**CODING SCHEME**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SAMPLE DESCRIPTION** | |
| 1. Case | Akinrele, R. v [2010] EWCA Crim 2972 |
| 2. Date of appeal hearing | 211210 |
| 3. Date of original trial/conviction | 051010 |
| 4. Keywords found in case | 5 |
| 5. Decision *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | 1 |
| 6. Number of pages | 16 |
| **DEFENDANT DEMOGRAPHICS (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| 7. Defendant’s gender? | 1 |
| 8. Defendant’s age (at time of offence)? | 35 |
| 9. Defendant’s nationality (at time of offence)? | 2 |
| 10. Defendant’s employment status (at time of offence)? | 99 |
| 11. Defendant’s education level (at time of offence)? | 99 |
| 12. Defendant’s relationship status (at time of offence)? | 2 |
| 13. Did defendant have any children (at time of offence)? | 1 |
| 14. Was defendant homeless (at time of offence)? | 2 |
| **APPEAL CASE/HEARING FACTORS (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| 15. When was appeal initiated? (e.g., post-trial, post-conviction, post-sentence, other) | 3 |
| 16. Who is appellant? (e.g., prosecution, defence, other) | 1 |
| 17. What is appeal against? (e.g., conviction, sentence, both, other) | 1 |
| 18. What are the grounds/reason(s) for appeal? *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | Ground 1: The case was not properly summed up by the judge; in essence it was said that the summing up was unbalanced, favouring Kelly Inman as opposed to the appellant, that the appellant's defence was not put properly to the jury and the medical evidence was not correctly summed up. Indeed, the judge had shown the appearance of bias against the appellant throughout the proceedings. Ground 2: The conviction was not safe as in judgments given before and after the trial before the judge, another judge from the Family Division of the High Court, had concluded in family proceedings that the co-defendant (the appellants partner) was an untruthful witness who manipulated her evidence; as her evidence was central to the case against the appellant, the conviction could not be safe. The appellant also sought leave to appeal on an additional ground, namely the failure by the judge to direct the jury correctly on intent. |
| 19. Was fresh evidence presented at appeal? **19b.** If yes, was it fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence? **19c.** If no, what was it? | Q19: 2  Q19b: 99  Q19c: 99 |
| 20. Were new techniques used to re-examine old evidence at appeal? | 2 |
| 21. Were new fingerprint/DNA/Digital experts consulted by defence after original trial? | 99 |
| 22. Were new fingerprint/DNA/Digital experts consulted by prosecution after original trial? | 99 |
| 23. Did new prosecution fingerprint/DNA/Digital experts present evidence at appeal hearing? | 99 |
| 24. Did new defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital experts present evidence at appeal hearing? | 99 |
| 25. Was concern expressed at appeal hearing about qualifications, knowledge, skills or experience of any new prosecution fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert(s)? | 99 |
| 26. Was any concern expressed at appeal hearing about qualifications, knowledge, skills or experience of any new defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert(s)? | 99 |
| 27. Did prosecution and defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert conclusions disagree at appeal hearing? | 99 |
| 28. What were the main areas of disagreement between prosecution and defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital experts at appeal hearing? *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | 99 |
| 29. Did fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert express his/her confidence in conclusion at appeal hearing? **29b.** If yes, how? *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | Q29: 99  Q29b: 99 |
| 30. Were any new probabilities of fingerprint/DNA match mentioned at appeal hearing? | 99 |
| 31. For DNA evidence, were any new contamination/error rates presented at appeal hearing? | 99 |
| 32. For fingerprint evidence, were any (new) points of dissimilarity between sample and print presented at appeal hearing? **32b.** If yes, how many? | Q32: 99  Q32b: 99 |
| 33. Did appeal court raise concerns about prosecution or defence team misunderstanding fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence? **33b**. If yes, who raised it? | 99 |
| 34. Did appeal court raise concerns about jury at original trial misunderstanding or having difficulty understanding fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence? **34b**. If yes, who raised it? | 99 |
| 35. Did appeal court raise concerns about judge at original trial misunderstanding fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence? **35b.** If yes, Who raised it? | 99 |
| 36. Did appeal court raise concerns about application of either wrong case law at original trial or ignoring right case law? If yes, who raised it? | 1 |
| 37. Did appeal court raise concerns about errors in judge’s summing up of case at original trial? **37b.** If yes, who raised it? | 1 |
| 38. Did appeal court raise concerns about judge’s instructions confusing jury at original trial? **38b.** If yes, who raised it? | 2 |
| 39. Did appeal court raise concerns about how fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence was presented at original trial? 39b. If yes, who raised it? | 99 |
| 40. Did appeal court raise concerns that weight of fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence was overstated in court by either prosecution/defence/judge at original trial? **40b.** If yes, who raised it? | 99 |
| 41. Did appeal court raise concerns about inadmissible evidence being presented at original trial? **41b.** If yes, who raised it? | 2 |
| 42. Did appeal court refer to any existing case law? **42b.** If yes, which? | Q42a: 1  Q42b: R v Levy [2006] EWCA Crim 1902; [2007] 1 Cr App R 1; David D and Philip J [1996] 1 Cr App R 455 |
| 43. Name of appeal judge(s) | Lord Justice Thomas, Mr Justice Openshaw and Mr Justice Spencer |
| 44. Name of lawyer(s) in appeal hearing, including who they represent | Mr A Rawley and Mr C Burton for the Appellant. Miss Y Coen and Mr S Thomas for the Respondent |
| **ORIGINAL CASE/TRIAL CHARACTERISTICS (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| 45. Date of crime (first date) | 301206 |
| 46. Was defendant immediately treated as a suspect? **46b.** If no, then how was defendant immediately treated? | Q46: 2  Q46b: The victim sustained multiple injuries over a three week period. Prior to the victim’s death the appellant and co-defendant were initially arrested on suspicion of inflicting GBH on the victim days before her death. |
| 47. Were there other suspects (arrests)? | 2 |
| 48. Did the defendant plead guilty or was he/she convicted at trial? **48b.** If convicted, then was the jury verdict unanimous or other? | Q48: 1  Q48b: 99 |
| 49. Was this the first trial? | 2 |
| 50. What offence(s) was defendant convicted of/plead guilty to? | Murder |
| 51. Was there circumstantial evidence in the case? **51b.** If yes, what? | Q51: 1  Q51b: Multiple injuries to victim; tape-recording of the 999 call; ambulance men reports on x-ray |
| 52. Was there any other evidence in the case? **52b.** If yes, what? | Q52: 1  Q52b: Medical opinion evidence on the injuries and approximate date when they were sustained; eye witness testimony from a previous girlfriend of the appellant and central heating engineer; Opinion evidence from a doctor specialising in Battered Women’s Syndrome on the co-defendants mental health; a paediatrician report on the head injury; In regards to the victims injuries, the appellants legal team contend this was a consequence of “temporary brittle bone disease”. In support of this they provided an expert report from a clinical radiologist and associate professor based in the US; opinion evidence from a professor in Paediatrics from the US; a report from a consultant and clinical lecturer |
| 53. Did defendant provide an alibi for whereabouts at time of crime? **53b.** If yes, was it corroborated? | Q53: 1  Q53b: 2 |
| 54. What was the defendant’s original sentence? | life imprisonment with a minimum period of 16 years less time on remand |
| 55. Was case originally tried in Crown court or magistrates’ court? | 1 |
| 56. Name of judge(s) in original trial | Judge Clegg; Judge Parker |
| 57. Name of lawyer(s) in original trial | 99 |
| **INVESTIGATIVE STAGE (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| **COLLECTION** |  |
| 58. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about there being a chance of contamination of fingerprint/DNA evidence prior to sample collection from the crime scene? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| 59. For DNA evidence, was concern expressed at original trial or about where the DNA came from? **59b.** If yes, where? | Q59. 99  Q59b. 99  **Annotations:** |
| 60. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about there being potential for evidence tampering/planting? | 2 |
| 61. Was there over a week delay between crime being committed and collection of fingerprint/DNA or Digital evidence from crime scene? | 99 |
| 62. How many fingerprint/DNA samples were taken from crime scene? | 99 |
| 63. Was only one method used to collect the sample(s) or multiple methods? | 99 |
| 64. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about the method(s) used to collect the sample? | 99 |
| 65. Was the fingerprint/DNA sample or Digital evidence in question considered by either the prosecution or defence experts to be partial or ambiguous? | 99 |
| 66. Were evidence requests made according to the legal rules? | 1 |
| 67. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about broken chain of custody i.e., who was looking after the fingerprint/DNA sample(s) or Digital evidence after they were collected? | 2 |
| **ANALYSIS** |  |
| 68. How much experience did the prosecution forensic examiner have? | The examiners credentials were reported in terms of the area of specialty or status: Medical evidence from a Professor |
| 69. How much experience did the defence examiner have? | The examiners credentials were reported in terms of the area of specialty or status: a clinical radiologist and associate professor; a professor in Paediatrics; a consultant and clinical lecturer. Notably, the vocation/discipline for some of the professionals providing expert evidence, i.e. Dr. Mezey and Dr. Mason, was not disclosed |
| 70. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about the methods of fingerprint/DNA/Digital analysis used? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 71. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about there being a chance of the fingerprint/DNA samples being degraded? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 72. Did analysis involve ‘cold’ match from a database or comparison against a suspect? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| 73. Did initial examination of sample lead to conclusion that origin could not be determined? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 74. Did initial examination of sample lead to conclusion that sample originated from defendant? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 75. Was sample re-examined? **75b.** If yes, did re-examination change initial conclusion? | Q75. 99  Q75b. 99  **Annotations:** |
| 76. Was fingerprint/DNA/Digital examiner opinion/conclusion verified by another examiner? | 99 |
| 77. For fingerprint examination, how many points of similarity were found (if any)? | 99 |
| 78. Was fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence destroyed before trial? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 79. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about the quality of notes taken/report of the fingerprint/DNA/Digital examiner? | 99 |
| **EVIDENTIARY STAGE (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| **EXPERT TESTIMONY** |  |
| 80. Did (main) prosecution fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert present evidence at original trial? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 81. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about the qualifications, knowledge, skills or experience of prosecution fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert(s)? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 82. Was prosecution fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert witness cross-examined by defence at original trial? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 83. Did (main) defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert present evidence at original trial? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 84. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about the qualifications, knowledge, skills or experience of defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert(s)? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 85. Was defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert witness cross-examined by prosecution at original trial? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 86. Was there a disagreement in conclusions made by prosecution and defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital experts at original trial? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 87. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about quality of prosecution expert reports? | 2 |
| 88. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about quality of defence expert reports? | 2 |
| 89. Were probabilities of fingerprint/DNA match mentioned at original trial? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 90. Did fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert express his/her confidence in conclusion at original trial? **90b.** If yes, how? | Q90. 99  Q90b. 99  **Annotations:** |
| 91. For DNA evidence, were probabilities of match presented by prosecution expert at original trial? | 99 |
| 92. For DNA evidence, were contamination/error rates presented at original trial? | 99 |
| 93. For fingerprint evidence, did the prosecution expert declare a match/individualisation at original trial? | 99 |
| 94. For fingerprint evidence, how many points of similarity between sample and print were presented at original trial? | 99 |
| 95. For fingerprint evidence, were any points of dissimilarity presented at original trial? | 99 |
| 96. Did (prosecution or defence) fingerprint/DNA/Digital experts try to explain any inconsistencies in evidence at original trial? | 99 |
| 97. Was hearsay evidence presented at trial? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| 98. Was any bad character evidence presented at trial? | 1  **Annotations:** |
| 99. Did prosecution team fail to share relevant information with defence team before original trial? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| **JUDGE’S INSTRUCTIONS/JURY BEHAVIOR** |  |
| 100. Were visual images used to present fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence at original trial? | 99 |
| 101. How did judge instruct jury to deal with fingerprint/DNA evidence? *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | 99 |
| **ADDITIONAL DIGITAL QUESTIONS** | |
| **APPEAL CASE/HEARING FACTORS (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| 102. For Digital evidence, were any technical problems presented at the appeal hearing? If yes, what? *Provide a quote if short, otherwise summarise* | Q102: 99  Q102b: 99 |
| **DIGITAL - INVESTIGATIVE STAGE (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| **COLLECTION** | |
| 103. For Digital evidence, was concern expressed at original trial about problems securing the data? | 99 |
| 104. For Digital evidence were there any concerns about data being missed during investigation? | 99 |
| 105. For Digital evidence, was any data hidden over the network? | 99 |
| 106. For Digital evidence was any data hidden inside storage areas to make them invisible to the system commands and programs? | 99 |
| 107. For Digital evidence, was any data corrupted? | 99 |
| 108. For Digital evidence, was there any residual data wiping? | 99 |
| 109. For Digital evidence, was concern expressed at the original trial or appeal about data sources being damaged? | 99 |
| **ANALYSIS** | |
| 110. For Digital evidence was any data encrypted? | 99 |
| 111. For Digital evidence was any data hidden in a carrier file without modifying its outward appearance? | 99 |
| 112. For Digital evidence, was any techniques used to obfuscate the source of the attack? | 99 |
| 113. For Digital evidence, did the investigator have to analyse high volumes of data? | 99 |
| 114. For Digital evidence, were the investigators restricted to analysing only recent data stored on volatile memory? | 99 |
| 115. Were there any Co-defendants? 115b. If yes, how many? | Q115. 2  Q115b. 99 |
| 116. Where the case involved co-defendant/s, was there a mixed verdict? 116b. If Yes, what were the verdicts? | Q116. 99  Q116b. 99 |
| **NOTES – PLEASE WRITE ANYTHING THAT YOU THINK IS IMPORTANT BUT WHICH IS NOT CODED ABOVE. THIS MAY INCLUDE QUOTES.** | This case consisted of: trial, a hearing in front of the family division of the high court before the appeal court review. Para 22 (iii) the appeal court made reference to opinion evidence from two doctors not being accepted at a previous family high court hearing. Para 33. It was indicated that the expert proffering an opinion on battered women’s syndrome had been dismissed in the judges judgement with the judge concluding: "*I am convinced that the mother has further tailored and altered her account in order to run a case in front of the jury that she thought was going to be more successful than the one before me*." |