



Year of Call: 1996

Jonathan defends, frequently as a leading junior, in cases of complexity, weight and public profile. He is committed to achieving the best possible outcome for those he defends and is meticulous in his preparation and oral advocacy in Court.

He has led in several white-collar fraud trials, representing business professionals, accountants, company directors and employees. Currently he is instructed in several paper-heavy long-running alleged tax evasion cases, as well as fake investment scheme cases.

He recently led in a high-profile murder trial (his client was charged with assisting two of the co-defendants), in which his client was acquitted. He was also instructed to represent a young vulnerable defendant charged with firearms offences, following the discovery of a quantity of 'bomb-making' ingredients, having had his premises searched under terrorism legislation.

Jonathan has also been instructed in many of the EncroChat cases (Operations Carter, Carina, Barcelona as well as others) involving kilos of class A drugs and firearms. He conducted many such cases alone but has also been led where the complexity and seriousness of the allegation required leading counsel.

Jonathan has also been instructed as junior counsel in a number of murder trials, throughout the South-East and at The Central Criminal Court. Particularly where the trial has involved an intense scrutiny of telephone data and evidence.

Before coming to the Bar, Jonathan obtained a Ph.D. in engineering.

BUSINESS CRIME

Jonathan defends regularly as a leading junior in complex fraud cases, such as income tax, VAT, Excise Duty and PAYE evasions, money laundering, fraud by misrepresentation/abuse of position and investment frauds. He acted recently in a multi-million pound boiler-room and money laundering fraud as leading junior. He also recently represented a Managing Director in a six-month trial alleging a multi-million-pound tax evasion fraud. He was then leading junior counsel representing the Managing Director of a company producing and fitting non-compliant exhaust systems which were supplied to customers who wanted to drive their vehicles in London's Low Emission Zone.

Because of his experience sitting as a Chair of various accountancy regulators' committees, he has developed a unique understanding of the best working practices of accountants and company directors. As a result, he frequently represents company directors and accountants facing serious criminal charges. In the last few years, he has represented 4 different company directors at trial, in various parts of the Country, securing acquittals for 3. Each fraud was complex, paper-heavy and high-value.



These cases are usually investigated and prosecuted by specialist fraud and e-commerce teams within the CPS, HMRC, VOSA, NCA, Post Office, National Fraud Squad and Trading Standards.

POCA AND SECTION 10A LITIGANTS

Jonathan almost invariably conducts the POCA proceedings that arise out of his own cases. He is also instructed to represent defendants who change representation and seek specialist confiscation solicitors and Counsel.

He has also been instructed in section 10A proceedings. He successfully resisted an attempt by a third party to institute 10A proceedings which would have deprived the defendant he represented of a significant proportion of the available assets.

FRAUD AND FINANCIAL CRIME

Jonathan specializes in complex fraud cases, including VAT, Excise Duty and PAYE evasion, fraud by misrepresentation/abuse of position, MTIC carousel frauds and investment frauds. He is currently instructed to represent a company director at the centre of an alleged Ponzi scheme, providing an 'investment product' which investors were led to believe was underpinned by an insurance guarantee.

He also represents a defendant facing charges as a result of a collapse of a multi-million credit union; the trial is listed in 2027.

He is regularly instructed as a leading junior. As such, he acted for a Managing Director in a six-month trial alleging a multi-million-pound tax evasion prosecuted by Trading Standards and HMRC. He was then leading junior counsel representing the Managing Director of a company producing and fitting non-compliant exhausting systems which were supplied to customers who wanted to drive their vehicles in London's Low Emission Zone.

Because of his experience as a Chair of Accountancy Regulators' committees (see his entry below relating to Regulatory and Professional Discipline), he has developed a unique understanding of the best working practices of accountants and company directors. As a result, he frequently represents company directors and accountants facing serious criminal charges. In the last 3 years he has represented 4 different company directors at trial, in various parts of the Country, securing acquittals for 3. Each fraud was complex, paper-heavy and high-value.

These cases are usually investigated and prosecuted by specialist fraud and e-commerce teams within the CPS, HMRC, VOSA, NCA, National Fraud Squad and Trading Standards and the Royal Mail.



SERIOUS AND ORGANISED CRIME

Over many years, Jonathan has represented defendants charged with the full gamut of criminal offences including homicide (murder, manslaughter, death by dangerous driving), Drugs, Sexual offences, Violence and Terrorism where there is serious and organized criminal activity.

Increasingly, allegations involve large volumes of digital evidence which require detailed analysis to best present the defendant's case. Since studying for his Ph.D, Jonathan is extremely familiar with searching, filtering and presenting digital media in a way that provides juries with assistance when understanding a defendant's case.

TERRORISM

He has recently represented defendants charged under the Terrorism Act.

One defendant was subject to hours of interviews following the discovery of was described as bomb-making chemicals and equipment at his home address. The case required a detailed understanding of the alternative (innocent) uses to which this material could be put.

Another defendant represented by Jonathan was an NHS surgeon charged with money laundering and terror-related fraud. The investigation was conducted by counter-terrorism officers (SO15) because of alleged links to a terrorist funding network. The defendant was one of only 3 to be acquitted of all charges.

He also acted for a young man who had been radicalized through internet based communication and literature and sought to persuade the Court that he should be given a suspended sentence.

HOMICIDE

Jonathan is regularly instructed in murder and manslaughter cases, as well as attempted murders and assisting offender cases. He regularly instructs experts, for example, pathologists, psychiatrists, telecoms experts, and similar.

Jonathan has been instructed in several complex murder cases, as led Junior counsel and has brought his energy and meticulous preparation at an early stage of the case in order to assist leading counsel.

Recently he was led in a murder for trial at the Central Criminal Court involving attribution, cell site, ANPR, expert evidence involving a revenge attack and conducted a lengthy cross-examination of the telecoms expert. His Ph.D. involved extensive use of Microsoft Excel,



leading to extensive skills in filtering, searching, and manipulating data, particularly telephone and banking records.

REGULATORY AND PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE

For 10 years, Jonathan was a chairman of the Disciplinary, Admissions and Appeal Committees of the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA). ACCA regulates the behaviour of qualified accountants and has a worldwide membership of over 300,000 trainee and qualified accountants.

In addition, for 4 years, Jonathan sat on the Appeal and Investigation Committees of the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA). CIMA has 240,000 members and student members worldwide.

Between 2016 and 2024, Jonathan was appointed as a chair of the disciplinary committee of Taxation Disciplinary Board. He was the chair of the Committee that determined, in 2019, the case of [David Hannah](#), a chartered Tax Adviser. He was been Chair on several of reported disciplinary decisions over the last 7 years.

In 2020 he was appointed to the Institute of Financial Accountants (IFA) as a legally-qualified chair of their disciplinary and investigation committees.

Jonathan has extensive experience from his sitting over the last 12 years of the rules and procedures of regulatory and disciplinary proceedings.

He has represented Solicitors before the SDT, most recently (in 2025) he represented a former [senior solicitor](#) at BNP Paribas before the SDT, who received a financial sanction for using nicknames for colleagues and sending inappropriate emails.

SEXUAL OFFENCES

Cases of this type will frequently involve extensive knowledge of the background of the defendant and the complainant(s). Cross-examinations are often far-reaching, demonstrating the factual background and context of the allegations, and why they were made. Jonathan is often instructed because he delves deeply into the allegation and assimilates the material presented to him by both the Crown and the Defendant. Also, where there is a requirement to comply with PACE procedures, Jonathan will examine whether breaches have occurred that could lead to exclusion of the evidence concerned.

In recent times Jonathan secured an acquittal for a young man with autism who was charged with several rape allegations and common assault. The defendant had confessed in interview, which was excluded at trial, following a section 76/78 PACE argument criticizing the custody sergeant's approach during the booking-in procedure.



He has conducted section 28 cross-examinations and has undertaken the vulnerable witness training. He has also advised about the instruction of intermediaries and conducted trials with vulnerable defendants.

MEMBERSHIPS AND PUBLICATIONS

He is a member of the Criminal Bar Association and the Fraud Lawyers Association. He assisted Robert Banks with Editions 2 and 3 of 'Banks on Sentence'. He has a Ph.D. from London University in engineering, acquired in 1996 called "Slurry Trench Wall Installation"

PRACTICE AREAS

BUSINESS CRIME

R vs JR – Southwark Crown Court – 2027 trial – Director alleged to have been involved in the collapse of a Credit Union.

R vs AB – Winchester Crown Court – 2025 – fraud of major energy provider by contractors, with 'kick-backs' and 'bribes for contracts' alleged, as well as a sophisticated money-laundering network of funds.

R vs RD – Southwark Crown Court – 2025 – trial involving a 'fake-invoice' scheme, leading to VAT repayments, running to several millions. Prosecuted by HMRC.

R vs DC – Southwark Crown Court – 2024/2025 – Director said to be at the heart of a Ponzi scheme selling ostensibly insured investments products.

R vs MO'R – Bradford Crown Court – Trial in 2023 – money laundering the proceedings of a confidence fraud.

R vs SK – Cardiff Crown Court – Trial in 2023 – Money laundering the proceedings of drug supply through BitCoin accounts

R vs MH – Southwark Crown Court – Trial in 2022 (3 months) – Money laundering and boiler room fraud, selling shares in a property portfolio company. Leading junior

R vs RB – Basildon Crown Court – Trial in 2022. Conspiracy to defraud customers who had purchased puppies, with a total value of £850,000. The puppies were sold as 'home-bred' whereas the Crown alleged that they were 'farm-bred'. After weeks of evidence, the prosecution offered a count of money laundering valued at £40,000.



R vs AB – Birmingham Crown Court – Trial in 2019 (2 months). The defendant was alleged to have been part of a serious and organized crime group evading alcohol excise duty by diverting lorry loads of Echo Falls and Hardys wine. The defendant was one of 2 to be acquitted. The other 5 defendants were convicted.

R vs BM – Basildon Crown Court – Trial in 2019 (2 months). The defendant was the director of a company producing and fitting pioneering exhausting systems. Leading Junior.

R vs POH – Wood Green Crown Court – Trial in 2019 (6 months). The defendant was the managing director a biofuel producing company. Over 50,000 pages of served evidence. Leading junior. The defendant's company was (on the one hand) entirely ethical and environmentally friendly as it produced biodiesel from recycled cooking oil. However, the defendant fell foul of the complicated excise duty taxation regulations and failed to declare enough tax for his supplies. With co-defendants, who had also failed to properly account for excise duty, this led to a 6-month trial. Although he was ultimately convicted, he received a suspended prison sentence, because of the exceptional circumstances of the case. The trial Judge described Mr Page's submissions as "polished, persuasive and highly professional".

R vs WM – Newcastle Crown Court – Trial in November 2018. The defendant was the director of a large heavy-engineering firm based in the North East. The case was cut-throat with a co-defendant who received an 8 ½ year sentence. WM was acquitted by order of the Judge at half-time following a successful submission of no case to answer.

R vs BH – Leicester Crown Court. A company director was charged with perverting the Course of Public Justice and fraud, following an investigation into his Umrah and Hajj travel agency. He was acquitted on the perverting charge and received a short (7 months') sentence for the fraud.

R vs AK – Central Criminal Court. The defendant as an NHS surgeon charged with money laundering and terror-related fraud. The investigation was conducted by counter-terrorism officers (SO15) because of alleged links to a terrorist funding network. The defendant was one of only 3 defendants to be acquitted of all charges.

R vs DY (Operation Perhaps) – Birmingham Crown Court – Trial in March 2016. The chartered accountant represented by Mr Page was charged with a conspiracy to fraudulently misrepresent the financial position of a spiritualist leader. He was the only defendant (of 11) to be acquitted. All other defendants received custodial sentences.

R vs TO (Operation Galion) – Liverpool Crown Court – Trial in September 2015. A telephone salesman alleged to have conspired to fraudulently sell advertising space in a non-existent magazine. This was a vast prosecution (VHCC) with 11 defendants, tried over 8 weeks. The Prosecution ultimately offered the defendant a deal, to plead to £2,500 of fraudulent behaviour (as opposed to over £1m). The defendant received a community order.



R vs KP (Operation Lift) – Birmingham Crown Court. A company director and accountant accused of being the record keeper in a massive money laundering conspiracy was acquitted following trial, notwithstanding the finding of key documents at his home address.

R vs AL (Operation Calluna) – Southwark Crown Court. A receptionist alleged to have purchased and supplied tobacco tax free using a Diplomatic privilege. Co-defendants included the deputy High Commissioner of The Gambia.

R vs AA (Operation Forbear) – Liverpool. Represented a company director in a multi-million MTIC carousel fraud conspiracy. Guilty pleas with full credit, coupled with significant time spent on bail with a tag, resulted in a short custodial sentence. VHCC.

R vs AV (Operation Ghast) – Southwark Crown Court. Represented a company director in a multi-million Carousel fraud conspiracy. PII was raised by the Crown as a result of disclosure requests made on behalf of this defendant. The Prosecution ultimately offered no evidence against this defendant. Others convicted.

R vs GP (Operation Dumpcart) – Manchester Crown Court. A freight-forwarder in an MTIC and diversion fraud. Successfully mitigated to receive a very low sentence for someone in his position.

R vs KB (Operation Euripus) – Southwark Crown Court. Represented an alleged exporter in one of the largest MTIC conspiracies ever prosecuted at that time. This defendant was the only defendant acquitted after trial.

R vs AS – Southwark Crown Court – Leading junior in a money laundering allegation against the wife of a serial fraudster. Following trial and conviction on only minor counts, the defendant was given a suspended prison sentence.

POCA AND SECTION 10A LITIGANTS

R vs MG 2024 – Kingston Crown Court – resisting an application by the Crown to re-open confiscation proceedings pursuant to section 22 of POCA 2002, which had been settled 10 years' earlier. The Crown sought to argue that the value of the available amount had increased substantially.

R vs SS Leicester Crown Court. Legal argument then settlement in 2023. The defendant was facing 'lifestyle' confiscation proceedings with a Benefit figure alleged to have been £4.8m. After contested legal argument, the Court ruled that it was not a 'lifestyle' case and the Benefit figure dropped to £430k. After further written submissions, a figure of £122k was agreed.

R vs AO Southwark Crown Court. Leading junior in confiscation proceedings following allegations of fraud and handling stolen goods. A £3.5m benefit figure sought from available assets was reduced to £700,000.



R vs BS Birmingham Crown Court. Successfully argued to have the Third Party litigation conducted in the County Court, as opposed to the Crown Court pursuant to section 10A POCA.

FRAUD AND FINANCIAL CRIME

R vs JR – Southwark Crown Court – 2027 trial – Director alleged to have been involved in the collapse of a Credit Union.

R vs AB – Winchester Crown Court – 2025 – fraud of major energy provider by contractors, with ‘kick-backs’ and ‘bribes for contracts’ alleged, as well as a sophisticated money-laundering network of funds.

R vs RD – Southwark Crown Court – 2025 – trial involving a ‘fake-invoice’ scheme, leading to VAT repayments, running to several millions. Prosecuted by HMRC.

R vs DC – Southwark Crown Court – 2024/2025 – Director said to be at the heart of a Ponzi scheme selling ostensibly insured investments products.

R vs MO’R – Bradford Crown Court – Trial in 2023 – money laundering the proceedings of a confidence fraud.

R vs SK – Cardiff Crown Court – Trial in 2023 – Money laundering the proceedings of drug supply through BitCoin accounts

R vs MH – Southwark Crown Court – Trial in 2022 (3 months) – Money laundering and boiler room fraud, selling shares in a property portfolio company. Leading junior

R vs RB – Basildon Crown Court – Trial in 2022. Conspiracy to defraud customers who had purchased puppies, with a total value of £850,000. The puppies were sold as ‘home-bred’ whereas the Crown alleged that they were ‘farm-bred’. After weeks of evidence, the prosecution offered a count of money laundering valued at £40,000.

R vs AB – Birmingham Crown Court – Trial in 2019 (2 months). The defendant was alleged to have been part of a serious and organized crime group evading alcohol excise duty by diverting lorry loads of Echo Falls and Hardys wine. The defendant was one of 2 to be acquitted. The other 5 defendants were convicted.

R vs BM – Basildon Crown Court – Trial in 2019 (2 months). The defendant is a director of a company producing and fitting pioneering exhausting systems. Leading Junior.

R vs POH – Wood Green Crown Court – Trial in 2019 (6 months). The defendant was the



managing director a biofuel producing company. Over 50,000 pages of served evidence. Leading junior. The defendant's company was (on the one hand) entirely ethical and environmentally friendly as it produced biodiesel from recycled cooking oil. However, the defendant fell foul of the complicated excise duty taxation regulations and failed to declare enough tax for his supplies. With co-defendants, who had also failed to properly account for excise duty, this led to a 6-month trial. Although he was ultimately convicted, he received a suspended prison sentence, because of the exceptional circumstances of the case. The trial Judge described Mr Page's submissions as "polished, persuasive and highly professional".

R vs WM – Newcastle Crown Court – Trial in November 2018. The defendant was the director of a large heavy-engineering firm based in the North East. The case was cut-throat with a co-defendant who received an 8 ½ year sentence. WM was acquitted by order of the Judge at half-time following a successful submission of no case to answer.

SERIOUS AND ORGANISED CRIME

HOMICIDE OFFENCES

R vs YT – Reading Crown Court. Trial 2023 (10 weeks). The defendant was charged with assisting 2 defendants, charged with murder. He had provided lifts and assistance to them shortly after a stabbing. The case was complicated, with volumes of digital evidence, including telematics from the defendant's car. The defendant was acquitted of all counts he faced. Leading junior.

R vs HR – Central Criminal Court (Old Bailey). Trial 2021 (11 weeks). This was a retribution stabbing arising from a number of revenge, tit-for-tat violent incidents. There was a wealth of digital evidence, CCTV footage, forensics and computer data against the 8 defendants on trial. There was extensive pathological and forensic evidence. Jonathan was instructed to analyse and then cross-examine the telecoms expert at trial.

R vs SM – Croydon Crown Court - Trial and re-trial. Murder. The defendant was accused of luring the deceased to her house so that he could be executed by her new boyfriend. The new boyfriend was convicted and sentenced to 30 years. The jury rejected the Crown's case against SM that she was a knowing participant in the killing and she was acquitted of murder and released from custody. Jonathan was instructed as a led junior.

R vs HM – Lewes Crown Court. Murder prepared for trial, involving a lie-in-wait robbery that went tragically wrong. There was extensive expert evidence concerning the question of whether the victim was tortured. Jonathan was instructed as a led junior.

R vs HL – Central Criminal Court – Jonathan represented a 15-year-old defendant (charged with murder), who "happy-slapped" a grandfather who had just left a mosque with his 7 year-



old granddaughter. The prosecution accepted a plea to manslaughter. Jonathan was instructed as a led junior.

R vs KS – Winchester Crown Court – A manslaughter within the Polish community in Southampton was alleged. The Prosecution was not, ultimately, able to prove causation and offered no evidence on this count. Jonathan was instructed as a led junior.

R vs KS – Central Criminal Court – Murder and ABH. Female defendant acquitted of all counts following trial. The allegation was the result of an argument over a football going into a neighbour's garden and the ensuing fight. Jonathan was instructed as a led junior.

R vs RC – Central Criminal Court – Murder. Blind Peruvian defendant acquitted of all charges, notwithstanding his admission that he had stabbed the victim at least 50 times with a pair of scissors. Jonathan was instructed as a led junior.

R vs KC – Central Criminal Court – Manslaughter, Rape x 3, Administering a noxious substance with intent to Rape. High profile case against a male nurse who was alleged to have administered Midazolam in order to rape his patients. He also administered the same drug to a friend, who subsequently died. Jonathan was instructed as a led junior.

ORGANISED CRIME AND DRUG OFFENCES

R vs CC – Manchester Crown Court – 2023 to 2025 - Encrochat evidence suggestive of extensive and serious class A and B drug supply (worth millions) in the North east. Linked to the Coggins' case in Liverpool.

R vs RP – Birmingham Crown Court – 2024 – money laundering from cigarette manufacture and distribution. Sophisticated tachograph evidence analysis employed.

R vs SK – Leicester Crown Court – 2023 – EncroChat evidence revealing alleged involvement in the supply of cocaine on a multi-kilo basis.

R vs SS – Blackfriars Crown Court – trials in 2017, 2018 and 2019. The defendant was accused of importing firearms into this Country from Poland on a massive scale. Disclosure arguments led to the first trial being aborted. The second trial led a re-trial, listed in late November 2019. This was an NCA investigation and received extensive publicity. Jonathan was instructed as leading junior.

R vs NM – Birmingham Crown Court. The defendant was already serving life for offences in Liverpool, but faced another indictment alleging that he had committed other similar offences in Birmingham. The Crown accepted his plea to a few substantive counts of burglary and robbery. He received a short additional sentence.



R vs JS – Cambridge Crown Court. The defendant was one of several travelers who were alleged to have carried out a number of burglaries and robberies of high-performance motor vehicles and parking meters. He pleaded early to receive maximum credit following a number of conferences at an early stage.

R vs PH – Liverpool Crown Court. Head of a drugs ring, responsible for organising the importation of 20 tonnes of class A drugs into the UK from Spain.

R vs OD – Harrow and St Albans Crown Courts. Conspiracy to burgle domestic properties for the car keys, enabling the theft of expensive top-end cars. The defendant was said to be at the centre of the case.

R vs JR – Chester Crown Court. Illegal money lending. The principal defendant was alleged to have loaned, without a licence, hundreds of thousands of pounds over a 3-year period.

TERRORISM

R vs XX – Aylesbury Crown Court. 2024. The defendant's premises were extensively searched whereby volumes of bomb-making equipment and paraphernalia was discovered, along with firearms. Searches conducted under Terrorism legislation.

R vs SA – Manchester Crown Court. The defendant pleaded guilty to accessing terrorist-related material via jihadi-sympathetic internet sites. Extensive reports were obtained about the extent to which he had been radicalized. The case received national attention. The defendant received a short custodial sentence in the circumstances of the considerable mitigation that was presented to the Court.

R vs AK – Central Criminal Court 2017. The defendant is an NHS surgeon who was charged with money laundering and terror-related fraud. The investigation was conducted by counter-terrorism officers (SO15) because of alleged links to a terrorist funding network. The defendant was one of only 3 to be acquitted of all charges.

SEXUAL OFFENCES

R vs AA – Leeds Crown Court. The defendant was charged with assault and rape. His defence was that his wife had made allegations to assist with her application to the Home Office for permanent leave to remain in the UK. An extensive knowledge of that application process was required to demonstrate that her applications had changed in order to fit with changes in the HO rules. The defendant was acquitted.

R vs CC – Croydon Crown Court – Jonathan secured an acquittal for a young man with a type of autism charged with several rape offences and harassment. The defendant had confessed in an interview; however, this was excluded at trial, following a successful section 76/78



LIBERTAS
CHAMBERS

Jonathan Page

jpage@libertaschambers.com

clerks@libertaschambers.com

PACE argument criticizing the custody sergeant's approach during the booking-in procedure.

R vs PW – Guildford Crown Court – defendant charged with historic sexual offences on his granddaughters. Acquitted after trial.

R vs SN – Winchester Crown Court – defendant charged with a range of recent and historic sexual offences spanning 20 years concerning a number of victims. The defendant had an extensive history of sexual offending on his record. Following his conviction, the Court was persuaded not to pass IPP, despite having the power to do so.

MILITARY LAW

Jonathan has conducted a number of Court Martials in recent years and will happily accept instructions in such cases. He has appeared at Colchester, Bulford and in Wiltshire.

APPEALS

Jonathan has appeared many times before the Court of Appeal in appeals against conviction and sentence.