

GEORGHIOS ZENONOS, *ALIAS* KOKOS,

*Appellant,*

v.

THE POLICE,

*Respondents.*

—  
GEORGHIOS  
ZENONOS  
*alias* KOKOS  
v.  
THE POLICE

(*Criminal Appeal No. 3213*).

---

*Sentence—Appeal against sentence—Two years' imprisonment for stealing—The Criminal Code, Cap. 154, sections 252 and 262—Appellant unable to profit by various lenient sentences previously imposed upon him—Not a case justifying interference of the Court—Appeal dismissed—Sentence to run from the date of such dismissal—Criminal Procedure Law, Cap. 155, section 147 (1).*

*Stealing—Sentence—Appeal—See supra.*

Cases referred to :

*Pullen v. The Republic* (reported in this Part at p. 13 *ante*; at p. 16).

The facts of the case sufficiently appear in the judgment of the Court dismissing this appeal against sentence.

### **Appeal against sentence.**

Appeal against sentence by Georghios Zenonos *alias* Kokos who was convicted on the 20th October, 1970, at the District Court of Limassol (Criminal Case No. 10887/70) on two counts of the offence of stealing contrary to sections 255, 262 and 20 of the Criminal Code, Cap. 154, and was sentenced by Loris, D.J., to two years imprisonment on each count, the sentences to run concurrently.

Appellant appearing in person.

*S. Nicolaidis*, Counsel of the Republic, for the respondents.

1970  
Dec. 8

—  
GEORGHIOS  
ZENONOS  
alias KOKOS  
v.  
THE POLICE

The judgment of the Court was delivered by :—

VASSILIADES, P. : This is an appeal against a sentence of two years' imprisonment imposed on the appellant in the District Court of Limassol upon his conviction for committing a number of larcenies together with other persons jointly charged with the appellant who are not now before us. The appeal was taken by the appellant in person on the ground that the sentence imposed by the trial Judge is manifestly excessive.

In measuring sentence in this case, the trial Judge took into consideration at the request of appellant's advocate seven other cases of similar nature, as shown in the record. The judge also took into consideration that this particular appellant had been placed under the supervision of a probation officer in the past after a Court conviction ; and that he had been an inmate of the Reform School for a period. Moreover, the judge took also into account that the appellant served a term of six months' imprisonment for housebreaking and stealing, about a year before the commission of the offences for which the Court was now imposing sentence. The judge had also before him a social investigation report (copy of which was supplied to appellant's advocate) which shows that unfortunately the appellant is a person who has not yet been able to profit by the opportunities to gather useful experience which were offered to him by various sentences previously imposed upon him.

In the circumstances, we find no merit in this appeal ; and no justification whatsoever for interfering with the sentence imposed by the trial Judge. (See *Pullen v. The Republic* (reported in this Part at p. 13 *ante*; at p. 16)). This appeal is, therefore, dismissed ; the sentence to run according to law from today, as provided in section 147 (1) of the Criminal Procedure Law, Cap. 155.

*Appeal dismissed.*