WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS BY DEPUTY M. TADIER OF ST. BRELADE ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 12th APRIL 2016

Question

Will the Minister state -

- (i) how many individuals have been cautioned for Cannabis possession in the past 5 years;
- (ii) how many of those were prosecuted, and
- (iii) what the outcome of the prosecutions were; including, in each case, how many of those individuals claimed to be 'medicinal users'?

What has the estimated cost been, over the last five years, for dealing with Cannabis enforcement, including Police time, Customs, Crown Officers, Court costs and prison accommodation?

Answer

- (i) 665 individuals have been arrested by the police for cannabis possession in the past 5 years (1 April 2011 31 March 2016). It has not been possible to distinguish if the same individual has been arrested more than once, at different times over the 5 year period.
- (ii) These individuals accounted for 714 cases of cannabis possession being referred to the Courts or Parish Hall for disposal.
- (iii) Details of the outcomes of these prosecutions are overleaf. It is not possible to distinguish how many of these individuals claimed to be 'medicinal users'.

It is, unfortunately, not possible for the services listed in the question to accurately estimate the cost of cannabis enforcement. For example, the prosecution of an individual for being in possession of cannabis can take different routes through the criminal justice system depending on the circumstances of the case. An individual might be dealt with by the Centenier at a Parish Hall enquiry, or charged for a court hearing which may result in a brief appearance or a case that goes to trial with a number of direction hearings. It should also be noted that the Prison Service is unable to attribute costs to the management of a specific category of offender.

The States of Jersey Police has, in recent years, reviewed and implemented new procedures for dealing with an individual found in possession of cannabis, with the aim of making the process more expeditious. This negates the need for the drugs to be officially analysed by the States Analyst, and allows the case to be processed through the judicial system quicker and more efficiently.

COURT DISPOSALS Binding Over Community Service Exclusion Order Fine OR Imprisonment Imprisonment Probation Order Probation Order AND Community Service	9 5 2 40 15	10 11 0 30 15	Jan- Dec 2013 14 13 0 20	Jan- Dec 2014 5 8 1	Jan- Dec 2015 6 3	Jan- Mar 2016 3 0
Binding Over Community Service Exclusion Order Fine OR Imprisonment Imprisonment Probation Order	9 5 2 40 15	10 11 0 30	14 13 0	5 8 1	6 3	3
Binding Over Community Service Exclusion Order Fine OR Imprisonment Imprisonment Probation Order	5 2 40 15	11 0 30	13	8	3	
Community Service Exclusion Order Fine OR Imprisonment Imprisonment Probation Order	5 2 40 15	11 0 30	13	8	3	
Exclusion Order Fine OR Imprisonment Imprisonment Probation Order	2 40 15	0	0	1	-	0
Fine OR Imprisonment Imprisonment Probation Order	40 15	30	_	_	0	
Imprisonment Probation Order	15		20		-	0
Probation Order	_	15		19	25	4
	14		19	7	9	1
Probation Order AND Community Service		16	23	13	14	3
resulting the resulting service	0	0	0	0	0	3
Absolute discharge	0	0	0	0	0	1
No evidence offered (case dismissed)	1	5	7	7	4	0
Case withdrawn	3	6	5	6	4	1
No separate penalty awarded	5	13	4	8	3	0
Bound Over to Leave the Island	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lie on file	0	0	1	0	0	1
Arrest ordered	9	2	4	3	2	1
Failed to appear	0	3	1	3	0	0
Sub Total	103	111	111	81	70	18
PARISH HALL DISPOSALS						
Written Caution	22	29	22	25	29	5
Written Caution Written Caution (as a result of a deferred decision)	10	16	13	16	21	5
Words of advice	1	0	0	0	0	1
No further action taken	0	1	2	0	2	0
Sub Total		46	37	41	52	11
Sub Total		70		71	32	
Overall Total	136	157	148	122	122	29