**CODING SCHEME**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SAMPLE DESCRIPTION** | |
| 1. Case | AS, R. v [2018] EWCA Crim 318 |
| 2. Date of appeal hearing | 150218 |
| 3. Date of original trial/conviction | 290817 |
| 4. Keywords found in case | 7 |
| 5. Decision *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | 2 |
| 6. Number of pages | 13 |
| **DEFENDANT DEMOGRAPHICS (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| 7. Defendant’s gender? | 2 |
| 8. Defendant’s age (at time of offence)? | 25 |
| 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)? | 1 |
| 13. Did defendant have any children (at time of offence)? | 1 |
| 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) | 2 |
| 18. What are the grounds/reason(s) for appeal? *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | The defence contends that owing to the appellants personal circumstances and mitigation, relating to her illness, were such that her sentence should have been suspended |
| 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: Medical evidence in the form of a psychiatists assessment of the appellant |
| 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? | 2 |
| 24. Did new defence fingerprint/DNA/Digital experts present evidence at appeal hearing? | 2 |
| 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? | 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 Bernard [1997] 1 Cr App R (S) 135; R v Qazi [2011] 2 Cr App R (S) 8; R v Hall [2013] 2 Cr App R (S) 68; R v Clarke; R v Cooper [2017] 1 WLR 3851, [2017] 2 Cr App R (S) 18; R v Forbes [2017] 1 WLR 53; R v Shaw [2010] EWCA Crim 982; R v S treater [2014] EWCA Crim 2491 |
| 43. Name of appeal judge(s) | Lord Justice Holroyde, Mrs Justice Elisabeth Laing and Judge Aubrey |
| 44. Name of lawyer(s) in appeal hearing, including who they represent | Mr J Doyle appeared on behalf of the Appellant AS. Mr S Heptonstall 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) | 0116 |
| 46. Was defendant immediately treated as a suspect? **46b.** If no, then how was defendant immediately treated? | Q46: 2  Q46b: Other members of her family were interviewed by the police before the appellant. The appellant initially denied any wrongdoings claiming other people had accessed her mobile phone |
| 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? | causing or inciting a child to engage in sexual activity |
| 51. Was there circumstantial evidence in the case? **51b.** If yes, what? | Q51: 1  Q51b: Examination of the victim’s mobile phone |
| 52. Was there any other evidence in the case? **52b.** If yes, what? | Q52: 1  Q52b: Medical reports from a Consultant forensic psychiatrist |
| 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? | 20 months imprisonment |
| 55. Was case originally tried in Crown court or magistrates’ court? | 1 |
| 56. Name of judge(s) in original trial | Judge Wall |
| 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? | 99 |
| 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? | 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? | 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? | 2  **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)? | 2  **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)? | 2  **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? | 99 |
| 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? | 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? | 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? | 2 |
| 104. For Digital evidence were there any concerns about data being missed during investigation? | 2 |
| 105. For Digital evidence, was any data hidden over the network? | 2 |
| 106. For Digital evidence was any data hidden inside storage areas to make them invisible to the system commands and programs? | 2 |
| 107. For Digital evidence, was any data corrupted? | 2 |
| 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? | 2 |
| **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 current case was one of two appeals which were heard together because they raised similar issue in principle. They were otherwise unrelated.  The appellant was serving a 20-month sentence for a sexual offence. As her grounds of appeal she lodges that her personal circumstances and mitigation (especially her illness) were such that her sentence should have been suspended. Ahead of deliberating on the current case the court of appeal visited the guidelines for sentencing and criminal justice act 2003, the mandatory rules which set procedures for early release on compassionate grounds (ERCG). Reference was made to article 3 of the European Convention of Human rights, the Prison service order 6000 and the circumstances in which the Secretary of State may intervene on releasing a prisoner on compassionate grounds. A pre-sentence report (? Furnished by a probation officer) made referred to the appellants medical condition, her physical capabilities and resultant healthcare needs. The author of the report, in their opinion, stated that the “appellant's physical deterioration had clearly led to an emotional and psychological deterioration”. Despite testimonial letters from the appellants family, the court noted that there was “no formal medical evidence before the court, and in particular no psychiatric or psychological report.” The judge noted that the appellant was of previous good character. Significantly at Para 31 the court noted that at that juncture there “still no medical evidence to support the suggestions made in the pre-sentence report. In granting an adjournment, this court directed that a psychiatrist be instructed to interview the appellant in prison and to prepare a report directed to the issue of whether her mental health condition is or may be causally connected to her commission of the offence and if so, how and to what extent.” A consultant forensic psychiatrist was subsequently commissioned by the defence. She outlined the appellants medical condition/s, symptoms and intensity. She also reported on the appellants restricted physical condition. Para 36. The expert was of the opinion that the appellant's physical conditions may have masked symptoms of a co-existing mental disorder, with the result that the severity of the mental disorder was not recognised and treated. The expert went on to state (para 37) that “the index offence is of a very serious nature and there is no direct relationship between [the appellant's] mental illness and offending. Nonetheless, the offence occurred at a time when [the appellant] was clinically depressed. Poor decision making is a core symptom of depression and in my opinion, reduced ability to exercise judgment may offer a partial explanation as to [the appellant's] actions.” The court judged on the basis of evidence presented, that there was no medical evidence showing a direct link between the appellant's mental health and her offending. Dr Whitworth's expert opinion goes no further than establishing a partial reduction in the appellant's ability to exercise judgment at the material time. The court therefore judged that the appellant case fell “well short of the exceptional circumstances which must be shown if the Bernard principles are to be relied upon” with respect to early release on compassionate grounds. |