**CODING SCHEME**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SAMPLE DESCRIPTION** | |
| 1. Case | Henderson v R. [2010] EWCA Crim 1269 |
| 2. Date of appeal hearing | 170610 |
| 3. Date of original trial/conviction | 1009 |
| 4. Keywords found in case | 7 |
| 5. Decision *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | 2 |
| 6. Number of pages | 15 |
| **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)? | 99 |
| 9. Defendant’s nationality (at time of offence)? | 99 |
| 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)? | 99 |
| 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) | 2 |
| 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* | The appellant sought to adduce fresh expert medical witnesses. In this case recovery demonstrated that the retinal haemorrhages could not be relied upon as evidence of shaking |
| 19. Was fresh evidence presented at appeal? **19b.** If yes, was it fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence? **19c.** If no, what was it? | Q19: 1  Q19b: 99  Q19c: 99 |
| 20. Were new techniques used to re-examine old evidence at appeal? | 1 |
| 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? | 1 |
| 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 Schmidt [2009] EWHC Crim 838; R v Harris & Others [2006] 1 Cr App R5; R v Reid & Ors [2009] EWCA Crim; R v Holdsworth [2008] EWCA Crim 971; R v Bonython [1984] 38 SASR 45; R v Kai-Whitewind [2005] 2 Cr App R 31 |
| 43. Name of appeal judge(s) | Judge Moses, Mrs Justice Rafferty and Mr Justice Hedley |
| 44. Name of lawyer(s) in appeal hearing, including who they represent | Miss S Wass and Miss K Thorne (instructed by Mark Williams Associates) for the Appellant. Mr E Brown (who did not appear below) and Miss N Tahta (instructed by the Crown Prosecution Service) for the Respondent |
| **ORIGINAL CASE/TRIAL CHARACTERISTICS (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| 45. Date of crime (first date) | 150207 |
| 46. Was defendant immediately treated as a suspect? **46b.** If no, then how was defendant immediately treated? | Q46: 2  Q46b: Eight days after the child sustained an injury the child sustained another injury. In the aftermath of this subsequent head injury the appellant was charged (A decision was taken to join both incidences). According to para 88 the first incident was comparatively trivial and was never suggested as having been deliberate; it was left to the jury on the basis of recklessness…had it stood alone, there is every reason to think that it may not have been the subject of criminal prosecution at all and would have been viewed as a piece of “new parent carelessness" |
| 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? | 1 |
| 50. What offence(s) was defendant convicted of/plead guilty to? | Grievous bodily harm and cruelty |
| 51. Was there circumstantial evidence in the case? **51b.** If yes, what? | Q51: 1  Q51b: Medical expert evidence on the injuries sustained by the victim |
| 52. Was there any other evidence in the case? **52b.** If yes, what? | Q52: 1  Q52b: medical evidence of the treating doctors: A & E, the paediatricians and the radiologists; reference to findings from a research study |
| 53. Did defendant provide an alibi for whereabouts at time of crime? **53b.** If yes, was it corroborated? | Q53: 2  Q53b: 99 |
| 54. What was the defendant’s original sentence? | concurrent terms of 18 months and 1 month imprisonment |
| 55. Was case originally tried in Crown court or magistrates’ court? | 1 |
| 56. Name of judge(s) in original trial | Judge Timothy Stow |
| 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? | 99  **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? | considerable standing in their field of paediatric neuroradiology and considerable forensic experience both in the criminal and in the family jurisdictions |
| 69. How much experience did the defence examiner have? | considerable standing in their field of paediatric neuroradiology and considerable forensic experience both in the criminal and in the family jurisdictions |
| 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? | 2  **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? | 99  **Annotations:** |
| 98. Was any bad character evidence presented at trial? | 99  **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. 1  Q115b. 2 |
| 116. Where the case involved co-defendant/s, was there a mixed verdict? 116b. If Yes, what were the verdicts? | Q116. Yes = 1, No = 2  Q116b. Add text |
| **NOTES – PLEASE WRITE ANYTHING THAT YOU THINK IS IMPORTANT BUT WHICH IS NOT CODED ABOVE. THIS MAY INCLUDE QUOTES.** | The medical evidence presented in this case fell under several categories (treating doctors: A & E, the paediatricians and the radiologists where it was highlighted that “The second group of medical evidence related to those experts who were asked to express a view as to causation, although the treating doctors were allowed to do so too”) and three subdivisions (ophthalmology, paediatric neurology and paediatric neuroradiology) (para 89/90). The original trial involved 18 medical witnesses (prosecution had called fifteen medical witnesses and the defendant three). The court presented the experts standings by making reference to their experiences, i.e. “Both these witnesses are of considerable standing in their field of paediatric neuroradiology and both have considerable forensic experience both in the criminal and in the family jurisdictions” (Para 95). There were disagreement of opinions between the prosecution and defence medical experts. We should add this. The summing-up contained serious misdirections. Those misdirections provide cogent support for the conclusion we have reached. The Judge did not sufficiently direct the jury as to the importance of the opthalmological evidence and its effect in undermining the triad as evidence of NAHI and as supporting an unknown cause. It was incumbent upon him to have done so. No proper direction was given to the jury that they must consider the possibility of an unknown cause, particularly in the light of the ophthalmological evidence, and should only convict if they reject it. The summing-up was also defective in its structure. The Judge carefully and conscientiously recited long passages of the expert evidence to the jury. But he did not 'direct' the jury at all. He recited those passages in the chronological order in which the evidence was given. That was of little assistance to the jury. The jury required a careful direction as to the essential issues which they had to determine and a reminder of that evidence and only that evidence which went to those issues. It was necessary to deal with that evidence issue by issue. The Judge did not have the assistance of R v Schmidt [2009] EWHC Crim 838 in which a summing-up similar to that in this case led to the quashing of the conviction [42] and [47]. Nor did he have the assistance of the current Judicial Studies Board Crown Court Bench Book March 2010, Chapter 8. We have only drawn attention to the summing-up because it assists in emphasising the need to construct a summing-up to meet the complexities of cases such as these and to ensure the case proceeds on a logical basis. It is only fair to the Judge to state that throughout the trial and the summing-up the Judge exhibited conspicuous care and fairness. We think that the conviction on Count 4 should be quashed as well. |