**CODING SCHEME**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SAMPLE DESCRIPTION** | |
| 1. Case | Sargeant, R. v [2019] EWCA Crim 1088 |
| 2. Date of appeal hearing | 200619 |
| 3. Date of original trial/conviction | 051018 |
| 4. Keywords found in case | 7 |
| 5. Decision *Provide quote if short, otherwise summarise* | 1 |
| 6. Number of pages | 15 |
| **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)? | 24 |
| 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* | 1. The judge erred in failing to withdraw the charge of murder at the close of the prosecution case. 2. The judge erred in refusing to admit the evidence contained in a joint statement of two experts proffering psychiatric evidence. 3. The judge erred in not giving a propensity direction in relation to the established character of the deceased (victim), as relevant to the issue of the precise circumstances of the killing. 4. The judge erred in failing to give a complete and full direction on loss of control, misapplying the ratio of R v Rejmanski [2017] EWCA Crim 2061. 5. The judge erred in failing to give appropriate safety warnings in his direction on diminished responsibility. |
| 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: 1  Q36b: Counsel for defence |
| 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: 1  Q38b: Counsel for defence |
| 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: 2  Q41b: 99 |
| 42. Did appeal court refer to any existing case law? **42b.** If yes, which? | Q42a: 1  Q42b: R v Rejmanski [2017] EWCA Crim 2061; R v Brennan [2014] EWCA Crim 2387 ; R v Golds [2016] UKSC 61) ; R v Blackman [2017] EWCA Crim 190 ; R v Khan (Dawood) [[2009] EWCA Crim 1569](https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Crim/2009/1569.html) ; R v Hussain [2019] EWCA Crim 666. |
| 43. Name of appeal judge(s) | Judge Hamblen, Judge Lewis and Judge Picton |
| 44. Name of lawyer(s) in appeal hearing, including who they represent | Mr C Miskin appeared on behalf of the Appellant and Mr M Heywood and Mr R Price 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) | 160318 |
| 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: 99 |
| 49. Was this the first trial? | 1 |
| 50. What offence(s) was defendant convicted of/plead guilty to? | Murder |
| 51. Was there circumstantial evidence in the case? **51b.** If yes, what? | Q51: 1  Q51b: Appellant’s 999 call ; body cam footage |
| 52. Was there any other evidence in the case? **52b.** If yes, what? | Q52: 1  Q52b: witness testimony from two individuals; paramedic testimony, Psychiatric evidence, testimony from two people officers, testimony from a nurse, appellants police interview 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? | Life imprisonment 13 years |
| 55. Was case originally tried in Crown court or magistrates’ court? | 1 |
| 56. Name of judge(s) in original trial | Judge Chambers |
| 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? | 2 |
| 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? | 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? | 99 |
| **ANALYSIS** |  |
| 68. How much experience did the prosecution forensic examiner have? | There were a number of experts with the “Dr” involved. However, the judgement did not specify their professions, experience nor the counsel they represented |
| 69. How much experience did the defence examiner have? | Professor and psychiatrist |
| 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? | 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? | 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? | 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)? | 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:** |
| 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? | 2  **Annotations:** The courts discussed the deceased (victim) and the appellants temperament and mental health issues |
| 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. 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 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 concerned whether the appellant was suffering from a substantial impairment in her mental health / functioning (i.e. disordered thinking and mind as well as loss of control). This would give rise to a defence of diminished responsibility. The expert for defence argued she was suffering from an adjustment disorder with features of a personality disorder and autistic spectrum disorder. Counsel for defence contended the appellant had a loss of control at the material time whilst crown advanced the appellant had a loss in temper and there was an element of pre-planning in her behaviour. In relation to the safety warnings the judge, in summing up, gave directions: "*Can I just warn you to be cautious in relation to that matter, in this sense: that the brutality of the attack may assist you on the issue of intent. Equally, it may be a reflection of her mental disorder. That is something that you are going to have to assess*." In relation to suggested safety warning (2), this did not arise on the facts since the prosecution did not contend that this was a case involving pre-planning. In relation to suggested safety warnings (3) and (4), the judge gave the jury clear and appropriate guidance as to their approach to the expert evidence. He said: *"It is for you to evaluate and assess this evidence. It is for you to decide whether it assists you or not. If, after having given the matter careful consideration, you do not accept the evidence of the expert, in theory you do not have to act upon it. This is trial by jury, not trial by expert. While you may accept or reject expert opinion evidence you must not substitute your own opinions for those of the expert. However, in the present case the primary findings of the experts are not in dispute, so you would have to think long and hard before rejecting them."* |