**CODING SCHEME**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SAMPLE DESCRIPTION** | |
| 1. Case | James & Ors, R. v [2018] EWCA Crim 285 |
| 2. Date of appeal hearing | 080218 |
| 3. Date of original trial/conviction | 090916 |
| 4. Keywords found in case | 8 |
| 5. Decision *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | 1 |
| 6. Number of pages | 17 |
| **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)? | 2 |
| 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) | 1 |
| 18. What are the grounds/reason(s) for appeal? *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | (i) The summing up omitted to include relevant issues of law, contained errors of law and was unfair such as to render the conviction unsafe. Ground (i) divides into three separate issues: (a) The Recorder failed to give a full circumstantial evidence direction; (b) The Recorder wrongly gave an adverse inference direction under s.34 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 when the applicant had provided a prepared statement which made it improper for such a direction to have been given; (c) The Recorder wrongly failed to correct a factual inaccuracy in her summary of the applicant's evidence and dealt with it in such a way as to leave open that his attempted rectification of it was wrong / misleading, thereby diminishing his standing before the jury. (ii) The jury panel was tainted by including a juror who had had contact with one of the officers involved in the search (Oliver-Jacques) whose evidence was disputed and was exacerbated by his being the disclosure officer and officer in the case. (iii) The disclosure process which took place was deficient / incomplete such as to render the trial unfair. (iv) A material witness, Michael Sinclair, about whose evidence there was a dispute, was wrongly allowed to be treated as hostile, and the procedure for treating him as such was carried out wrongly. |
| 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? | 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? | 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: 2  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? | 1 |
| 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? | 1 |
| 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: R v Gray and Others [2014] EWCA Crim 2372; R v Singh [2017] EWCA Crim 466; R v McCook [2014 EWCA Crim 734]; R v Pinfold (1988) 87 Cr.App.R 15; R v Grantham (1969) 53 Cr. App. R 369; R v Yasain [2015] EWCA Crim 1277; Hughes [2009] EWCA Crim 841; R v Thorsby [2015] EWCA Crim 1; R v Wilson [2016] EWCA Crim 65; R v Roberts & Others [2016] EWCA Crim 71; Hamilton v R [2012] UKPC 21, [2013] 1 Cr App R 13; R v Thorsby [2015] 1 Cr App R (S) 63; Williams [2010] EWCA Crim 3289; R v Jogee; Ruddock v The Queen [2016] UKSC 8, [2016] UKPC 7; R v Johnson & Others [2016] EWCA Crim 1613; Ordu [2017] EWCA Crim 4; Cox & Thomas [1999] 2 CAR 6; R v Kirk [2015] EWCA Crim 1764; Kelly [2015] EWCA Crim 817; Knight [2004] 1 CrAppR 9; R v Williams (John) 8 Cr.App.R. 133; Thompson 64 Cr.App.R. 96 |
| 43. Name of appeal judge(s) | Lady Justice Hallett, Mr Justice Sweeney and Ms Justice Russell |
| 44. Name of lawyer(s) in appeal hearing, including who they represent | D George (instructed by Direct Access) for the Appellant. J Polnay (instructed by CPS) and Mr. Underhill for the Respondent |
| **ORIGINAL CASE/TRIAL CHARACTERISTICS (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| 45. Date of crime (first date) | 250815 |
| 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? | 1 |
| 50. What offence(s) was defendant convicted of/plead guilty to? | Two counts of being in possession of Class A drugs with intent to supply |
| 51. Was there circumstantial evidence in the case? **51b.** If yes, what? | Q51: 1  Q51b: Class A drugs recovered from a room where the appellants was seen to be emerging from; multiple bags containing different quantities and types of drugs; a glass bowl containing powdered crack cocaine in the process of being manufactured; 2 sets of digital scales; 4 rolls of cling film; a large sum of cash; mobile phones. The Applicant's fingerprints were on a blue plastic bag and his DNA was on a piece of cling film which contained four drug wraps; multiple documents relating to the Applicant and his family were found in one of the rooms searched; the keys to the property were found on the appellant. |
| 52. Was there any other evidence in the case? **52b.** If yes, what? | Q52: 1  Q52b: Police officer witness statement |
| 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? | 7 years imprisonment |
| 55. Was case originally tried in Crown court or magistrates’ court? | 1 |
| 56. Name of judge(s) in original trial | Ms Recorder Laney |
| 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? | 1  **Annotations:** |
| 59. For DNA evidence, was concern expressed at original trial or about where the DNA came from? **59b.** If yes, where? | Q59. 2  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? | 2 |
| 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? | 2 |
| 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? | 2  **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? | 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? | 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? | 1  **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? | 2 |
| 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. 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? | 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? | 2 |
| 98. Was any bad character evidence presented at trial? | 2 |
| 99. Did prosecution team fail to share relevant information with defence team before original trial? | 2 |
| **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.** | The application to appeal is based on ‘fresh’ lawyers, who did not represent the applicant at trial, lodging new Grounds of Appeal after refusal of the written application for leave to appeal by the single Judge. The court of appeal acknowledged that on occasions legitimate grounds have been identified by fresh lawyers that trial lawyers have missed and miscarriages of justice have been avoided. The original grounds of appeal (Para 45) in this case were: (i) and (ii) The judge made errors in summing up the evidence which were misleading and confusing. (iii) A juror indicated that she had had previous dealings with the Officer in the case, and the Officer could have influenced the verdicts. (iv) A prosecution witness and prosecution counsel referred to the first trial (in which the jury had been unable to reach a verdict) although the judge had indicated that there should be no reference to that trial. The witness' comment 'compounded' his bias. (v) Criticisms of the applicant's trial counsel. (vi) The DNA evidence should not have been admitted. (vii) The fingerprint evidence should not have been admitted. (viii) The prosecution relied upon unsigned statements. (ix) There was no proof of the warrant. (x) The Police Crime Scene Notes did not accord with the police officers' witness statements. (xi) There were issues with the schedule of non-sensitive unused material. (xii) The prosecution relied, in the re-trial, upon the evidence of Clinton Sinclair, who was not a credible witness. |