



LIBERTAS
CHAMBERS

Roxanne Morrell

rmorrell@libertaschambers.com

clerks@libertaschambers.com

Year of Call: 1996

Ranked for 11 years in Band 4 and Band 5 Crime – Chambers and Partners

2025 - *"Roxanne is absolutely excellent."* – Chambers and Partners

2024 – *"Hard-working, professional and no nonsense in her approach."* - Chambers and Partners

2024 – *"She's an excellent cross examiner."* - Chambers and Partners

2023 – *"Extremely conscientious and meticulously professional."* - Chambers and Partners

2022 - *"Her cross-examination of witnesses is superb."* - Chambers and Partners

2020 – *"She instils incredible confidence in clients."* - Legal 500.

2019 – *"A pleasure to work with- straight to the point and tactically brilliant."* - Chambers and Partners

Roxanne is recognised as an outstanding defence only advocate with a strong courtroom presence. She has a reputation for being legally and tactically astute and highly capable with all types of evidence. She has a particular expertise in the cross-examination of experts ranging from DNA, EncroChat, Cell site and Forensic Accountants.

She has consistently defended in the whole spectrum of a) high-value complex fraud cases ranging from investment fraud, carousel fraud, VAT and Tax frauds, boiler room frauds, timeshare frauds and trademark frauds and b) Serious and Organised Crime offences, including HMRC/UKBA prosecution of multi-handed, multi pound conspiracies involving importation of cigarettes and drugs by air and sea; SOCA, CPS and NCA prosecutions for conspiracy to import and supply Class A drugs, conspiracies to supply firearms, murders, attempted murder of a police officer, gang-related murders and cases involving defendants with complex mental health issues.

PRACTICE AREAS

FRAUD AND FINANCIAL CRIME

R v D (2025) Southwark Crown Court: (Current) Operation Baler. I represent the principal defendant and senior director of an umbrella of award winning film companies. There are 9 further defendants and 2 follow on trials. This case concerns an alleged criminal scheme by which, as a director, the defendant is alleged to have cheated the revenue out of over £14m in value added tax. The investigation which uncovered this scheme also identified a vast



LIBERTAS
CHAMBERS

Roxanne Morrell

rmorrell@libertaschambers.com

clerks@libertaschambers.com

network of fictitious companies. This network is alleged to have provided a service by which false invoices were raised and the money used to pay them was recycled both through bank accounts managed by the network and by third parties who lent their services to the scheme, enabling the money to be returned to the film production company, minus a fee. The effect was to launder the proceeds of the crime on a massive scale. The defendant is further charged with linked Vat offences in relation to two further companies of which he is a director and shareholder. These companies are alleged to have submitted false invoices linked to the same network of fictitious companies. First 2 months are being taken up by disclosure issues and legal arguments led on behalf of the principal defendant.

R v S: Southwark Crown Court (12 months 2023-2024): Operation Destin was prosecuted by the Special fraud division and concerned an investigation into fraudulent sales of a timeshare extraction investment product. All victims were timeshare owners, typically elderly and vulnerable between 55-80 years old that had been targeted through direct advertisement or cold calling using a 'bait and switch' tactic. There were around 5000 victims in Operation Destin with a total loss calculated to be in the region of £40 million. The period of sales was from late 2012 until 31st January 2017. Not one of the 5000 'clients' received an investment return as promised.

R v A: Southwark Crown Court (Listed for trial 2023/24): Sole Counsel: Conspiracy offences to commit fraud and money laundering and which occurred between December 2016 and January 2018. This case concerns large scale banking fraud and the laundering of the proceeds of that fraud. Stolen banking credentials were obtained in different ways a) Some were purchased from a number of "carding" websites and these stolen credit card credentials were then used in a to make fraudulent transactions and purchases and to access bank accounts and withdraw cash, b) Bank cards were obtained direct from account holders, under the guise of banking officials contacting them and alleging fraud on their cards and these were then used to withdraw cash and c) the compromised credit card details obtained by this group were used in relation to the fraudulent use of point-of-sale terminals, commonly known "Chip and PIN" machines [or card machines]. Worldpay (UK) Ltd provide payment card processing facilities to retailers and businesses. Bogus businesses were created that applied to Worldpay for terminals, supposedly to process their sales. Stolen credit card details were used process payments that would be credited to a bank account nominated by the fraudsters.

R v L (2022) Kingston Crown Court: Operation Hodack was a 3 defendant case. The defendant was a retired solicitor, who at the time of the offence of which he was accused was a consultant at a law firm and conducted the conveyancing in respect of a property. The prosecution alleged that the defendant knew or suspected or had reason to suspect that the property was purchased with the proceeds of crime and failed to disclose this to the firm's nominated officer and by failing to do so committed an offence contrary to section 330 Proceeds of Crime Act.



R v C: Maidstone Crown Court (2022) Sole Counsel. Re-trial- following trial in 2019 (stopped part heard in relation to disclosure issues). Allegation of theft and associated money laundering conspiracies involving money alleged to have been stolen from a company whose main business at the relevant time was to process sub-contractor payments for companies in the building trade.

R v A: Snaresbrook Crown Court (2022). Sole Counsel: This case is about the transferring between people a substantial quantum of money from the proceeds of crime, and/or the concealment of the proceeds of crime and/or the converting of the proceeds into outwardly legitimate funds or property.

R v S: Southwark Crown Court. 2022. Led Counsel: This case is about the non-payment to Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC) of Pay As You Earn (PAYE) Income Tax and National Insurance Contributions (NIC) deducted from wages of all employees of a hotel between 6 April 2011 and 5 April 2015.

R v Kanapathippilai: Croydon Crown Court (2020). Sole Counsel. This was a conspiracy to conceal, disguise, convert, transfer or remove criminal property. The laundering was professional, sophisticated and well-organised. The frauds themselves involved invoice scams that took place all over the world. The laundering operation was also an international one. The actual payment of funds into a mule accounts was in excess of £2 million. 8 other attempts were stopped but, had they been successful, would have netted over £1.5 million. The defendant was severed from the trial part heard due to the Covid pandemic. Following a review, a substantive charge involving half million was preferred and the defendant received a 10-month sentence suspended for 18 months.

R v Todd: Southwark Crown Court (2019/2020): Boiler room fraud. Operation Cornflower (2019). Leading counsel representing administrator for numerous companies alleged to be created one after another as phoenix companies set up to sell pay day loans; binary products and bitcoins.

R v P: Southwark Crown Court (2019). Instructed as led counsel in Bribery/Corruption case relating to contracts awarded to a UK company supplying equipment to measure earthquakes by a Korean company. Connected Proceedings in USA.

R v O'Hara: Wood Green Crown Court (2019). Leading Counsel- Vat and Excise Fraud: Operation Electron—Leading Counsel representing director of company in relation to allegations of large-scale VAT and excise fraud brought by HMRC and Trading Standards relating to the supply of biodiesel in Sussex. A suspended sentence was imposed.

R v B: Southwark Crown Court (2018-2019). The trial took place over 5 months ending in April 2019. The POCA proceedings alleging 17.5 million benefit was adjourned whilst the conviction was subject to appeal and recommenced in February 2021 and was completed in December 2023 following a 4 day part heard hearing. The case involved 3 counts of



conspiracy to cheat the revenue spanning the period January 2008-March 2014. The prosecution case was that the defendants conspired to defraud the Revenue by manipulating the VAT system. I represented the first and principal defendant who was alleged to be the architect and principal of the fraudulent scheme. The defendant ran a group of companies which traded in precious metals. There were over 30 suppliers to the Group companies which featured in the evidence in the case and each of these traders failed to account, in whole or in part, for any output tax on transactions which appeared in the Group's trading records, or they were part of a chain of traders where there was such a failure to account for output tax. Conversely the Group companies claimed input tax amounting to over £17.5 million.

R v Richardson : Southwark Crown Court (2019). Sole Counsel in conspiracy to money Launder through creation of 4 phoenix companies set up to transfer funds of boiler room fraud. A suspended sentence was imposed following trial.

R v Wrenn: Birmingham Crown Court (2019) Sole Counsel. Conspiracy to cheat the public revenue. Defendant was a director of company alleged to be involved in evasion of duty payable on large scale alcohol importations.

R v Ross: Liverpool Crown Court (2018). Led Junior in 17 million solar panel fraud by false representations. Case lasted 5 months and involved intermediary and mental health issues.

R v Venskus: Southwark Crown Court. Bribery and Corruption (2016-2018) Led Junior representing JV, prominent defendant in major European corruption trial. of the case involved alleged wholesale corruption by Alstom who are a global leader in the world of power generation, power transmission and rail infrastructure. The prosecution case concerned a corrupt relationship between Alstom Power Limited and Alstom Power Sweden on one side and senior officials at the Elektrenai Power Plant (which is a subsidiary of the Lithuanian state owned energy company and which is the principal producer of electricity in the country) whereby it was alleged that a conspiracy was created to ensure that valuable contracts were placed with Alstom companies as opposed to other competitors. During the course of this a Lithuanian company called UAB Vilmetrona were utilised in the conspiracy to facilitate the payment of bribes to Lithuanian officials. The total contract value was €93.92m. The case was one of three prosecutions being conducted by the SFO in relation to the affairs of Alstom, in Hungary and India, further to a recent prosecution in America.

R v Hoare: Southwark Crown Court (2018). Instructed as leading counsel on behalf of Director in a case concerning the alleged use of two large engineering and telecommunications companies that had been contracted to install broadband for BT Carillion Telent to defraud HMRC. The contracts were worth in-excess of £15m. No evidence offered following representations relating to mental health issues. All other defendants convicted.



R v Hicks: Stafford Crown Court. (2018). Sole Counsel. The case involved a conspiracy relating to a “time share- resale fraud’ principally targeting the elderly, and thereafter and in addition to, allegations of setting up bank accounts associated to money laundering between 2012-2015. A suspended sentence was imposed.

R v Hussein: St Albans Crown Court (2018). Courier Fraud. Sole Counsel who represented principal defendant on multi handed indictment.

R v Hassan: Isleworth Crown Court (2017). Sole Counsel representing principal defendant on a multi handed indictment. The defendant was alleged to have used his business and associated family businesses to launder 1 million of criminal money obtained directly through an employee at the bank. The case involved medical/psychiatric condition, fitness to stand trial and services of an intermediary.

R v Bryne: Nottingham Crown Court 2016-2017. Sole Counsel. This case involved Fraud and Money Laundering allegations, and further connected charges of Perverting the Course of Justice by the National Trading Standards Board. The case concerned a group of 95 companies known as Wyvern Media Group. The organization comprised of many limited companies, but many were transient, either after a short period of trading or subjected to many name changes. The investigation was instigated by more than 440 complaints made by individuals and companies based across the UK and Europe. The defendant represented was a director of the principal company, and a manager and director of 6 other interconnected companies. She faced 5 counts on the indictment. A suspended sentence was imposed.

R v Patwary: Hull Crown Court (2017): Sole Counsel. A courier fraud upon elderly persons in excess of 10 defendants. The defendant was alleged to be an organizer of this fraud and as part of the same contacted the victims of this fraud falsely representing that he was a police officer/and or representative of the bank, instructing that bank officials were involved in counterfeit money exchanges and that money should be withdrawn as part of the investigation of those employees.

R v Glasgow: Derby Crown Court (2016). Sole Counsel. This case involved a large scale ‘cash for crash’ fraud alleged to involve defendants involved in all aspects of the claims, including garages, cheque centers, doctors and solicitors. No evidence was offered at start of trial following service of abuse of process arguments.

R v E: Leeds Crown Court (2016). Sole Counsel. The case involved an allegation that 3 brothers entered into a money laundering arrangement with 3 companies involved in the multi-million-pound asbestos removal business to wash the proceeds of their Class A drug trafficking.

R v Shafique: Southwark Crown Court. (2016). Sole Counsel. This case involved a money laundering conspiracy involving 100’s of stolen vehicles that had been subjected to car



ringing in excess of 2 million pounds.

R v Farah: Central Criminal Court. 2015. Sole Counsel. This case was widely reported as “the bank of terror case”. It involved a courier fraud whereby elderly people were targeted. People posed as police officers investigating frauds committed by bank staff, and persuaded individuals to withdraw their money from the bank and hand over to fraudsters. The defendant represented was the only defendant of 10, to be acquitted.

R v Benstead: Southwark Crown Court (2015.) Leading Counsel. A large scale “Ponzi fraud” amounting to losses in excess of 20 million that involved an umbrella of companies that were involved in the sale of currency and bullion gold. The case involved 7 defendants and a 19-count indictment alleging in the main fraudulent trading and theft of bullion gold. This was the first “iPad trial” in a London court.

R v Makusha: Blackfriars Crown Court (2015). Sole Counsel. Represented Company Director whose company was alleged to have participated in a £6 million-pound conspiracy to employ, exploit and sub-contract to multi-million-pound companies illegal working security guards. Acquitted on all counts.

R v Bensley: 2014. Kingston Crown Court. Led Counsel. The allegation involved a large scale £24 million-pound missing trader (MTIC) fraud and money laundering charges that related to an £8 million loan taken out by the company and alleged to have accrued from third party payments due to defaulters in the chain. The client was a director of a company that traded in mobile phones and computer equipment. The defendant was the sole defendant to be acquitted.

R v Emery: Southwark Crown Court. Led Counsel. Allegation involved SFO prosecution involving a £100 million-pound investment fraud. The allegation was essentially a ‘boiler room’ type fraud concerning a share dealing entity in Madrid. There were many victims including elderly and vulnerable victims. Case was complex as it was apparent that some investors had made very considerable profits although they were small in number when compared with the victims.

R v Wilson: 2014. Blackfriars Crown Court. Sole Counsel. This case involved the setting up/hijacking of numerous companies, the purpose of which was to submit fraudulent Vat returns to cheat the public revenue out of sums in excess of £1 million. Suspended sentence imposed.

R v Riaz: Manchester Crown Court. 2014. This case involved 12 members of the same family alleged to be involved in a conspiracy to launder the proceeds of drugs in excess of 1 million. This case was dropped after 4 weeks of trial following disclosure arguments.

R v Brookes: Southwark Crown Court. 2014. Leading Counsel. £1.5 million conspiracy to defraud. Represented principal defendant, first on the indictment, who was charged with



masquerading as a knighted Sir and a disabled person for over 20 years and who set up a company designed to employ disabled persons in order to exploit both the employees and the government backed "back to work program" for disabled person.

R. v. B: Liverpool Crown Court: instructed in Large-scale dental practice conspiracy fraud.

R. v. G: Cardiff Crown Court. Leading Counsel in multi-handed 19 count case involving conspiracy to supply Class A drugs and conspiracies involving £1.5 million money laundering. Prosecution out of time in setting confiscation dates and matter referred to Court of Appeal for argument on the statutory time limits. £1.5 million confiscation order sought, and issues involved attribution of benefit between husband and wife. No order made against defendant represented.

R. v. N: Southwark Crown Court: Counsel in 13-handed conspiracy case, involving staged vehicle accidents and fraud on insurance companies.

R. v. S: Southwark Crown Court: Led junior Counsel in £51 million trademark fraud.

R. v. A: Harrow Crown Court: Sole counsel in £1.2 million conspiracy to defraud insurance companies. Case involved staged vehicle accidents.

R. v. T: Harrow Crown Court: Sole Counsel in 44 count fraud on Harrow Council by subcontracted company manager. Defendant acquitted.

HOMICIDE AND CORPORATE MANSLAUGHTER

R v M: Inner London Crown Court (2024). Represented Principal defendant who alone was charged with attempted murder. This case involved an alleged revenge attack following an initial altercation whereby the 5 defendants used 3 vehicles to tracked down and crash into the victim following a car pursuit. The victim was then subjected to a violent assault, having his head stamped on by the defendant after he had been unconscious for minutes.

R v H: Croydon Crown Court (2024). Represented Principal defendant who was charged with attempted murder. The defendant was involved in an altercation whereby it was alleged he produced a knife and stabbed the victim in the head. The knife was embedded in the skull.

R v P: Harrow Crown Court (2021). Leading Counsel. Allegation of attempted murder, possession of shotgun with intent to endanger life where victim shot in broad daylight.

R v S (Snaresbrook Crown Court): Sole Counsel. Attempted murder. The allegation was that the defendant, who was a professional footballer, was the driver of a vehicle from which 3 passengers exited and became engaged in a violent assault upon a victim of mistaken



identity who was stabbed multiple times and had his throat slashed. Submission of no case at half time was successful.

R v G: Chelmsford Crown Court. Juvenile. Led Junior Counsel. This case involved a fatal stabbing following the Notting Hill Carnival.

R v Pulham: Central Criminal Court. Led Counsel. This case involved a doorstep gun killing. The allegation was that 3 defendants pre-arranged to travel in convoy to the deceased address and target the individual. Defendant acquitted.

R v Leslie: Leeds Crown Court. Led Counsel. Attempted murder/shooting of a police officer. This case involved complex mental health issues.

R v W: Juvenile. Central Criminal Court. Led junior Counsel. Multi handed-joint enterprise murder- alleged to be gang related/ revenge for shooting at the defendant's premises.

R v B: Chelmsford Crown Court: Led Counsel. This case involved the murder and dismemberment of the body of deceased over a drug debt.

R v T: Central Criminal Court: Led Counsel. Murder by shooting, involving drugs background. Sole evidence in case reliant on parallel cell site evidence and phone traffic. Defendant acquitted.

R v H: St Albans Crown Court: Led Counsel. Attempted murder of a disabled youth in his home and conspiracy to pervert the course of justice. Pre-trial legal arguments related to a section 8 production order for disclosure from solicitors of documents and legal professional privilege.

R v D: Juvenile. Central Criminal Court: Led Counsel. Murder of schoolboy outside his school. Case involved teenage gangs and cut-throat defences.

R v Mendendez: Central Criminal Court: Murder. Led Counsel. First case involving the use of canine DNA. A dog was alleged to have brought the victim down who was thereafter stabbed in a gang related background. Legal argument on admissibility of canine DNA evidence where no statistical basis able to be given successful.

R v A: Central Criminal Court: Led Counsel. Contract killing murder. First trial aborted due to House of Lords ruling on anonymity orders. Case also involved issues surrounding prison informant evidence.

R v C: Southwark Crown Court: Led Counsel. Murder trial. Case involved issues of admissibility of similar fact bad character evidence as to previous non-fatal stabbing in identical location and cu- throat defences. Killing said to be drug related.



LIBERTAS
CHAMBERS

Roxanne Morrell

rmorrell@libertaschambers.com

clerks@libertaschambers.com

ORGANISED CRIME

Roxanne is regularly instructed in Organized Crime offences across the whole spectrum. Examples include HMRC/UKBA prosecution of multi-handed, multi pound conspiracies involving importation of cigarettes and drugs by air and sea; SOCA prosecution for conspiracy to supply cocaine and assorted money laundering charges over a two-year period; attempted murder of a police officer involving complex mental health issues; large scale conspiracy involving 8 importations of amphetamine oil; R v A: case resulted in no evidence offered, for facilitating mortgage fraud by and laundering the proceeds for an alleged crime syndicate.

<https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/crime-family-face-jail-for-money-laundering-and-fraud-3vgwclm6f> and

<https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/notorious-a-team-crime-family-11457555>.

R v H: (listed for trial 2025): Woolwich Crown Court. Sole Counsel. This case is linked to Operation Venetic and relates to an investigation into offences of large-scale drug importation and supply of Class A drugs in Kent, between March and June 2020. A conservative estimate in relation to the drug supply messages on Encro Chat devices attributable to this conspiracy is approximately 200+ kilo's of class A drugs with an estimate of **£6-8 million**. The defendant represented is the principal defendant charged with importation, supply and money laundering offences.

R v R v Sharma & Guilled: Kingston Crown Court (2023-2024). Represented two defendants. Sharma was the Principal defendant and alleged to be involved in both parts of the alleged conspiracy. Operation Gallen concerned a sophisticated and long-running conspiracy to supply commercial multi-kilo quantities of cocaine-just under half a tonne. The conspiracy alleged fell into two parts: the first part commenced in Jan 2020 and involved Sharma alone and the use of Encro Chat devices and the second part of the two year conspiracy took place between May and September 2022 and involved Sharma, Guilled and 3 further defendants. The Encrochat messages discussed the potential importation of various different types of drugs, including cocaine, ketamine and multi-ton quantities of binding agents being shipped by airfreight from India, China and Holland. There are discussions about buying two 20ft shipping containers, to be loaded with 24 pallets and transported on a 40ft lorry, twice weekly. There are further discussions about making mephedrone, obtaining flualprazolam, etizolam and methylphenidate. Police surveillance between 09 June 2022 and 21 September 2022 resulted in safe houses being discovered and recovery of 20 Kilograms of cocaine. The conspiracy was alleged to involve ½ tonne of cocaine.

R v M: (2021/22) Stafford Crown Court: Leading Counsel for the principal defendant and alleged head of an Organised Crime Group (involving 20 defendants) that were involved in the supply of Class A, B and C drugs during 2016-2019. The estimated sale of Class A alone was 6 million.



LIBERTAS
CHAMBERS

Roxanne Morrell

rmorrell@libertaschambers.com

clerks@libertaschambers.com

R v R: (2022) Warwick Crown Court. Leading Counsel for the principal defendant and alleged to be the at the head of a criminal network (involving 16 defendants) orchestrating the supply of Class A drugs in multi kilos on courier trips from Liverpool to onwards supply to a number of distributors based in and around Warwickshire, West Midlands, Nottinghamshire and Northamptonshire. Further, it is alleged that he was in active control of 15 firearms, including shotguns and pistols and ammunition.

R v S: Luton Crown Court (awaiting trial). This case relates to an Organised Crime Group (based across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire that are alleged to be responsible for the supply of well in excess of 100 kilograms of Class A and B drugs nationally as well as the supply and use of firearms, where on one seizure 6 loaded firearms were seized. The defendant is alleged to be a key player and the key evidence relates to material obtained through the enchrohat phone system.

R v B: Woolwich Crown Court (Current). This case involves various serious, substantial and complex conspiracies to supply Class A and B drugs which continued over the course of at least 18 months. 33 kg of Class A drugs, 593 Kilograms of Class B drugs and £899,275.47 were seized which are alleged to be just a snippet of the conspiracy.

R v C: Nottingham Crown Court. Instructed Sole Counsel. Defendant faces trial on a charge of assisting an offender who is alleged to have been a participant along with 5 other defendants to have broken into the home address of the victim who was subjected to a machete attack.

R v Stoica: Canterbury Crown Court (2020). Sole Counsel. Importation of 16 kilograms of cocaine in a purpose-built step within a vehicle registered to the defendant.

R v Vickers: Birmingham Crown Court (2019). Sole Counsel representing principal defendant. This case involved conspiracies relating to large-scale importation of cigarettes and alcohol. After 3 weeks of trial and following disclosure arguments made on behalf of this defendant, the prosecution applied to discharge the jury to carry out a full audit/review of disclosure. The case was dropped following a 6-week audit against all defendants.

R v Keane: Chelmsford Crown Court. Leading Counsel. This case involved 9 importations of amphetamine oil said to be in excess of 53 million.

R v Hazel: Manchester Crown Court. Sole Counsel. Represented principal defendant. This related to Operation Demolysis and a NCA prosecution relating to the preparation and distribution of amphetamine. Hundreds of thousands of pounds of drugs were seized and a 'lab/factory' uncovered. Counsel represents the defendant alleged to be the 'directing mind/role behind the amphetamine factory and 3 conspiracies to supply amphetamine to Scotland and the Essex area'. Defendant was acquitted on all counts.



R v B: Isleworth Crown Court. Sole Counsel. Represented director who was a majority shareholder and Imports manager in ERTS/ Customs clearing approved company by HMRC in complex HMRC/UKBA prosecution of multi-handed, multi-million-pound conspiracies involving importation of cigarettes and drugs by air and sea. Defendant represented was acquitted on all counts.

R v Heath: Isleworth Crown Court. Sole Counsel. The offence involved multiple conspiracies between 2014/2015 in which the defendant was alleged to have played a leading role in allowing his business to be used for a major drug smuggling operation that imported numerous successful consignments of multi-kilo amounts of cocaine, crack cocaine, heroin, and cannabis. The prosecution submitted that the importations and supply operation was clearly on the most serious and commercial scale and involved quantities of drugs significantly higher than category 1 and the defendant fell to sentenced therefore, outside the guidelines. The defendant was sentenced to 7 years imprisonment. The defendant alleged to be one rung above this defendant (whilst sharing the leading role) was given a sentence of 21 years.

R v Johnson: Birmingham Crown Court. Sole Counsel. This case was substantial and complex. The defendant was one of 8 defendants and faced 1 count of Conspiracy to Supply Cocaine over a 16-month period and 3 substantive counts of Money Laundering over a two-year period. She was alleged to be the 'assistant manager' of an organized crime group that supplied Cocaine. Defendant acquitted on all counts.

R v W: Maidstone Crown Court. Sole Counsel. This case involved a large-wholesale operation involving importation of Class A drugs from the Netherlands via companies set up for that alleged purpose. The Prosecution alleged 19 identical trips. On the final trip, 42 kilograms of Cocaine were seized in the possession of the defendant who was represented, who was a Dutch National.

R v Jukes: Birmingham Crown Court. Sole Counsel. This case involved a large-scale surveillance operation to import and distribute counterfeit cigarettes. A suspended sentence was imposed.

R v D: Juvenile. Southwark Crown Court. Leading Counsel in £1 million-pound composite "smash and grab" commercial burglary conspiracy and associated robberies. Represented principal defendant, first on the indictment, who was charged with masterminding the fraud and acting as "a modern-day Fagin" who recruited his friends to steal motorcycles to carry out a series of 47 ram raid burglaries/robberies on high-end commercial retailers in the West End.

R v P: Central Criminal Court: Led Counsel in £53 million Tonbridge Securitas robbery and kidnappings. Said to be largest robbery known in UK. The defendant was alleged to be the make-up/prosthetics artist behind disguises worn. No evidence was offered following



LIBERTAS
CHAMBERS

Roxanne Morrell

rmorrell@libertaschambers.com

clerks@libertaschambers.com

severance from the first trial, an assistant make-up artist/defendant turning QE during first trial and service of abuse of process arguments.

R v Bains: Worcester Crown Court: Led Counsel. Defended in multi-handed conspiracy to kidnap/torture and false imprison an individual targeted over a debt.

R v H: Luton Crown Court: Lead Counsel in conspiracy to supply 43 kilos of cocaine by an organized crime group responsible for the distribution of cocaine within the counties of Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire.

R v B: Harrow Crown Court: Lead Counsel in conspiracy to supply large quantities of almost pure cocaine by a criminal organization in Northwest London.

R v B: Kingston Crown Court: Led Counsel in £1 billion conspiracy to import cocaine and money laundering counts. Multi-jurisdictional case and related issues. Said to be largest importation of its kind as of date of case. Defendant pleaded to money laundering shortly after start of trial, no evidence offered on drug conspiracy and received a suspended sentence.

R v Blaire: Wood Green Crown Court: Leading Counsel in multi-handed, multi-count conspiracies to kidnap and rob drug dealers. Evidence solely reliant on telephone probe evidence and admissibility. Defendant acquitted on all counts.

R v P: Nottingham Crown Court: Counsel in multi-handed honor kidnapping conspiracy and false imprisonment.

R v G: Cardiff Crown Court: Leading Counsel in multi-handed 19 count case involving conspiracy to supply Class A drugs and conspiracies involving £1.5 million money laundering.

R v C: Central Criminal Court: Sole Counsel in multi-handed, multi-count case involving blackmail, robbery and torture of Chinese nationals by organized Chinese gang.

R v G: Blackfriars Crown Court: Led Counsel in conspiracy to import 102 kilos of cocaine through haulage company.

R v E: Kingston Crown Court: Led Counsel in multi-handed conspiracies to supply Class A drugs involving two-year police undercover operation.



R v B: Birmingham Crown Court: Led Counsel in Police corruption trial where police provided information on investigation to suspects of a well-known gang relating to a double murder.

GENERAL CRIME

R v Kidd: Kingston Crown Court. Sole counsel instructed in multiple allegations of s.18 in an alleged turf war between motorcycle clubs, Hell's Angels, Red Devils and others. You can read more about this case in the following article:

<https://www.getsurrey.co.uk/news/surrey-news/live-blindley-heath-hells-angels-16404718>

R. v. K. Snaresbrook Crown Court: Counsel in conspiracy to supply firearms, including MAC-10s, shotguns, etc., to undercover police officers.

R. v. H. Snaresbrook Crown Court: Conspiracy to rob security vans by gunpoint.

R. v. H. Kingston Crown Court: multi-million-pound conspiracy to commit burglaries to steal high-powered vehicles to order.

R. v. G. Maidstone Crown Court: £1.5 million conspiracies relating to ram raid post office robbery with JCB and burglaries to steal high powered vehicles stolen to order by same gang.

R. v. T. Kingston Crown Court: Multi-handed kidnap trial.

R v. M. Middlesex Guildhall Crown Court: Counsel in multi-handed £1 million conspiracy to commit commercial burglaries.

R. v. H. Leicester Crown Court: Death by dangerous driving involving military vehicle, army personnel and military regulations for storage of army vehicles.

APPEALS AND CCRC

R v B: Attorney General Reference (No. 4 of 1999) House of Lords: Junior Counsel. The A-G Reference related to whether the obligation to destroy DNA samples of an acquitted person was directory or mandatory. Legislation governing the destruction of DNA samples was subsequently changed following the ruling and the case remains authority on the issue of statutory interpretation.