**CODING SCHEME**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SAMPLE DESCRIPTION** | |
| 1. Case | Fender, R v [2018] EWCA Crim 2829 |
| 2. Date of appeal hearing | 251018 |
| 3. Date of original trial/conviction | 120917 |
| 4. Keywords found in case | 5 |
| 5. Decision *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | 1 |
| 6. Number of pages | 9 |
| **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)? | 5 |
| 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)? | 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* | Ground 1, that the judge erred in his conclusion that the appellant had given a false impression. As such, counsel for defence contends that the bad character evidence was wrongly admitted before the jury - if the admission of the evidence was wrongful then the conviction was necessarily unsafe despite these directions. The Crown's rebuttal evidence created, she argued, overwhelming prejudice to the appellant. The amount of the bad character material and its nature could not be cured by any direction. If a false impression had been created by the appellant's evidence, the admission of the bad character material went too far to correct that impression.  Ground 2, the evidence submitted by a police officer on gang affiliation did not meet the test for admission as expert evidence and should have been excluded |
| 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? | Q33: 99  Q33b: 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? | Q34: 99  Q34b: 99 |
| 35. Did appeal court raise concerns about judge at original trial misunderstanding fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence? **35b.** If yes, Who raised it? | Q35: 99  Q35b: 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? | Q36: 99  Q36b: 99 |
| 37. Did appeal court raise concerns about errors in judge’s summing up of case at original trial? **37b.** If yes, who raised it? | Q37: 1  Q37b: Counsel for defence |
| 38. Did appeal court raise concerns about judge’s instructions confusing jury at original trial? **38b.** If yes, who raised it? | Q38: 2  Q38b: 99 |
| 39. Did appeal court raise concerns about how fingerprint/DNA/Digital evidence was presented at original trial? 39b. If yes, who raised it? | Q39: 99  Q39b: 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? | Q40: 99  Q40b: 99 |
| 41. Did appeal court raise concerns about inadmissible evidence being presented at original trial? **41b.** If yes, who raised it? | Q41: 1  Q41b: Counsel for defence |
| 42. Did appeal court refer to any existing case law? **42b.** If yes, which? | Q42a: 1  Q42b: R v D and others [2012] 1 CrAppR 8 ; R v Myers [2015] UKPC 40 |
| 43. Name of appeal judge(s) | Judge Green, Judge Nicol and Judge Deborah Taylor |
| 44. Name of lawyer(s) in appeal hearing, including who they represent | Miss A Power appeared on behalf of the Appellant and Mr J Dawes 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) | 210516 |
| 46. Was defendant immediately treated as a suspect? **46b.** If no, then how was defendant immediately treated? | Q46: 2  Q46b: The appellant was arrested ten months later |
| 47. Were there other suspects (arrests)? | 1 |
| 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? | two counts of conspiracy to sell or transfer prohibited weapons and conspiracy to possess ammunition |
| 51. Was there circumstantial evidence in the case? **51b.** If yes, what? | Q51: 1  Q51b: (1) All the firearms seized were prohibited weapons and the ammunition was controlled ammunition (2) none of the occupants of the flat had the requisite certificates entitling them to possess either the firearms or the ammunition. (3) it was an agreed fact that there was an agreement to sell or transfer firearms and ammunition and that the three defendants were parties to the agreement. (4) CCTV existed to identify those present in the flat at the relevant time. (5) inculpatory cell phone evidence recorded the exchanges between the participants (6) inculpatory CCTV footage existed of individuals arriving and departing from the crime scene. (7) there was the evidence from an officer in the case, who gave evidence about each of the alleged conspirators. (8) there was agreed telephone schedules detailing the telephones and telephone numbers attributed to the individuals concerned in the alleged conspiracy and contacts between them (9) inculpatory agreed cell site information showed the movements and meetings of individuals concerned in the conspiracy. (10) incriminating cell site evidence showed the appellant's physical movements on the night in question. (11) an agreed telephone schedule of all activity on the appellant's two phones (12) bad character evidence relating to the appellant in the form of four images from the appellant's phone (13) there was the evidence of non-defendant's bad character for the co-defendants. |
| 52. Was there any other evidence in the case? **52b.** If yes, what? | Q52: 1  Q52b: Expert evidence from a police officer |
| 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? | Add text |
| 55. Was case originally tried in Crown court or magistrates’ court? | 1 |
| 56. Name of judge(s) in original trial | 99 |
| 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? | 99 |
| 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? | 99 |
| **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? | 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? | 99  **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:** Although there was cell site evidence there is no reports as to whether this was destroyed before the trial |
| 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:** Although cell site evidence was available there are no reports on who presented it at the original trial |
| 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:** No reports on who, or the credentials of the individual, provided the cell site evidence |
| 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 |
| 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? | 99 |
| 88. Was concern expressed at original trial or appeal about quality of defence expert reports? | 99 |
| 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 |
| 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? | 1  **Annotations:** This was central to the ground of appeal for this case. Counsel for defence contended that the judge erred in his conclusion that the appellant had given a false impression. As such, counsel for defence contends that the bad character evidence was wrongly admitted before the jury - if the admission of the evidence was wrongful then the conviction was necessarily unsafe despite these directions. The Crown's rebuttal evidence created, she argued, overwhelming prejudice to the appellant. The amount of the bad character material and its nature could not be cured by any direction. If a false impression had been created by the appellant's evidence, the admission of the bad character material went too far to correct that impression. |
| 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/Digital 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? 102b If yes, what? Provide a quote if short, otherwise summarise | Q102. 2  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? | 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. 4 |
| 116. Where the case involved co-defendant/s, was there a mixed verdict? 116b. If Yes, what were they? | Q116. 99  Q116b. 99 |
| **NOTES – PLEASE WRITE ANYTHING THAT YOU THINK IS IMPORTANT BUT WHICH IS NOT CODED ABOVE. THIS MAY INCLUDE QUOTES.** | With respect to the second ground of appeal advanced by defence, that the evidence submitted by a police officer on gang affiliation did not meet the test for admission as expert evidence and should have been excluded, making reference to R v Myers [[2015] UKPC 40](https://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/2015/40.html" \o "Link to BAILII version) the court judged the evidence submitted by defence was admissible on the basis of: (1) experience: there was a report including a statement that PC had previously worked on the Gangs and Firearms Unit in Newham and that he was employed in the Trident and Area Command. (2) the officer’s actions – reports that he had viewed the images on the appellant's phone. He compared those images to individuals on the Police Aware System and he also had access to the Newham Gangs Matrix and to the Custody Imaging Portal to perform facial recognition of the images. (3) the basis of the officers conclusions on each image - He sets out the image of the phone and the image on the police system so that a comparison could be made and he set out his conclusion on each image, giving details of the individual concerned including dates of birth, police national computer reference and gang affiliation where relevant. He then gave, at least for some individuals, details of their actual gang activity and previous convictions.  Of Myers case law, the courts said: The issue arising in Myers concerns the admissibility of expert evidence when that is put in issue by a party. In the present case, the Crown did not apply to the judge to reopen the prosecution case to permit them to call [the PC]. Instead, the Crown used the information in parts of the report as a basis for cross-examining the appellant on his claim that he did not have connections with gangs. The nub of the complaint therefore is not truly about the admissibility of expert evidence; it is much more about the use to which the contents of such a report can subsequently be put. |