**CODING SCHEME**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SAMPLE DESCRIPTION** | |
| 1. Case | Wenton, R. v [2010] EWCA Crim 2361 |
| 2. Date of appeal hearing | 041010 |
| 3. Date of original trial/conviction | 290909 |
| 4. Keywords found in case | 1 |
| 5. Decision *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | 2 |
| 6. Number of pages | 4 |
| **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)? | 20 |
| 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)? | 99 |
| 14. Was defendant homeless (at time of offence)? | 99 |
| **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* | Whether damaging the window can be made out as an offence of being reckless as to whether life was endangered |
| 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? | 2 |
| 22. Were new fingerprint/DNA/Digital experts consulted by prosecution after original trial? | 2 |
| 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? | 2 |
| 31. For DNA evidence, were any new contamination/error rates presented at appeal hearing? | 2 |
| 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? | 2 |
| 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? | 2 |
| 35. Did appeal court raise concerns about judge at original trial misunderstanding fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence? **35b.** If yes, Who raised it? | 2 |
| 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? | 2 |
| 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? | 2 |
| 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: Steer [1988] AC 111; Dudley [1989] Crim.L.R 57; Asquith and others [1995] 1 Cr.App.R (S) 492 |
| 43. Name of appeal judge(s) | Lord Justice Leveson, Mr Justice Irwin and Mr Justice Holroyde |
| 44. Name of lawyer(s) in appeal hearing, including who they represent | Mr E Haygarth appeared on behalf of the Appellant. Mr K Grant appeared on behalf of the Crown |
| **ORIGINAL CASE/TRIAL CHARACTERISTICS (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| 45. Date of crime (first date) | 210609 |
| 46. Was defendant immediately treated as a suspect? **46b.** If no, then how was defendant immediately treated? | Q46: 1  Q46b: 99 |
| 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: 1 |
| 49. Was this the first trial? | 2 |
| 50. What offence(s) was defendant convicted of/plead guilty to? | five counts of damaging property being reckless as to whether life was endangered, one count of possessing a controlled drug of class B with intent to supply. |
| 51. Was there circumstantial evidence in the case? **51b.** If yes, what? | Q51: 1  Q51b: appellant's fingerprints were found on the canister and the piece of paper |
| 52. Was there any other evidence in the case? **52b.** If yes, what? | Q52: 1  Q52b: 99 |
| 53. Did defendant provide an alibi for whereabouts at time of crime? **53b.** If yes, was it corroborated? | Q53: 1  Q53b: 1 |
| 54. What was the defendant’s original sentence? | Six years imprisonment |
| 55. Was case originally tried in Crown court or magistrates’ court? | 1 |
| 56. Name of judge(s) in original trial | Judge James |
| 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? | 2 |
| 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? | 1  **Annotations:** |
| 75. Was sample re-examined? **75b.** If yes, did re-examination change initial conclusion? | Q75. 2  Q75b. 99 |
| 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? | 3  **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? | 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. 2  Q90b. At the court of appeal it was stated “The appellant's fingerprints were found on the canister and the piece of paper”  **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? | 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? | 2  **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? | 2 |
| 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.** |  |