

Adam Hones, you have pleaded guilty to five counts of involving a person under 18 years in the production of child exploitation material, 11 counts of attempting to involve a person under 18 years in the production of child exploitation material, two counts of grooming with intent to expose a young person to indecent material and one count of possessing child exploitation material. The crimes were committed during approximately a 12 month period between June 2020 and July 2021.

At the time of the offending you were aged 32 years and employed as an IT technician at a school on the North West Coast. Each crime was committed against a different young female but involved relatively similar circumstances. There were 17 victims of your criminal behaviour, aged between 14 and 17. Many of the victims went to the same school where you were employed.

Between June 2020 and July 2021, you used social media platforms and email accounts to message numerous females. You created Instagram accounts in false names and Snapchat accounts in false names to facilitate these communications. You downloaded an application onto your phone to enable you to record images sent via the social media platforms without alerting the sender of your recording in order to preserve images sent. In this way, you were able to retain images from platforms like Snapchat and Instagram which would otherwise have been deleted automatically, or at the choice of the sender. Because of the falsity of the names you used in creating the social media platforms, the complainants were unaware of your identity whilst they were communicating with you. You often pretended to be a male around the same age as the complainants or, alternatively, were evasive when the complainants enquired as to your identity.

The first victim was aged 16 and 17 at the relevant time. She was in Grade 10 at a different school to where you were employed. You contacted her via Snapchat. You and she exchanged messages for approximately two months from June 2020. You asked the complainant if she would be your "sugar baby". You regularly requested that she send you photographs of her breasts, body and vagina. You told her you liked both her breasts and her vagina. During the two month period, the complainant sent you videos of herself and photographs of herself. The videos and photographs were always sent in response to a request from you. The photographs depicted her naked breasts and vagina. The video she sent you showed her masturbating. In exchange for the photographs and videos that were sent, you deposited \$100.00 into the complainant's bank account. When police executed a search warrant at your residence in July 2021, they located a hand written note with the complainant's name and bank details upon it.

The second victim was a 15 year old female. She was a student at the school at which you were employed. She is a vulnerable student who suffers from a learning disability. You contacted the complainant via Snapchat. Her profile used her real name. You told the complainant that you were of a similar age to her and went to a local high school. You asked the complainant to send nude photos of herself. Initially, the complainant declined but after a period of time began to send you photographs of her breasts and her vagina. Some of the photographs depicted her face. The messaging went on for approximately nine months between October 2020 and July 2021. The complainant sent you a large number of photographs and videos. You directed the complainant at times as to what types of photos and videos you

wanted her to send. You used the screen recorder app to save screen shots of the messages, images and conversations you engaged in with the complainant without her knowledge.

When your residence was searched on 22 July 2021, police located 25 video recordings of Snapchat conversations that had occurred between you and the complainant. Those conversations disclosed that the complainant had sent you 29 sexually suggestive photographs, including photographs of the complainant in her underwear and pulling her underwear tight against her vagina so as to expose the outline of same; four clothed but sexually suggestive videos; seven photographs of her naked breasts; 13 photographs of her naked vagina and six videos depicting her masturbating. There were also four videos of her naked breasts; one video of her vagina without masturbation and seven videos of her naked buttocks including videos of her spreading her buttock cheeks to fully expose her anus.

You also sent the complainant photographs of your erect penis. This behaviour grounds one of the grooming charges. The conversations you engaged in with this complainant were sexually explicit. You asked her to describe in detail her previous sexual experiences, you asked her to send photographs depicting particular sexual behaviours, and you talked to the complainant about the manner in which you liked to engage in sexual intercourse.

The third victim was aged 16 years and was also a student at the school where you were employed. You contacted her via Instagram. You asked how old she was and enquired as to whether she had an Only Fans account. You told the complainant that you had been "loving her Instagram" and wanted to see more of her modelling. Between late April and late June 2021, you messaged the complainant often. You asked her if you could be her "sugar daddy" and requested nude photographs and videos of her. You specified the type of photographs you wanted and what you would pay for particular types of photographs. You referenced wanting to receive sexually explicit photographs of her in her school uniform and wanting to know "her sizes". The complainant did not, in fact, send any photographs or videos.

The fourth victim was 15 years of age and also a student at the school where you were employed. You contacted her via Instagram. Her Instagram account was in her real name. You asked her age and enquired as to whether she had an Only Fans account. The complainant said she did not but would "love some cash". You asked her what she was selling and what her prices were. You requested nude photographs of her and photographs of her in her school uniform, in sexual poses. The complainant did not send any photographs and stopped replying to you. You persisted with your messaging, asking her if she had changed her mind and asking her about her bra and panty sizes. You told her you were happy to talk prices and said that you liked her "arse and tits". You had interaction with this complainant as a student at the school where you were employed and given her Instagram account utilised her real name, I am satisfied you must have appreciated with whom you were communicating.

The fifth complainant was a 16 year old female who was also a student at the school where you were employed. You contacted her via an Instagram account, which included her real name. You messaged the complainant and asked her if she would send photos for money and mentioned that you wished to be her "sugar daddy". The complainant did not reply to you. The complainant had many interactions with you at the school in your role as an IT technician. Again, given her Instagram account utilised her real name, I am satisfied you must have appreciated with whom you were communicating

The sixth complainant was aged 16 and also a student at the school at which you were employed. You messaged her via Instagram. Her Instagram account included her name and age and photographs of herself were uploaded onto it. You commented upon the photographs, asked her for her age and enquired as to whether she had an Only Fans account. The complainant responded by informing you that she was 16 years old. There was an exchange of messages in which you commented upon her chest and asked her if she would send nude photographs of herself for money. You had several communications with this complainant at the school at which you were employed. You would speak to her at school and enquire what she was doing after school and what she was doing in the holidays and where she worked. Again, I am satisfied you had knowledge as to whom you were communicating with.

The seventh complainant was aged 14 years. She too was a student at the school where you were employed. You messaged her via an Instagram account. Her profile included her full name, age and photographs of herself. You asked her how old she was and whether she had an Only Fans account. You asked her whether you could be her "sugar daddy". You wanted to know her bra and underwear size. You told her that if she sent you "things" (which I am satisfied was obviously a reference to inappropriate material), you would give her money. When the complainant asked how much money, you said it would depend on "her sizes". The complainant did not reply and blocked you. Again, this complainant knew who you were from your employment at the school, but she did not know it was you sending the messages because of the false names you used on your social media platforms. Given the information that was on her social media account, I am satisfied you must have appreciated with whom you were communicating.

The eighth complainant was aged 15 years. She too was a student at the school at which you were employed. You messaged her via Instagram. Her Instagram account included her full name. You asked the complainant for nude photographs and offered money in exchange. When the complainant did not respond, you sent a follow up message. Thereafter, the complainant blocked you. Again, the complainant knew you from school but did not appreciate that you were the person sending the messages.

The ninth complainant was aged 15 years and a student at the school at which you were employed. You messaged her via Instagram. The complainant's Instagram account included her full name. You offered the complainant money in exchange for nude photographs. At the time this message was sent, a friend of the complainant was using her phone. She sent you a random nude photograph from the internet. You told the complainant you would leave money for her at a department store for her to collect. You, in fact, did this. You also deposited \$200.00 into the complainant's bank account via two separate transactions as payment in advance for nude photographs. The complainant, in fact, did not send any further photographs.

You messaged the complainant, telling her the money was in her account and requesting the type of nude photographs that you wanted. You directed her as to a sexual activity she should engage in and send to you. You did not receive any response. You sent the complainant further messages using a second Instagram account. You told her that your first Instagram account had been deleted and provided an email address for her to contact you on, telling her that you were "always looking to buy". The complainant did not respond. You sent several more follow up messages, telling the complainant that she "owed you" because you did not receive any nude photographs following the payment you had made. You offered her more money for photographs of her buttocks. You said you would increase the price if she agreed to do something "kinky or freaky".

Two days later, you again messaged the complainant, this time via a Gmail account and provided her with a Snapchat user name where she could contact you. You told her you got her Gmail address from a friend and did not want to email her on her school email address – an obvious indication that you were well aware that she was a student at the school where you worked. In the emails, you again requested nude photographs and offered to increase the price from that which you had previously offered. You sent messages telling her you would drop the money to her on Saturday. You told her that if she was not willing to provide the nude photographs, she should delete all the messages you had sent. The following day you contacted the complainant via her school email account and told her that she should check her Gmail account email. Clearly by this behaviour you knew she was a student at the school where you worked.

The tenth complainant was a 15 year old student at a different school from the one where you worked. This complainant was a friend of the ninth complainant. The ninth complainant had told her that you had messaged, offering money in exchange for nude photographs. The tenth complainant contacted you via your Instagram account. Her Instagram account showed that she was 16 years of age. When she contacted your Instagram account, it became apparent that you were already following her on Instagram. This complainant sent you a message saying "I heard you like having sugar babies, hook me up please". You asked this complainant whether she was friends with the ninth complainant, a fact I infer you had gleaned from their Instagram accounts. You told this complainant that you worked in the mines near Burnie. You also told this complainant that the ninth complainant would always be your "number one". You asked this complainant for a "sexy recent". You asked this complainant "what you would get" for the price she was looking for. You told this complainant the amount of money you were prepared to pay would depend on the detail in the photographs you received. You said to her "let's see you first and sizes". You offered to put money into her account. You told her that you would pay \$25.00 for "naked pussy", \$25.00 for "naked arse". You offered to put \$100.00 into her account and would work out what you would receive for the extra \$50.00 you paid. You asked the complainant for videos of her masturbating whilst she was in her work uniform. You also asked her whether she performed sexual acts with her female friends. The complainant sent you a photograph of herself in her bra. She also sent a generic photo of what she looked like and sent you some random photographs of girls off the internet. You deposited \$100.00 into her account. Subsequently the complainant became scared and deleted the messages and blocked you from her social media accounts.

The eleventh complainant was 15 at the time of the offending. She was a student at a different school from where you were employed, although had previously been a student at that school. In mid-June 2021, the complainant added you, via Snapchat. You messaged her thanking her for "the add" and asking if you knew her. The complainant replied that she had heard that you liked young girls. You replied by asking, amongst other things, how old she was. She told you that she was 15. You replied "let's see you". The complainant sent a photo of herself. The two of you engaged in conversation over Snapchat. The complainant's Snapchat account included her full name. During the conversations you asked the complainant to send you "pussy pics". You also asked for pictures of her breasts and buttocks, photographs of her in her school uniform and nude photographs. You asked her to send videos of herself masturbating and inserting her fingers into her anus and vagina. The complainant sent photographs of herself to you. Following receipt of the photographs, you made a number of sexually explicit comments to her about the photographs. On occasion you directed the complainant as to the type of nude photographs you wanted her to send. On one occasion when

the complainant sent a photograph of herself wearing pink underwear, you asked her to put the worn underwear into a bag and leave it at a bus stop in exchange for money. The complainant did not do this.

You used the screen recorder app that you had downloaded to save screen shots of the messages and images that the complainant sent to you. This allowed the recording of conversations without her knowledge. When police subsequently searched your residence, they located ten video recordings of Snapchat conversations on your computer. Those recorded conversations revealed that over a 12 day period in July 2021, the complainant had sent you 18 clothed, but sexually suggestive photographs; one clothed but sexually suggestive video; eight photographs of naked breasts and three photographs of her naked buttocks and anus. In exchange for the photographs and video, you had left money for the complainant to collect at various locations. On one occasion, you left \$100.00 under a rock near the fire station and on another location, you left money near a bus station. You would send the complainant a photo of the location where she was to collect the money.

The twelfth complainant was 15 years of age and a student at a high school other than the one at which you were employed. At some stage prior to 22 July 2021, you had added the complainant to your Snapchat account. You sent her a number of messages. In one of those messages, you asked to see her belly. The complainant asked for a photograph of you so she could identify you. You sent a photograph of yourself. You also sent her a message making a sexually explicit comment and asking her if she wanted to see your penis. The complainant said no. You nevertheless sent her a photograph of your penis on an alternate social media account. This behaviour encompasses the second grooming charge.

The thirteenth complainant was aged 14 at the time of the offending and went to a high school other than the one at which you were employed. In April or May 2021, you started messaging her on Snapchat. Her Snapchat account disclosed her full name. You told the complainant you were 15 years of age. The two of you communicated over Snapchat for approximately two months. It is estimated you sent each other approximately one thousand messages each. You asked the complainant what she looked like. You started talking to her about her body and asked her whether she would send nude photos of herself. The complainant disclosed to you personal matters about herself. You tried to gain her trust by encouraging her to disclose such matters to you. You offered to send a nude photo of yourself so she would send a nude photo of herself in return. You tried to convince her to send nude photographs by telling her that she was "really hot" and had a good body. You told her that some of the photographs she sent of herself "turned you on". You were persistent in your endeavours to gain nude photographs, asking for them on three or four occasions. The complainant did not, in fact, send any nude photographs.

The fourteenth complainant was aged 14 at the time of the offending. She was home schooled. You contacted her via Snapchat. She told you she was 16 years of age. You asked her to send nude photographs and videos of herself in exchange for money. You discussed sexually explicit topics with the complainant. You told the complainant that she sounded like she was only 13 or 14. You asked to see photographs of her tummy and requested a video of her spreading her buttock cheeks. You also asked her to send photographs of herself in her school uniform. When she sent material, you used the screen recorder app to save the Snapchat messages. When police conducted a search at your residence, six video recordings of Snapchat conversations were located on your computer. These conversations revealed that the complainant had sent you one clothed but sexually suggestive photograph; two photographs of

naked breasts; four photographs of her bare buttocks and anus; 16 videos of her vagina, including videos of her masturbating and using a hair brush and chapstick whilst masturbating; one video of her vagina without masturbation and four videos of her naked buttocks, including her spreading her buttock cheeks to fully expose her anus. You had made comments to the complainant on Snapchat suggesting she could use a substance to "lube her arsehole". You had offered the complainant \$100.00 and told her you would leave it at a department store for her to collect.

The fifteenth complainant was 15 years of age and attended the school at which you were employed. You messaged her using your Instagram account. You engaged in some general conversation and then you started asking her about sexual bite marks. You asked the complainant if she was into BDSM. You asked her to describe whether she had any bite marks from her partner. When the complainant declined to comment upon this and asked you to respect her boundaries, you mocked her and made suggestions that she tell you about her sexual behaviours with her partner. You would refer to her as "baby" throughout the conversations. The complainant blocked you. You endeavoured to add her using a second Instagram account. You also contacted her via her school email, asking if she would add you back on Instagram. Clearly then you knew she was a student at the school where you worked. You used the screen recorder app to record the conversations between yourself and this complainant.

The sixteenth complainant was aged 16 and a student at the school at which you were employed. In May 2021, you contacted her via Instagram, asked her for her age and enquired as to whether she had an Only Fans account. Over the next two weeks, you requested the complainant send you nude photos and also videos of her working. She declined. You nevertheless continued to ask her for nude photos and offered her money. She did not send you any photographs.

The seventeenth complainant was 16 years of age at the time of the offending and attended a school other than the one at which you were employed. In mid-June 2021, you messaged the complainant via Instagram. The complainant's Instagram account disclosed that she was 16. You asked her how old she was and enquired as to whether she had an Only Fans account. The complainant told you she was 16 years of age. You asked her for her bra and underwear size, saying that you "wanted to know what you were dealing with". You asked her whether she would show herself twerking in her underwear for \$100.00. When she did not initially respond, you offered her more money. You also contacted this complainant via Snapchat. You told her that you worked in the mines on that social media platform. The complainant told you that if you sent her money, she would send you some "special stuff". You responded by asking for a sexy photo of her. You asked for her sizes and enquired how much she wanted and for what. The complainant sent you a photograph of herself in her underwear. There was further conversation in which you discussed payment. You told the complainant you wanted to see her naked and wanted to see her "arse spread". You asked her what \$100.00 would get you. During the conversation you asked for her bra and underwear size and also asked her whether her genitals were shaved or hairy. During the conversation in which you were discussing prices, you made a number of sexually explicit comments. The complainant told you that she had a girlfriend. She said this in an endeavour to deter you. It did not. Instead, you asked her if she did sexual things with her girlfriend and requested more photographs. You asked her to describe what sexual activities she performed with her girlfriend. The complainant told you that her girlfriend would send some pictures. The complainant then sent you a photograph of an anus with a butt plug inserted. It is not known if that photograph was from the internet or taken by the complainant, or her purported girlfriend. You used the screen recorder app to save

screen shots of the messages and images that the complainant sent to you. When police searched your residence, they located two video recordings of Snapchat conversations. Those recorded conversations revealed the complainant had sent you nine clothed but sexually suggestive photographs, including photographs of her in her underwear and one photograph of a naked buttocks and anus with a butt plug inserted. The complainant had sent a number of photographs of herself in her underwear before you agreed to provide her with \$100.00. You left the money in a department store for her to collect.

During the investigation into these matters, it became apparent that you had made attempts to engage other teenage girls by contacting them via various social media platforms. It is apparent you have been quite persistent in attempting to engage other young females in the same type of behaviour to which the 17 complainants I have referenced were exposed. Also, when your residence was searched, police found a SD card which contained videos of you recording up the skirts of students at the school. This is uncharged conduct and you will not be sentenced for it, but it is indicative of your interest in teenage females.

Following the search, you were arrested and interviewed. During the initial interview, police were only aware of two complainants. Whilst you made some admissions in terms of you having created social media accounts under false names, you claimed you only reached out to people you thought were over 18. You admitted making payment to females for "sexy photos" but denied that you were aware they were underage. You admitted that you would store the images you received on your laptop.

You suggested to police that you did not actively seek the girls out. You said you had created false identities because you did not want it to be revealed that you were paying for pornography. You suggested to police that the two complainants who you were asked about during the interview were the only ones from whom you had received photographs. Clearly, parts of what you told police simply were not true. Following further investigations, and the revelation of further complainants, you were offered the opportunity for a further interview. You made no comment about the specific allegations but did say that you were very sorry, remorseful and shameful.

You are now 32 years of age. You have no prior convictions. You have qualifications in IT. You lost your employment at the school when this offending came to light, and given the inevitable convictions for these crimes, it may well be you find it difficult to obtain employment in the future. You live with your mother. You had a difficult and lonely upbringing. During your schooling years, you were ostracised and bullied because you were overweight. You had very few friends and had difficulty in socialising. It is suggested that this offending occurred because you were socially isolated and lonely. I am told you sought out friendships via social media because you have limited social skills, lack self-confidence and have difficulty in forming friendships. Whilst I can accept you felt more confident communicating with others via social media platforms, your behaviour went far beyond pursuing friendships. It was persistent, predatory behaviour directed at young persons who, at times, lacked the maturity and understanding to make sensible, protective choices for themselves. These laws exist to protect young persons from themselves as well as from predatory adults.

I am told that you now have insight into the wrongfulness of your behaviour. You are undertaking counselling in an endeavour to improve your self-confidence and self-esteem, and minimise the risk this type of offending reoccurring. That is to your credit. I note, however,

you continue to maintain that you did not appreciate the ages of the complainants initially. It is suggested you did not deliberately seek out young, underage females, but thought you were liaising with adults. I reject this suggestion. The information that was apparent from many of the complainant's social media platforms clearly included their real names and real ages. Further, in some instances, in direct communications with you, they told you their real ages. In other instances, you were well aware they were of school age and in some cases, communicated with them via their school email. Your unwillingness to acknowledge this is suggestive that you lack a true understanding of the gravity of your behaviour.

It is also suggested that your employment at the school had no nexus to your offending. Again, this is a proposition that I reject. Eleven of the complainants were students at the school at which you were employed. One was a past student. On two occasions you used the school email to contact complainants. Whilst I accept the main of your communication with the complainants occurred via social media platforms, and always outside of school hours, I am satisfied that you must have appreciated who the complainants were and that they were students at the school at which you were employed. To this end, it was a breach of trust in respect to your employer and also the students who were entitled to expect all staff employed at the school to treat them with respect and decency.

Whilst I am satisfied that your offending was associated with your employment, in the sense that you knew the complainants and could readily identify them on their social media platforms, I cannot be satisfied that any of the complainants were under your care, supervision or authority such that s 11A(1) (a) of the *Sentencing Act* applies. You were employed in the IT section. I have nothing before me to suggest that you were in a position whereby you could direct or authorise any matter in respect to the students. And given the complainants did not know your true identity I cannot be satisfied their behaviour was in any way influenced by your position at the school. I also am not satisfied that the class list found on your computer during the search was in any way related to your offending.

This was a very serious example of offending of this nature. The age disparity between you and the complainants was marked. In the vast majority of cases you initiated the contact with the complainant. On the occasions the complainants initiated contact with you, it was because they were aware of other complainants who had already been contacted by you. As noted, your behaviour was protracted and predatory. It was in no way opportunistic. You offered money to the complainants in return for nude photographs and videos. To my mind, this is an aggravating feature. You treated the complainants as commodities for your entertainment and encouraged them to also treat their bodies as a commodity. The damage this may cause to their self-worth and self-esteem in years to come is simply unknown, but there is no question in my mind that your behaviour has enormous potential for harm.

Sexual crimes against children are presumed to cause harm. This presumption is not displaced because the behaviour occurs online. It is the role of the courts, as far as can be achieved, to protect potential victims from online predators. Although you were not physically in contact with the complainants, and I accept that you had no intention to make physical contact with the complainants, you nevertheless persuaded them to perform sexual acts upon themselves and send you photographs or videos of the same. You saved such images unbeknown to them. Some of the complainants were most vulnerable, including a complainant with learning disabilities. The level of maturity and capacity to rationalise consequences which may have assisted them in making informed decisions was simply absent for many of the complainants. And, of course, none of the complainants could lawfully consent.

I have no Victim Impact Statements from any of the complainants, but it is easy to appreciate they may well experience anxiety, humiliation, embarrassment, distrust, fear and uncertainty, together with other psychological impacts, as a consequence of your criminal conduct. I do not lose sight of the fact that many of the charges relate to attempting to engage a person under the age of 18 in the production of child exploitation material. Whilst many of the complainants resisted your endeavours, the conversations they engaged in with you whilst you were endeavouring to persuade them to provide naked photographs, retains, in my view, the capacity to cause harm. The crimes committed against the complainants occurred at a critical stage of their emotional, sexual and physical development and the attitude you encouraged the complainants to take in seeing their bodies as commodities that could be manipulated for another's sexual gratification, has the potential to cause harm. I reject the submission that those complainants who chose not to participate were not adversely impacted. What I do accept, however, is that those complainants would not be subject to the same anguish as those who shared images and now understand those intimate images of them were retained by you for your own sexual gratification, together with perhaps an ongoing concern that those intimate images may have found their way onto the internet. You are not charged with distributing child exploitation material and will not, of course, be sentenced for that. That does not mean, however, it is not an area of concern for the complainants.

In sentencing you for the possession of child exploitation material charge, I bear in mind the number and nature of the images. I also take into account that to a large degree, this charge arises from the other counts, but the steps you took to save the material secretly and then retain it indicates the level of sexual interest you had in the young complainants and reflects the extent of your criminal and moral culpability.

Offences involving the use of social media by a mature adult to prey upon vulnerable young people for sexual gratification, are most serious. Such conduct is insidious and is often highly damaging. Sexual abuse of children in whatever form it takes, is a matter of great community concern and deserves condemnation. General deterrence is a dominant sentencing consideration. Previous good character and even prospects of rehabilitation do not carry great weight. Your conduct was deliberate, persistent and at times, bordered on being coercive when assessed in the context of the ages of some of the complainants. No mitigation arises from any mental impairment or the like.

I take into account in your favour, your pleas of guilty which I accept were entered at an early opportunity. A significant number of complainants have been spared the ordeal of giving evidence and saved the embarrassment and humiliation of a public trial. The pleas also have significant utilitarian value. I take into account that the entirety of the offending represents a course of conduct over approximately a 12 month period. Some of the complainants were only impacted for short periods of time, whilst for others the communications went on for several months. At times, more than one complainant was being pursued by you.

The objective seriousness of your crimes means, in my view, immediate imprisonment is warranted. Taking into account, however, the absence of prior convictions, your early pleas of guilty and indications of a willingness to reform by undertaking counselling, I have concluded it is appropriate to conditionally suspend part of the period of imprisonment I intend to impose.

I make the following orders. You are convicted of all counts to which you have pleaded guilty. I will impose one sentence. You are sentenced to three years and nine months' imprisonment.

The last nine months of that period of imprisonment is suspended on condition that you commit no offence punishable by imprisonment for a period of two years from your release. I order that you not be eligible for parole until you have served one half of the operative part of the term of imprisonment I have imposed. I make an order directing that the Registrar under the *Community Protection (Offender Reporting) Act 2005* cause your name to be placed on the register and that you comply with the reporting obligations under that Act for a period of ten years following your release from prison. I order the forfeiture of items 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 20 as recorded on property seizure record receipt 188420.