**CODING SCHEME**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SAMPLE DESCRIPTION** | |
| 1. Case | Abdurahman v R [2019] EWCA Crim 2239 |
| 2. Date of appeal hearing | 051219 |
| 3. Date of original trial/conviction | 040208 |
| 4. Keywords found in case | 1 |
| 5. Decision *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | 1 |
| 6. Number of pages | 37 |
| **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)? | 99 |
| 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* | The appellant’s first witness statement should not have been admitted and his second Statement had contradicted the First. That there was no evidence to contradict the case advanced in his Second Statement, and at trial, that the appellant did not believe a convicted terrorist was one of the bombers until he was stopped by the police. That the appellant had 'provided the police with the framework around which they subsequently built a case'. That the first Statement had been taken tainted as well as other evidence to which police had been led by its contents. |
| 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? | 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: 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? | Q33: 2  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: 2  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: 2  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: 2  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: 2  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: 2  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: Gäfgen v German [GC] [(2011) 52 EHRR 1](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/eu/cases/ECHR/2010/759.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); Salduz v United Kingdom [GC] [(2009) 49 EHRR 19](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/eu/cases/ECHR/2008/1542.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); Jalloh v Germany [GC] [(2007) 44 EHRR 32](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/eu/cases/ECHR/2006/721.html); R v Abu Hamza [[2007] 1 Cr App R 27](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/ew/cases/EWCA/Crim/2006/2918.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); Ibrahim and others v United Kingdom, [[2014] ECHR 1392](https://www.bailii.org/eu/cases/ECHR/2014/1392.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); R v Sherif and others [[2008] EWCA Crim 2653](https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Crim/2008/2653.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); R v Togher [[2001] 1 Cr App R 33](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/ew/cases/EWCA/Crim/2000/111.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); R (Anderson) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [[2003] 1 AC 837](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKHL/2002/46.html); R (Dowsett) v Criminal Cases Review Commission [[2007] EWHC 1923 (Admin)](https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2007/1923.html); R v Horncastle [[2010] 2 AC 373](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKSC/2009/14.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); R v Dundon [[2004] EWCA Crim 621](https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Crim/2004/621.html); R v Cadder [[2010] 1 WLR 2601](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKSC/2010/43.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); R v Walsh (1990) 91 Cr Ap R 161; Schatschaschwili v Germany [GC] (2016) 63 EHRR 14; Sher v United Kingdom (2016) 63 EHRR 24; Panovits v Cyprus, App. No. 4268/04; Zaichenko v Russia, App. No. 39660/02; Bandaletov v Ukraine, App. No. 23180/06; Cimen v Turkey, App No. 19582/02; Schmidt-Laffer v Switzerland (App. No. 41269/08); R v Dundon [[2004] EWCA Crim 621](https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Crim/2004/621.html); R (Alconbury Developments Ltd) v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions [[2003] 2 AC 295](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKHL/2001/23.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); R v McGovern (1991) 92 Cr App R 228; R (Ullah) v Special Adjudicator [[2004] 2 AC 323](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKHL/2004/26.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); Cadder v HM Advocate [[2010] 1 WLR 2601](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKSC/2010/43.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); Manchester City Council v Pinnock [[2011] 2 AC 104](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKSC/2011/6.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); Doherty v Birmingham City Council [[2009] AC 367](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKHL/2008/57.html); R (Chester) v Secretary of State for Justice [[2014] AC 271](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKSC/2013/63.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); R (Kaiyam) v Secretary of State for Justice [[2015] AC 1344](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKSC/2014/66.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); R (Hallam) v Secretary of State for Justice [[2019] 2 WLR 440](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKSC/2019/2.html" \o "Link to BAILII version); Lambert [[2002] 2 AC 545](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKHL/2001/37.html); Mills [[2002] 3 WLR1597](https://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/2002/D2.html);  Ashton & Webber [2002] EWCA 2782; HM Advocate v P [[2011] 1 WLR 2497](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?path=/uk/cases/UKSC/2011/44.html); R v Dundon [[2004] EWCA Crim 621](https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Crim/2004/621.html) |
| 43. Name of appeal judge(s) | Judge Garnham and Judge Chamberlain |
| 44. Name of lawyer(s) in appeal hearing, including who they represent | John King (instructed by Carters Solicitors) for the Appellant Louis Mably QC (instructed by Crown Prosecution Service) for the Respondent |
| **ORIGINAL CASE/TRIAL CHARACTERISTICS (code as 99 if not stated and cannot be inferred)** | |
| 45. Date of crime (first date) | 250705 |
| 46. Was defendant immediately treated as a suspect? **46b.** If no, then how was defendant immediately treated? | Q46: 1  Q46b: Initially questioned by police as a witness. The officers subsequently, after consultation with a senior officer, caused him |
| 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? | 2 |
| 50. What offence(s) was defendant convicted of/plead guilty to? | Assisting an offender with intent to impede his apprehension or prosecution and of four counts of failing to give information about acts of terrorism |
| 51. Was there circumstantial evidence in the case? **51b.** If yes, what? | Q51: 1  Q51b: CCTV footage; cell site analysis; telephone contact; Footage from police surveillance camera; A newspaper report; telephone records |
| 52. Was there any other evidence in the case? **52b.** If yes, what? | Q52: 1  Q52b: Three fingerprints; oral testimony; Appellants first and second statement, police interviews along with evidence from questioning officers |
| 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? | 10 years imprisonment appeal against conviction but later reduced to 8 years' imprisonment subsequent to appeal |
| 55. Was case originally tried in Crown court or magistrates’ court? | 1 |
| 56. Name of judge(s) in original trial | Judge Worsley at Trial; Judge Latham, Judge Openshaw and Judge Burnett at the first appeal court hearing |
| 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? | 3 |
| 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? | 2 |
| 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? | 2  **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. 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:** |
| 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? | 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:** It was submitted that appellants fingerprints were found. However, it not reported whether an fingerprint experts provided testimony before the courts on this |
| 85. Was defence Fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert witness cross-examined by prosecution at original trial? | 99  **Annotations:** It was submitted that appellants fingerprints were found. However, it not reported whether an fingerprint experts provided testimony before the courts on this |
| 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? | 2  **Annotations:** |
| 90. Did Fingerprint/DNA/Digital expert express his/her confidence in conclusion at original trial? **90b.** If yes, how? | Q90. 99  Q90b. It was submitted that appellants fingerprints were found. However, it not reported whether an fingerprint experts provided testimony before the courts on this |
| 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? | 99  **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/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? | 2 |
| 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 they? | Q116. 99  Q116b. 99 |
| **NOTES – PLEASE WRITE ANYTHING THAT YOU THINK IS IMPORTANT BUT WHICH IS NOT CODED ABOVE. THIS MAY INCLUDE QUOTES.** | This case was previously presented to the court of appeal. The appeal against conviction being orginally dismissed but the appellants sentence was decreased from 10-years imprisonment to 8 years.  The Criminal Cases Review Commission subsequently decided to refer this conviction back to the court of Appeal because it consider there to be a real possibility that the conviction would not be upheld in the light of 'new evidence', namely the conclusions of the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights ("ECtHR") which found that the appellant’s Article 6 rights were breached by the way in which he was dealt with by the police when interviewed as a witness. |