



---

## Practice Profile

***William practices across all areas of criminal law. He has appeared in the Magistrates', Youth and Crown courts and in the Court of Appeal. He has a calm and approachable manner with his clients and presents robust and persuasive advocacy in the courtroom.***

William has particular experience dealing with youth clients and clients with mental illness. He has a comprehensive understanding of telephone and cell site evidence and is regularly instructed to deal with serious and complex matters.

Before coming to the Bar, William gained a range of specialist experience. He spent a year working for a boutique law firm in Malaysia, drafting submissions that were instrumental in achieving the exoneration of death row inmates charged with either murder or drug trafficking in the Malaysian Supreme Court. Prior to this, he spent 9 months in the USA investigating and preparing capital defence cases with Mississippi's Office of Capital Defense Counsel. William also spent a year practising civil law during his time as a County Court Advocate.

William's Privacy Policy can be downloaded [here](#).

---

## Areas of Practice

- General Crime
- Regulatory & Professional Discipline
- Road Traffic
- Public Access
- Prosecution
- Homicide
- Serious & Organised Crime
- Sexual Offences

---

## Memberships

- Criminal Bar Association
- South Eastern Circuit
- Young Legal Aid Lawyers
- Human Rights Lawyers Association
- The Honourable Society of the Inner Temple

---

## Appointments

- CPS Grade 2 Prosecutor
- Social Mobility Advocate of the Bar Council of England and Wales 2021

- 
- Treasurer of the Inner Temple Junior Bar Association

## Scholarships & Prizes

---

- 2021 Pegasus Scholarship (Washington, USA), Pegasus Trust
- 2019 Award for Excellence in Advocacy, Criminal Bar Association
- 2018 Ede and Ravenscroft Prize, Inner Temple
- 2016 Internship Award, Inner Temple
- 2016 Travel Award, Northumbria University
- 2015 Travel Award, Northumbria University
- 2015 Winner, Bar Mooting Competition, Northumbria University
- 2015 Exhibition Award, Inner Temple

## Publications

---

Malaysia's Test for Incompetence of Counsel, Outdated from its inception? [2019] 5 MLJ xviii

## News

---

### Criminal Appeals Seminar

22 April 2024

5KBW Criminal Appeals Unit is delighted to present the first in a series of seminars on appellate matters:

#### **The Criminal Appeal Office and Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) [CACD]**

A practical approach to CACD procedure: **Master Alix Beldam KC**, Registrar of Criminal Appeals

Fresh evidence as a ground of appeal (now and in the future): **Paul Taylor KC**, General Editor of Taylor on Criminal Appeals

**Wednesday 22nd May 2024 at 6pm**

#### **Inner Temple Lecture Theatre**

Master Beldam KC will discuss the work of the Criminal Appeal Office and the CACD, the procedural framework for launching and pursuing an appeal and the practical issues that often arise.

Paul Taylor KC will analyse the CACD's current approach to grounds of appeal based on fresh evidence. He will also consider potential changes in this area that may follow the recommendations of the Law Commission's Criminal Appeal Project (expected in 2025.)

Please click [here](#) to register your interest in attending this seminar.

## Recent Cases

---

### **R v AS [Bromley Youth Court] 2021**

#### Trial (Wounding with Intent)

William was instructed to represent a 15-year-old client in a three-day, two-handed Youth Court trial (Certificate for Counsel granted). The Crown sought to adduce the complainant's evidence as hearsay under section 116(2)(e) (the complaint had stated he was in fear but also did not want to be seen as a "grass") and the defendant's initial account to police (not taken under caution) under section 114(d). William successfully opposed both of these applications in oral and written submissions. At the close of the prosecution case (and after skeleton arguments from both sides), the Court determined that there was insufficient evidence for any reasonable court properly to convict and the case was dismissed. Instructed by Joseph Hill & Co.

#### **R v SR [Wood Green Crown Court] 2021**

##### Trial (being concerned in the supply of cocaine)

William was instructed to represent a client in a Crown Court trial. The Crown's case was that the client had been operating a prominent drugs phone over the course of four months. This burner phone had been seized from the police at an address where the defendant and three other persons were arrested (however only the defendant had been charged). The Crown sought to adduce thousands of pages of cell site evidence to attribute the phone to the client as opposed to the other three persons found at the address.

William was only instructed one working day before the trial (due to previous counsel being unable to deal with the case) and no cell site expert had been instructed (due to late service of cell site data and the client not authorising an application for an adjournment). Notwithstanding these constraints, William was able to successfully highlight the significant limitations of the cell site evidence and secure an acquittal for the client.

#### **R v DC [Huntingdon Crown Court] 2021**

##### Trial (Breach of Restraining Order x 3; Harassment (with fear of violence); Common Assault)

William was instructed to represent a client in two trials. In the first trial, during Williams's cross-examination, the complainant claimed to have a "record of pretty much no violence whatsoever" and that he was "not a violent person". After making an impromptu non-defendant bad character application, William was able to adduce the complainant's four cautions for common assault, whilst successfully preventing his client's bad character from also being adduced. The client was acquitted of four out of five charges and subsequently pleaded guilty to a "second strike" bladed article offence (the second trial), resulting in a six-month conditional charge for all convictions. Instructed by Geoff White Solicitors.

#### **R v KR [Maidstone Crown Court] 2021**

##### Dwelling burglary and dangerous driving

William was instructed to represent a client who had pleaded guilty to dwelling burglary and dangerous driving and not-guilty to two counts of attempted burglary. Following representations being made to the CPS, the Crown offered no evidence on the attempted burglary counts. Citing the case of *R v Jesseme* [2021] EWCA Crim 175, William successfully argued that the Crown Court's sentencing powers were limited to those of the Magistrates' Court and he was able to secure an eight-month suspended sentence for his client. Instructed by Thomas Boyd Whyte.

#### **R v JC [Chelmsford Youth Court] 2021**

##### Conspiracy to supply Class A drugs x 2

William was instructed to represent a youth client who was charged with conspiracy to supply Class A drugs. Following representations being made to the CPS' reviewing lawyer regarding the positive NRM referral and the

inherent weaknesses of the Crown's case, the Crown discontinued the charges. Instructed by Paul Martin & Co

### **R v TB [Highbury Youth Court] 2021**

Conspiracy to commit robbery

William was instructed to represent a youth client who was charged with conspiracy to commit robbery with two others. William drafted a Section 78 PACE argument seeking to exclude the entirety of Crown's cell-site evidence, which resulted in the Crown discontinuing the proceedings against his client. Instructed by Edwards Duthie Shamash.

### **R v Wayne [Court of Appeal] 2020**

Appeal against sentence - dwelling burglary, harassment, and criminal damage

William was granted permission to appeal against a sentence made by Portsmouth Crown Court. The appeal concerned the relevance of the factors indicating lesser harm in a case of a burglary where nothing was stolen and the intention was to cause criminal damage. The Court of Appeal also considered the cases of R v Manning and R v Jones in the wake of lockdown measures being lifted. Instructed by Geoff White Solicitors.

### **R v SE and FE [Highbury Magistrates Court] 2020**

Public Order 1986, Section 4A

William Sneddon represented a defendant, who was accused of making threats to the footballer Mesut Özil and his security staff. Following cross-examination of both complainants over two days, and William's 'half-time' submission of no case to answer, the Court dismissed the case against Mr Ekinici. Instructed by Joseph Hill & Co.