**CODING SCHEME**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SAMPLE DESCRIPTION** | |
| 1. Case | Joseph v R. [2010] EWCA Crim 2580 |
| 2. Date of appeal hearing | 111110 |
| 3. Date of original trial/conviction | 271010 |
| 4. Keywords found in case | 7 |
| 5. Decision *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | 1 |
| 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)? | 30 |
| 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)? | 2 |
| 13. Did defendant have any children (at time of offence)? | 99 |
| 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. Since the appellants original trial, there have been changes in the Forensic Science Service's guidelines for presenting and interpreting evidence on the recovery of Gunshot residue which, counsel for the defence contend, render the evidence given by the forensic scientist at trial as being inaccurate or misleading causing the convictions to be unsafe. Ground 2. Where the appellant has no previous convictions, the defence contends that the trial judge did not direct the jury to take the appellant’s good character into account. Ground 3. It was submitted by the defence that the judge may have inadvertently given the jury the impression that a mobile phone associated with the crime belonged to the appellant. Ground 4. Hostile witness direction. The defence assert that judge should have given the jury an explicit direction that, had they concluded that the witnesses oral evidence was true or may have been true then it should be treated as a significant weakening of the prosecution case. |
| 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? | 2 |
| 37. Did appeal court raise concerns about errors in judge’s summing up of case at original trial? **37b.** If yes, who raised it? | 2 |
| 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? | 1 |
| 42. Did appeal court refer to any existing case law? **42b.** If yes, which? | Q42a: 1  Q42b: Barry George [2007] EWCA Crim 2722; Gray, [2004] EWCA Crim 1074, [2004] 2 Cr App R 496; Aziz [1995] 2 CrAppR 483; Zoppolo-Barraza; Durbin; Vye; Shaw v R [2002] 1 Cr App R 77; Moustakim [2008] EWCA Crim 3096 |
| 43. Name of appeal judge(s) | Lord Justice Pitchford, Mr Justice Sweeney and Mrs Justice Slade |
| 44. Name of lawyer(s) in appeal hearing, including who they represent | Mr Paul Mendelle and Mr John Lyons (instructed by Registrar of Criminal Appeals) for the Applicant. Mr Mark Heywood (instructed by CPS - Homicide Team) for the Respondent |
| **ORIGINAL CASE/TRIAL CHARACTERISTICS (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| 45. Date of crime (first date) | 180403 |
| 46. Was defendant immediately treated as a suspect? **46b.** If no, then how was defendant immediately treated? | Q46: 2  Q46b: The police initially conducted surveillance, then searches on a vehicle, property and clothes associated with the defendant. |
| 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? | Count 1: Murder. Counts 2 and 3: Possessing a firearm with intent to endanger life. Count 4: Possessing ammunition without a certificate. Count 5: Possessing a Class A drug, cocaine, with intent to supply |
| 51. Was there circumstantial evidence in the case? **51b.** If yes, what? | Q51: 1  Q51b: Testimony from someone who had witnessed the shooting; cell site analysis recording the number of calls made to a mobile telephone, the number of calls and the location of the devise; clothing found in the appellants bedroom containing gunshot residue; a vehicle owned by the appellant father and accessible to him was located within the vicinity of the crime when it was committed; a thumb belonging to an associate of the appellant was located in a vehicle associated with the crime/s; within the vehicle was a bag belonging to the appellant containing two firearms, ammunition and electric scales; an immigration document and doctors registration form with a mobile phone number (associated with the appellant) pertaining to an associate of the appellant was also found in the vehicle |
| 52. Was there any other evidence in the case? **52b.** If yes, what? | Q52: 1  Q52b: Testimony from two firearms experts (one acting on behalf of the prosecution one commissioned by the defence counsel) offering an opinion on a bullet recovered from the victim and gun later recovered. Firearms discharge residues (particle recovery) from the murder weapon, a vehicle and various items of clothing belonging to the appellant; eyewitness testimony; evidence from the police following surveillance of the appellant; defendants evidence |
| 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 term of 17 years and 4 months to be served. He received concurrent terms of imprisonment upon the remaining counts. |
| 55. Was case originally tried in Crown court or magistrates’ court? | 1 |
| 56. Name of judge(s) in original trial | Judge Michael Hyam |
| 57. Name of lawyer(s) in original trial | Mr Borrelli and Mr Korda |
| **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? | 1 |
| 61. Was there over a week delay between crime being committed and collection of fingerprint/DNA or Digital evidence from crime scene? | 1 |
| 62. How many fingerprint/DNA samples were taken from crime scene? | 1 |
| 63. Was only one method used to collect the sample(s) or multiple methods? | 1 |
| 64. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about the method(s) used to collect the sample? | 2 |
| 65. Was the fingerprint/DNA sample or Digital evidence in question considered by either the prosecution or defence experts to be partial or ambiguous? | 2 |
| 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? | 99 |
| 69. How much experience did the defence examiner have? | 99 |
| 70. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about the methods of fingerprint/DNA/Digital analysis used? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| 71. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about there being a chance of the fingerprint/DNA samples being degraded? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| 72. Did analysis involve ‘cold’ match from a database or comparison against a suspect? | 1  **Annotations:** |
| 73. Did initial examination of sample lead to conclusion that origin could not be determined? | 2  **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. 2  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? | 2 |
| **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)? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| 82. Was prosecution fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert witness cross-examined by defence at original trial? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| 83. Did (main) defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert present evidence at original trial? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| 84. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about the qualifications, knowledge, skills or experience of defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert(s)? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| 85. Was defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert witness cross-examined by prosecution at original trial? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| 86. Was there a disagreement in conclusions made by prosecution and defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital experts at original trial? | 2  **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. 1  Q90b. his thumb mark was later found on the internal rear-view mirror. Para 6. Referring to an associate of the appellant “his thumb mark was later found on the internal rear-view mirror”. Para 10. From the surface of the helmet was recovered a thumb print for an associate of the appellant  **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? | 1 |
| 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? | 2 |
| 96. Did (prosecution or defence) fingerprint/DNA/Digital experts try to explain any inconsistencies in evidence at original trial? | 2 |
| 97. Was hearsay evidence presented at trial? | 1  **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.** | The Court of Appeal received fresh evidence which described a change in approach by the Forensic Science Service to its guidelines on "the assessment, interpretation, and reporting of firearms chemistry cases". Low level of residue from firearm – not significant but it dependence upon the precise circumstances and other evidence  Para 21. Given the 4 week period between the killing and the recovery of the exhibits, and the lack of knowledge about wear, it was not possible to know for what period the particle had been present. Para 22. Understanding that the evidence was that the armed officers had searched the Mitsubishi, she (defence expert) expressed the view that contamination was a possibility. However, the evidence was to the contrary; the armed officers had not searched the Mitsubishi (vehicle associated with crime). The defence expert later conceded upon cross-examination that, under the circumstances presented by the prosecution counsel, that it was "highly unlikely" that contamination had taken place. Direction on Good character: Para 29. the appropriate terms of a good character direction in favour of the applicant. The applicant had no previous convictions. Ordinarily he would have been entitled to receive from the trial judge a direction to the effect that the jury should take the applicant's good character into account in his favour in two respects: first, a defendant of good character may be less likely to commit offences, certainly offences of the gravity alleged, and second, a man of good character may be more likely to tell the truth about important matters. Para 30. a person is of good character does not mean that he is incapable of committing crimes, however serious. If that were so, no-one would ever be convicted because we all start with a good character |