in front of him, like I think he did for the most of the trial, to me, and this is my personal opinion, it felt like another stab, it felt like another wound to me, because that was being taken away. It took me a few weeks, maybe a few months to be able to say look to my police liaison. I want to come down to London. When that sentence is passed,

I want to look him in the eye and show him that I'm not defeated. So to have that taken away from me, I don't think I'll ever forgive the justice system for that, even though I know it, you know, he's going to serve out the remainder of his time in jail, and he's always going to be looking over his shoulder, you know, in a way, I didn't get my little bit of karma, I'm allowed to say that. I don't think I'll ever forgive the justice system for that. And I know other families felt the same. Does it still stay with you, Matty? Yes. Like the fact that you weren't able to look him in the eyes that day? Yeah, I get very angry about it, I get very frustrated. I've had counselling, I'll continue to have counselling. Because it would have been a final moment of reconciliation for yourself with what had happened? Yeah, I suppose that there's a bit of a selfish thing in there, but I think with everything that we've been through, I deserve that, you know, so it almost feels like he's not gone away with it, because obviously he's going to be in prison for the rest of his life. But, you know, I've never been in trouble in my life, but I believe in the judicial system, I believe in law and order, and I believe that when you commit a crime, like Lucy has, like Hashem Azan, like others have over the last four or five years, you stand in front of judge and jury and you are held accountable. Did it maybe feel, in a way, that it was kind of for him and for you, it was almost like he was exercising like a final bit of power over you. Yeah, exactly. Like he'd exercised power over you that day that you had no control

of, and it was a last element, a last strike of his power against you and the others. Yeah, no, I do believe that, and I said that at the time, you know, he got to choose what he wore every day. He got to choose the meals yet every day and he got special requests given every day. When you commit those types of crimes, you know, you don't decide. People argue with regards to this

that the problem with forcing someone is that they can still do things to make it impossible, you know, they can shout, they can scream, they can refuse to go. What do you say to those who might argue it's just in reality, everyone might want it to happen, but practically it's just too difficult to make it happen. I don't agree with that at all. You look at other countries around the world, they do it. Maybe there's a debate that needs to happen in terms of bringing the UK judicial system into the 21st century, you know, maybe there's a debate around that, you know, as much as I support it, and as we've seen today, you know, it does work in most cases, you know, should serial killers and murderers, should they get a choice, but all I can give is a personal experience and, you know, I'd say if I have to get that courage and strength to go into a courtroom every day, then they should do likewise to be held accountable and to stand in front of judge and jury for what they have done, you know, at the end of the day, they have committed these crimes, so they should have to stand in front of judge and jury.

Martin, thanks so much for talking to us. Thank you. I really appreciate it, all that best to you and your daughter. Thank you. Thank you. Okay. Right, when we come back, we're going to be talking to a judge about why as much as we might want criminals to confront their crimes, it isn't as easy as it sounds. Stay with us. This is The News Agents. Welcome back. Right, as I say, the judges and the courts are the ones who have to try and keep the wheels turning in cases like this, and we're joined now by Wendy Joseph Casey, a former Old Bailey judge. Wendy, thanks so much for being on The News Agents. I think maybe for many people, it won't be a surprise to you, of course, but I think many people looking at this horrendous case and the fact that Letby is not there in court to hear her sentencing this morning

might be surprised that she doesn't have to go or that she can refuse to go. Is this very common in cases like this? Well, there aren't very many cases like this, Lewis, but in terms of murders, it happens from time to time. It's not terribly common. Normally, people are terribly anxious to know what the sentence is going to be and what findings the judge has made. So they're very keen to be there, but it does sometimes happen. And the judge doesn't have the power to force someone into the dock, but does have the power to liaise with the governor of the prison and request that someone is brought even against their will. However, it is then a matter for the prison governor to decide whether that is too dangerous, whether it really is necessary for the hearing to take place, and a whole lot of other features. So there's no power within the court, within the judge himself to compel her attendance today. I suppose it must, from the judge's point of view, feel rather peculiar because we can see, as we're talking and recording this right now, the sentencing is taking place. And we see the judge in this case, Mr Justice Goss, having to read out his summary and his sentence as if she were there. So saying, you have done this, you have done that, this is what the court is going to say to you. But obviously, she's not there. So that must be rather peculiar, just from the judge's position, if nothing else. Yes, it must look extremely peculiar to people within the courtroom, but it wouldn't be that surprising from the judge's point of view because every word of his ruling, of his findings, of his sentencing remarks will have been very, very carefully thought through in advance. It will all be written down, and it would be exactly the same if she was there or not. I suppose for the victims, involved with the families of the victims, to be precise, this will inevitably feel like another kick in the teeth in the sense that they would want to go to court, they would want, they hear their victim impact statements, they want

the perpetrator to hear that and to hear their sentence and to see them as part of the justice process. And they are going to be denied that today. They are, but I'm not entirely sure that they would necessarily like what would happen if she was forced into the dock. If we take a step back from her for a moment and just imagine what could happen in any case where you force someone

into the dock, the sentencing exercise is one of the most serious and important parts of a trial. The judge is setting out the findings of fact, and he is setting out the sentence and explaining exactly why he's come to that sentence. And it's all about the victims, it's all about the victim's family and the law. And the last thing that you would want to do would be to run the risk of reducing it to some sort of circus. And you can easily imagine how a defendant, I'm not talking about Lucy Letby, I know nothing about that woman, but you can imagine

circumstances where someone hijacks the case effectively by talking at length about how and loudly about how innocent they are, how the jurors got it all wrong by disrupting proceedings or even by crying very loudly and making themselves the center of attention when the attention really needs to be elsewhere. And then there are practical difficulties if you think about it. If someone really doesn't want to be there and you carry them effectively kicking and screaming into the dock, what do you do if they put their fingers in their ears or close their eyes? Are we really going to force their eyes open? How do we cope with this? So I don't think anyone, when you begin to think it through, thinks there's a way you can make people come into

[Transcript] The News Agents / Should Lucy Letby have been made to go to court?

the dock. What you could do would be to impose a punishment if they didn't come into the dock. Such as what? Such as what? Because I suppose if someone's getting a full life sentence in any case, they're perhaps, it's difficult to incentivize them with the promise of an extra few months or years or whatever it is. You're way ahead of me. That's exactly what I was going to say in a case like this. If she gets a whole life sentence, what on earth could the judge do or say that would encourage her to come into the dock? Of course, most people, almost all people who commit murders

don't get whole life sentences. They get a life sentence because that is the only sentence that you can get for murder. But then the judge will impose the minimum term that has to be served before they can apply for parole. And it might be 15 or 25 or 30 years or more. And in those circumstances, if it were clear, for example, not perhaps so much that they serve a bit longer, because I think if you're serving 15 years, as you rightly say, nine months is unlikely to make the difference. But if they thought it might make the difference as to whether they got parole or not, because the parole board would be looking for remorse and understanding of what they had done and a demonstration of that, if they thought it might affect their chances of getting parole, that might encourage them to come. But in the case of let be, where the sentence is going to be whole

life, I think you're absolutely right. It's hard to think what you could do that would encourage her to walk into the dock. When both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition have both said today that they would like to change the law, an incoming Labour government would do it, and the Prime Minister was suggesting that this government might do it, would change the law in some way to compel, to force people in this situation to go into the dock to hear these things. From what you're saying, you think that would be a bad idea. And do you think most other judges would also think it were a bad idea? It's not so much that I think it's a bad idea. I think difficult to execute. There's such practical difficulties. And I know it sounds as if that's what the Prime Minister and others are saying. But if you listen to what Alex Chalk is saying, the Justice Secretary, who one might best listen to on this subject, what he is saying is that they should either be made to face the consequences of what they have done, that is to say, tip up and listen, or they should be forced to bear the consequences of their refusal to do that. Now, the consequences of the refusal to do that are what are very interesting. And it's really what we've just been discussing, what the best way forward would be. One needs to remember there is very few cases where someone is going to get a whole life sentence. Just finally, Wendy, we very rarely hear from judges about what it is like to oversee cases like this or trials involving cases like this. And indeed, what it is like thinking about what Justice Goss is doing today, which is preparing the sentence, preparing the summary that is going to be on the record for all time and is the last word, certainly from the state's point of view, from the court's point of view, and ultimately from the families and for the families. What is that like? It must be a tremendous sense of responsibility when you're thinking about drawing it up. It's a huge task. You need to get the law right. You need to get the facts right, and then you need to apply the facts to the law. And it must be done absolutely meticulously. And of course, you have to do it trying the best you can to put aside emotion, because as you rightly say, the document has to stand up to scrutiny. Get something wrong,

there's a court of appeal up there for the defense to go to, or indeed for the prosecution for that

matter. It takes an enormous amount of very careful and thorough preparation.

[Transcript] The News Agents / Should Lucy Letby have been made to go to court?

And particularly, in this case, with the cameras on the judge.

Yes, although I think that if you're a judge, you're awfully used to being stuck up there with everyone looking at you. And so I don't think that a judge who is dealing with work at this level and who will have prepared it in the way that this one will have done is going to be phased by that. Wendy, thank you so much for talking to us. It's been fascinating and so helpful. Thank you. My pleasure. Thank you.

So, no easy answers. There is one inescapable truth for let me though. She is one of only around 70 criminals to be given a whole life order, only the fourth woman in British legal history to be served with one. She has a very long time ahead of her to think about and contemplate what she has done. That is, she may have run from her crimes today, but she can't hide from them. We'll be back just after this.

This is The News Agents.

Welcome back. Now, we all know the mighty lionesses didn't quite manage to bring the trophy home this weekend. But if they want some comfort, they can at least console themselves that a string of political figures have made themselves look like total weirdos talking about it. I watched the game in the pub locally in North Allerton at home. You know, I'd like nothing more than to be able to watch England play around the world. I love football. I love sport. I love cheering on England. Sadly, I wasn't able to go to the World Cup in Qatar last year. I wasn't able to go to this final, but I said enjoyed watching it in the pub with friends and constituents in North Allerton. I think we're all being incredibly proud about what the lionesses have achieved and what an incredible set of memories we've all got. Yeah, that was Rishi Sunat widely mocked over the weekend for his painful pictures watching the match in a pub in North Yorkshire, a weird Twitter video where he seemed to be writing the lionesses a letter. Probably can't imagine that they'll read, but he wasn't alone. He follows lots of other politicians talking weirdly about football, even actually when they're really into it. Here's Keir Starmer. I've been supporting Arsenal for a very, very long time. When I was growing up, I didn't go to games because we didn't have the money to go to games until I was an adult living in London. And then we'd go down to the old stadium and watch four guid to get in through the turnstile to stand on the terraces. And as you go down towards Highbury, there was no getting away from that mix of smells, the horse manure, and the hamburgers mixed together with the smell of the grass. Or what about the ignominious sight of the air to the throat, incidentally, presidents of the FA, Prince William, trying to account for the fact that he wasn't going to see the match. But honestly, he was so, so supportive. No, really. Have you even got my daughter with

Lionesses, I want to send you a huge good luck for tomorrow. We're sorry we can't be there in person. We're so proud of everything you've achieved and the millions you've inspired here and around the world. So go out there tomorrow and really enjoy yourselves. Good luck, lionesses.

Well, he is very busy, you know, in fairness, he's very busy. It's so hard having to maintain your only constitutional requirement of having a pulse. Anyway, it got us thinking, how is it that politicians and football so often make a noxious combination, even when the politicians involved are genuine fans and actually love it. No other man to talk to about this than Lord Danny Finkelstein, Times columnist, conservative peer and genuine obsessive of the beautiful game. Danny, but that is quite rare, isn't it? I mean, isn't it the truth that politicians, even if they like

football like Starmer, kind of struggle to talk about it and be authentic about it? It's a very interesting issue because, I mean, Keir Starmer is a proper football fan. He completely loves it. Jeremy Corbyn actually also. And Rishi Sunak too. In fact, Rishi Sunak is somebody that was one of the people I enjoy talking about football to most. And I think he was rather jealous and when I became a director of Chelsea, I think he was more jealous of me doing that than I was of him becoming prime minister. So wait, does he actually like it? Because honestly, I thought that does he actually read because the way he talks about it, I thought it was affected, I have to say, but it's not. It's true. No, no, he completely does. We often text during games and he has, as you would expect, he's got a very analytical data driven approach. In fact, it's one of the things that, you know, it was the first things I kind of got to know about him when I first met him. So he's a big Southampton fan and always has been. And he really does follow the game pretty closely. So yeah, it's a big thing for him. And interestingly, it's not just Michael Howard. I remember him calling me to a meeting, which I thought was to discuss where the conservative body was going. I thought it would be guite useful for my column. And then it turned out what he really wanted to talk to me about was Stephen Gerrard and whether he was going to leave Liverpool and go to Chelsea. And we had a 45 minute meeting, was one of my few moments of access with him. And he spoke for about half an hour about Stephen Gerrard. So why is it given, as you say, that Sunak actually likes it and is very analytical about it and actually is passionate about it? Why is it that he struggles to sound authentic about it? Or is this actually just a wider thing with him, which he's actually, he struggles to sound authentic, which is actually a wider political problem for Sunak and the conservatives leading up to the election? So I think it would be true if he was alone in this, but all politicians, I think, struggle on this question. Tony Blair certainly did. Michael Howard was called a fake fan by Sir Alex Ferguson. So they all struggle with that. I think there are a number of reasons for it. First of all, quite a lot of politicians are quite inauthentic about football. William Hague had to give a team and said he supported Rotherham United and he didn't actually follow Rotherham at all. He just felt he had to give a team. And so I used to follow Rotherham for him in order to make sure he wasn't caught out. So that's the first thing. You had to specifically follow what was happening with Rotherham when you were working for Hague,

just in case. I must admit that I'd have known it anyway, but I did. Yes. So that's the first thing. Secondly, obviously, politicians express themselves inauthentically about football, even when they're authentic football fans, because who tweets out good luck to the lads? Or Keir Starmer are tweeting about how he loves the smell of grass, a freshly cut grass. He's talking about that all the time at the moment. It sounds so odd. Yeah, it does sound odd. So first of all, you know, politicians have expressed themselves in ways that people don't think about. And it's also, there's a more general authenticity problem about politicians. But what interests me, I think there's also an issue about football here, Lewis. So I think people have quite an outdated view about who football fans are. They think to themselves, Rishi Sunak can't be a football fan. You know, he's sort of Goldman Sachs banker, who's comes from an ethnic minority, who's, he's not going to be a football fan. And that's just not true. It's an outdated view of who football fans, it's probably an inaccurate view of who football fans weren't. It's certainly an outdated one. And I think most of this doesn't really matter much. Actually, it's kind of the froth of politics. It's interesting and interesting to talk about different politicians' authenticity.

So we can, as you're trying to do, get that interesting questions through it. But the one bit of it that does I think matter is restricting who it is you feel they can be an authentic football fan and who can express themselves authentically. And I, you know, I want someone like Keir Starmer to feel that they can be free to express and be a football fan, even if he does support Arsenal. It's funny, though, isn't it? What interests me, Danny, is that there does seem to be something, the authenticity thing does seem to be something specific around football. So I think of, for example, John Major and Cricket. No one really questions, as far as I can remember or know, anyone really questioned John Major's love of Cricket. There seems to be something specific about football. And I wonder why you think that is. Well, correct. So John is also an extremely keen football fan. He's a fan of Chelsea. And the most recent discussion I had with him was all about Chelsea women and why certain players were leaving and certain were arriving. And he follows that extremely closely. And I think he would have a same problem that the others that I mentioned or have, because people think that someone like him can be a Cricket fan and don't think someone like him can be a football fan. They think that in saying that he's a football fan, he's sort of asserting that he's a man of the people and that's therefore a phony act. Nobody is less a man of the people than me. Do you know what I mean? I mean.

look at me. But I claim absolutely proudly, right, to be a vigorous football fan. And I just think it's about stereotypes, which maybe when they come in with my kind of advantage, it doesn't matter. But it certainly does matter when it comes to excluding people, a good example of that being women from feeling they can be authentic fans. So I think this idea of the authentic fan, we've got to be very careful with it. All sorts of people can be authentic fans and need to feel part of the fan community. Is there another element thrown into this as well in terms of authenticity and the way that people speak about it, though, which is the fact that this is obviously referring to women's football. So I was very struck that kind of in just in terms of the PR of dealing with this, right? Sunak, whenever he's talking about this, and I can certainly understand why he's doing this in a way, it's a legitimate enough point. But he always talks about, you know, as the father of daughters, or when Prince William appeared in his slightly weird hostage video at the weekend with him and his daughter, you know, he while rolled out Charlotte to sit there and say, you know, I'm the father of daughters, I love women's football. It's like, well, you don't have to say that. You could just say, this is just part of football, right? It's not women like the men's game. There's a sort of slight cack-handedness when you throw in the women's element as well. I think people are still seeing it as some kind of social statement when they should be seeing it as an incredible sport. So our Chelsea affortunates, I have one of the best women's teams in the world. Our manager, Emma Hayes, is an extraordinary football leader. And I think the moment when people can recognise that, as they think they are doing with England women's manager

as well, when people begin to see what those people can contribute to a more broad football debate, then I think some of this slightly, perhaps patronising way of talking about it will go. Leaving aside elected politics, just from the PR kind of perspective, it's a bit weird that William didn't go, wasn't it? I mean, okay, he was basically on holiday, right? I mean, I can understand the PM, look, he's busy at Australia going as a long way for a football match. But he is the president of the FA. I mean, it's not just a Royal thing. I mean, you know, the Queen of Spain was that I just thought from a PR point of view from the Royal family. It wasn't great, was it? I think

[Transcript] The News Agents / Should Lucy Letby have been made to go to court?

if I was determining his diary, I would have given a lot of priority to it. I just haven't, I don't know what his diary is like and how easy it was for him to do that, given his other days on holiday. Yeah, I know, but you know, people also need to have that as well. So I don't, I don't want to comment on, on that specifically, but certainly I think it was, he's been very supportive of the game. And he's been, you know, he attends a lot of games. And I think that was one that would probably would have been a good idea for him to go to. I would agree with that.

Well, you've gone if it was the men, do you reckon? Honestly?

Yeah, I think so. Yeah.

Which says quite a bit, doesn't it? Whether he gets Charlotte out or not?

Oh, yeah. I mean, you know, it probably was, it probably was a mistake. And, you know,

if you think about the fact that if we'd have won, it would have been even more serious one.

Danny, just finally, predictions for Rotherham season this year?

I'm not getting into that.

Oh, I mean, surely you've been keeping an eye on them ever since. We've had to be very disappointed,

if not, I'm not actually sure what sure that I do know what their what their season is going to be. So I think maybe I haven't dropped off a bit.

Oh, dear. That is shocking.

It is. Yeah.

As far as I'm concerned, very best of luck to the Millers for this season.

You impressed? I may or may not have my phone in my pocket.

Cheers, Danny.

Don't press. Cheers.

See ya.

So shortly after we finished recording, another football story broke, which we covered last week relating to Mason Greenwood. Manchester United announced today that he will leave the club by mutual agreement after a six month internal investigation into his conduct. That's after charges of rape and assault against a 21 year old England international, which were later dropped in February. We're going to return to that on tomorrow's show. The rest is football. Never heard of them. I will be back with John, the special one, so called tomorrow. Join us then and thanks for listening. Bye bye.