



William Sneddon

Call 2016

Practice Profile

William practices across all areas of criminal law and has a busy Crown Court practice, with a particular focus on cases involving violence, drug supply, firearms, and sexual misconduct. He has a calm and approachable manner with his clients and presents robust and persuasive advocacy in the courtroom.

William is regularly instructed to deal with serious and complex matters as both sole and junior counsel. He has recently been instructed as junior trial counsel in cases involving murder; conspiracy to defraud over £10 million; and supply of tens of kilograms of class A drugs. He also has significant experience representing youth clients and clients with mental illness.

William is known for his comprehensive trial preparation and attention to detail. He can confidently deal with documentary and expert evidence in respect of telephone and cell site data, DNA, and other forms of forensic evidence.

In addition to his trial work, William has obtained leave for appeals to both the Court of Appeal and the High Court. Most recently, he successfully applied to overturn his client's conviction after it was discovered that one of the jurors had been conducting their own independent research.

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 appellate submissions for the Malaysian Federal Court that were instrumental in achieving the exoneration of death row inmates charged with either murder or drug trafficking. Prior to this, he spent nine months in the USA investigating and preparing capital defence cases with Mississippi's Office of Capital Defense Counsel and 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 (2020 – 2022)
- President of the Inner Temple Junior Bar Association (2022 – 2024)
- Judicial reverse mentor

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

Rape, Attempted Rape & Sexual Assault Acquittal

28 May 2024

A man charged with three counts of rape; three counts of attempted rape; and three counts of sexual assault was unanimously acquitted on all counts within 27 minutes following a five-day trial at Croydon Crown Court.

William Sneddon acting on behalf of the client was instructed by Paul Martin & co

Conspiracy to Possess Firearms Acquittal

17 May 2024

Following a nine-week trial at Southampton Crown Court, a man charged with two counts of conspiracy to possess firearms along with six co-defendants, was acquitted of both charges.

Paul Walker and William Sneddon were instructed by Gammon Percy Gaiger.

Recent Cases

R v A [Southampton Crown Court] 2024

Large Scale Dealing of Drugs & Firearms Possession

The 9-week trial concerned large scale drug dealing and the possession of numerous firearms. Paul and Liam's client was said to be a "Leading Role" Class A drug dealer. Mr A accepted he was involved in the drugs trade, but categorically denied possession of the guns which were allegedly found at his "safe-house". Leading counsel for the crown described the prosecution case against Mr A as "comprehensive and compelling". After considering Paul's closing speech the jury disagreed. Mr A was acquitted on all the counts the jury had to determine.

Junior – Liam Sneddon

R v GH [Chelmsford Crown Court] 2024

Application to Dismiss

William successfully made an application to dismiss on behalf of his client, who was charged with allowing serious injury to her child. After analysing the Crown's medical evidence and the previous family proceedings, William successfully argued that there was insufficient evidence for a properly directed jury to convict. Instructed by Paul Martin & Co.

R v KS [Senior Courts Cost Office] 2023

Costs Appeal

William appealed against the decision of the Determining Officer at the Legal Aid Agency ("LAA") in respect of his claim for considering unused material under the Advocate's Graduated Fees Scheme ('AGFS'). Costs Judge Whelan agreed with William's submissions that "consideration of unused material" should be given a "relatively broad interpretation" as opposed to the LAA's restrictive interpretation, which sought to exclude time spent cross-referencing documents.

R v ML [Kingston Crown Court] 2023

Conspiracy to Defraud

William appeared as junior counsel for the defence in a 12-week trial in which his client was alleged to have fraudulently obtained over £10 million through an overseas investment scheme. The case involved a detailed understanding and comparison of a substantial volume of financial information, including bank records. Instructed by Brooklyn Law.

R v KS [Central Criminal Court] 2022

Murder of a Child

William appeared as junior counsel for a youth defendant, who was charged with murdering a child by stabbing. Citing the case of *Horne* [14th November 1991 (CA)], via both oral and written submissions, William successfully applied to exclude evidence of a Snapchat post that the Prosecution argued was tantamount to an admission. Instructed by Joseph Hill.

R v MD [Court of Appeal (Criminal Division)] 2022

Appeal Against Sentence

William represented the Crown in an appeal against sentence concerning a Sexual Harm Prevention Order. The appeal was only allowed in part and the Court of Appeal agreed with William's submissions that the prohibitions from entering public toilets and from sending photographs of genitalia were necessary and did not mimic the existing law. William's submissions were described as "ingenious" by the Court of Appeal. Instructed by the Crown Prosecution Service.

R v CS [Southwark Crown Court] 2022

ABH, Malicious Communications & Racially Aggravated Harassment with Violence

William represented the Crown in a domestic abuse case. The Defendant made a series of threats to the victim - his ex-partner - over a two-month period and attacked her with a knife, causing injury. The defendant was unanimously convicted of all five counts, assessed as dangerous, and sentenced to four years' imprisonment with licence extended to five years.

R v CW [Kingston Crown Court] 2022

Making Indecent Images

William represented a Defendant charged with four counts of Making Indecent Images. William successfully adduced from the Crown's expert the fact that there was no evidence that the "cache" indecent images that had been downloaded to his computer would have been visible to the Defendant. The jury unanimously acquitted(?) the Defendant. Instructed by Thomas Boyd Whyte.

R v BK [Southwark Crown Court] 2021

Conspiracy to Murder

William as appeared as junior counsel for a defendant charged with conspiracy to murder, in a case involving the assassination of a Swedish crime boss in London. William was instructed late and had to quickly get across the vast amount of material. Instructed by Sternberg Reed.

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 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 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.