



# Nick Robinson

**Year of Call:** 2006

**Email Address:** [nick.robinson@3pb.co.uk](mailto:nick.robinson@3pb.co.uk)

**Secure Email:** [nick.robinson@3pb.co.uk.cjism.net](mailto:nick.robinson@3pb.co.uk.cjism.net)

**Telephone:** 01202 292 102

## Sexual offences

Nick has been recommended by the Legal 500 every year since 2011 for his sexual offences practice, with specific recognition of his work in cases involving children and historical allegations. He defends the full spectrum: rape, assault by penetration, historic sexual abuse, indecent assault, sexual activity with a child, coercive and controlling behaviour, and breaches of sexual harm prevention orders – with acquittals across a range of difficult and contested cases.

*"He specialises in sexual offence cases, particularly those involving children and historical allegations."* – Legal 500, 2014

Nick's practice in this area is built on careful preparation and cross-examination. He drafts defence statements designed to force disclosure that can change the shape of a case, and his work is particularly effective where police investigations have been one-sided, where a complainant's account does not withstand scrutiny, or where third-party material – from social services, medical records, schools or the Family Court – materially undermines the prosecution.

Nick is regularly instructed in cases of acute sensitivity – allegations spanning decades, multiple complainants, or matters with a high media profile – and works as readily at trial as at the pre-charge investigative stage.

## Selected Cases

**R v ME – (2026)** Rape. Eight-day trial at Bournemouth Crown Court; nationally reported, including by [BBC News](#) and [Sky News](#). The defence case was that the sexual activity was consensual, agreed in advance for payment, and that the complaint followed a dispute about money. With no independent eyewitness and DNA proving only intercourse, the case turned entirely on the complainant's credibility. Nick's review of the extensive unused material proved central to testing it: he identified footage from three residential CCTV cameras and scene photographs, none relied on by the prosecution, all of which went before the jury. In cross-examination he tested the complainant's account against the agreed facts, the medical evidence and the recordings, and his written note on the legal directions secured a direction, following *R v Lawrance* [2020] EWCA Crim 971, that a failure to pay cannot in law turn an otherwise consensual act of intercourse into rape. Not guilty.

**R v LE – (2026)** Rape. Acting for vulnerable defendant with a full-scale IQ of 64 (first percentile), the language skills of a child aged between six and nine, markedly impaired memory and pronounced suggestibility. The Crown's case turned on two lengthy police interviews said to be replete with lies and inconsistencies. When the Court raised concerns as to admissibility, Nick's written submissions persuaded the Judge to allow the key findings of the defence clinical psychologist as to the defendant's cognitive difficulties to go before the jury as agreed facts. Nick invited the jury in closing to view the interviews through the prism of how the defendant's mind worked under pressure – and, in the alternative, to recognise that even if he had lied in interview there remained good reason to doubt the prosecution case. Not guilty after a five-day trial.

**R v BD – (2025)** Two-week trial before HHJ Evans KC involving multiple counts of rape, sexual assault, and coercive and controlling behaviour. Allegations were made by the defendant's wife coinciding with acrimonious divorce and financial remedy proceedings. The complainant had undergone gender reassignment surgery before meeting the defendant, a fact she

had concealed from him and which he discovered only during the criminal investigation – bearing directly on the complainant's credibility and the reliability of her account. Nick and his junior [Anna Leathem](#) (3PB) compiled a 300-page defence bundle from six years of documentary evidence, exposing systematic dishonesty and a closed-minded police investigation that had failed to question the complainant's account. Not guilty on all counts.

**R v BE – (2025)** Sixteen counts of historic rape and sexual assault spanning over 15 years. Defence statement secured disclosure of critical sensitive material from an earlier police and social services investigation. Unanimous not guilty verdicts on all counts.

**R v BN – (2025)** Rape retrial – three counts, two complainants. Unanimous acquittals on two counts of rape.

**R v AF – (2025)** Assault by penetration and sexual assault – seven-day trial. Expert psychiatric evidence on dissociative episode inadmissible – proceeded to trial nevertheless. DNA transfer successfully challenged. Not guilty of assault by penetration after nearly nine hours' deliberation. Suspended sentence order imposed for lesser offence.

**R v MH – (2025)** Two counts of assault by penetration and two counts of sexual assault. Unanimous not guilty verdicts on all four counts in under two hours.

**R v MC – (2025)** Assault and strangulation of a heavily pregnant partner with global learning difficulties. Defence of consent and fabrication; cross-examination of the complainant and both parents. Unanimous not guilty verdicts.

**R v DL – (2025)** Sexual activity with a child family member, strangulation, and assault – a father accused by his teenage son. Unanimous not guilty on all three counts.

**R v DS – (2024)** Rape, assault, strangulation, and coercive and controlling behaviour. Defence statement and disclosure disclosure applications revealed that the complainant had made false statements to police. Prosecution offered no evidence; acquitted by judicial direction.

**R v DW – (2024)** Historic sexual offences including rape and unlawful sexual intercourse with a girl under 13. Not guilty of rape and the most serious charges on the indictment.

**R v SP – (2024)** Sexual touching – mistaken identity. Mid-trial, the real assailant attended court and confessed; Nick managed the novel procedural issue of a self-incriminating defence witness. Prosecution offered no evidence, not guilty verdict by judicial direction.

**R v AC – (2024)** Sexual assault of a 7-year-old child. Vulnerable defendant with paranoid schizophrenia. Nick was instructed two days before trial. Cross-examination exposed inconsistencies in the eyewitness account of the complainant's mother's account. Unanimous not guilty verdict.

**R v HR – (2024)** Sexual assaults of a 15-year-old girl at a Jazz Festival. Section 28 cross-examination of the complainant and her friend exposed inconsistencies in their evidence. The defendant denied any physical contact in interview and at trial. Unanimous not guilty verdicts; prosecution application for a restraining order upon acquittal refused.

**R v AC – (2023)** Historic sexual offence retrial. Eight counts of sexual activity with a child. Successful section 41 application regarding complainant's sexual behaviour. Bad character evidence of a prosecution witness admitted following legal argument. No-case-to-answer submission succeeded on four counts; unanimous not guilty on all remaining counts.

**R v PA – (2023)** Rape (×2), assault by beating, and coercive and controlling behaviour. Acquitted on all counts.

**R v HD – (2022)** Seven counts of sexual assault against a disabled patient, six involved most serious charges. Bad character evidence of a previous similar conviction successfully excluded. Complainant's credibility was severely undermined by her post-incident conduct, and cross-examination on the victim personal statement. Unanimous not guilty verdicts on all counts in under two and a half hours. *Reported: [Daily Mail](#), [Daily Echo](#).*

**R v SS – (2022)** Eight counts including sexual assault causing/inciting a child under 13; Afghan war veteran with traumatic brain injury and PTSD. Extensive third-party disclosure. Unanimous not guilty verdicts on all counts.

**R v SB – (2022)** Two counts of serious sexual assault; defendant aged 19 and of good character. Prosecution failed to serve the complainant's phone download before trial. Disclosure applications yielded the phone evidence, Snapchat data, and further statements from the officer in charge and digital examiner – establishing that the complainant's Snapchat account did not match the one she gave police and that the message content was inconsistent with her account. Successful cross-examination of the complainant; part of the officer's statement excluded. Unanimous not guilty on both counts.

**R v JM – (2021)** Exposure, alternatively outraging public decency. The complainant runner said she witnessed the defendant deliberately masturbating in his parked vehicle at a bus stop. The defendant's case was that the complainant had been angered by his parking, remonstrated with him, and he swore at her – he has Tourette's. The allegation was made in retaliation. Cross-examination exposed inconsistencies across the complainant's 999 call, witness statements, and evidence in chief. Acquitted.

**R v LH – (2021)** Sexual assault on a child under 13. Following section 28 cross-examination of the child complainant, during which significant inconsistencies were elicited regarding a prior fabricated allegation against a family member, the Crown reviewed its case and offered no evidence. Formal not guilty verdicts entered by judicial direction.

**R v AT – (2017)** Gang rape of a prostitute; two Polish defendants. DNA evidence found; he denied any sexual contact with the complainant. The Crown relied upon forensic scientists and expert DNA evidence. Failures in the investigation and disclosure process were identified. The case ultimately centered on credibility. Unanimously acquitted after a two-week trial.

**R v LD – (2017)** Sexual assault. Defendant alleged to have placed his hand inside the complainant's bra. Jury hung on sexual assault; Crown accepted a plea to attempted robbery following cross-examination of the complainant.

**R v KI – Merthyr Tydfil Crown Court (2016)** Nine counts of alleged sexual assault made by three females who worked for the defendant at his restaurant. After a week-long trial and just three minutes in retirement the jury returned unanimous not guilty verdicts on all counts. Further, the defendant managed to recover the majority of his privately funded legal fees after Nick made a successful application to the National Taxing Team for costs on the grounds this was an exceptional case.

**R v JJ – (2016)** Sexual assault by the worst causes of a child aged 6 and trespass with intent to commit a sexual offence. The defendant broke into a family home in the early hours and was found asleep, naked from the waist down, in the child's bed. The child's pyjamas had been removed and there was reddening to her stomach and minor injury. She made an immediate report to her parents. The Crown relied upon a purported confession, no-comment interview, the removal of both parties' clothing, and the defendant's conduct in police custody. The defendant denied the offences and had no recollection of events. He waived privilege and the police station solicitor gave evidence. Expert evidence established that none of his DNA was found on the child's body. Not guilty on all counts. *Reported: [BBC News Bulletin \(video\)](#), [BBC News](#), [The Sun](#).*

**R v SB – (2015)** Causing or inciting a child to engage in sexual activity. 14-year-old complainant; defendant aged 20. Defence of reasonable belief as to age. The accused had complex needs: Tourette's, ADHD, Attachment Disorder, and possible psychosis, with expert evidence describing significantly impaired decision-making, communication, and social awareness. Nick advised on and secured a Registered Intermediary for the defendant throughout the proceedings, not merely when giving evidence. Defendant did not give evidence. Acquitted.

**R v CS – (2015)** Five counts of serious sexual offences against his stepdaughter aged 7. Third-party disclosure – school, social services, and medical records of the complainant – obtained and deployed in cross-examination to undermine the prosecution case. Acquitted after a one-week trial.

**R v JW – (2015)** Historic indecent and sexual assault of a granddaughter (two counts). The defendant denied the allegations and contended they were the product of malice and/or fantasy. Extensive unused material obtained from social services and the complainant's school was deployed in support of the defence case. Acquitted on both counts.

**R v IF – (2014)** Exposure. The defendant entered a family tennis club, undressed, and masturbated. In interview he stated his drink had been spiked and he could not, and did not, intend to cause alarm or distress. Nick successfully stayed the proceedings as an abuse of process: the police had failed to obtain blood or urine samples whilst the defendant was in custody, depriving him of a defence of automatism which he had raised in interview and which the interviewing officers had ignored. Not guilty verdict.

**R v LM – (2014)** Exposure. Direct access. Two 16-year-old complainants alleged the defendant exposed himself in the communal showers at a family leisure centre. Defence of mistaken identity. Not guilty verdict.

**R v HK – (2014)** Sexual assault in a convenience store. Successful application to exclude bad character evidence of pornographic websites found on the defendant's phone – the Crown could not prove which of six account holders had accessed the material, and the full phone report was never served. No DNA on the complainant's clothing. Unanimous not guilty verdict.

**R v GD – (2011)** Rape. The alleged offence was said to have occurred in the 1990s when the complainant and defendant worked as a waitress and DJ respectively at a well-known hotel in Hampshire. High profile defendant. Unanimous not guilty verdict after a week-long trial.

## Recommendations

### Court of Appeal

In an appeal against sentence R v Sherriff [2012] EWCA Crim 2381 Lord Justice Aikens said:

**"Mr Robinson presented the arguments very concisely, clearly and persuasively".**

In an appeal against sentence R v Kluver [2010] EWCA Crim 3237 Lord Justice Moses said:

**"There is ample authority for the proposition that counsel for the defence has so skilfully identified both in his written grounds and in his oral submissions and we are indebted to Mr Robinson for them".**

In an appeal against sentence R v Bennett [2010] EWCA Crim 1032 Mr Justice Davis said:

**"Mr Robinson, on behalf of the Appellant, has put the case very well".**

In an appeal against sentence R v Woodcock [2011] EWCA Crim 1347 Mr Justice Blair said:

**"Mr Robinson has argued the case well for the applicant."**

### Chambers and Partners Legal Directory

Nicholas Robinson exclusively defends in heavyweight and high-profile criminal cases. He acts in a variety of cases including murder, sexual offences and crimes against children as well as mortgage fraud and armed robbery. He also handles appeals against conviction from the Court of Appeal in Jamaica to the Privy Council.

Strengths: "He has a great practice. "He is a smooth advocate who has a great way of speaking to the jury."

### **Chambers UK 2025/Crime/Western Bar**

Strengths: "He has a very client-centred approach." "His advocacy skills are impressive." "Nick is an industrious individual."

### **Chambers UK 2024/Crime/Western Bar**

Strengths: "He is highly effective and highly skilled in all aspects of criminal defence work."

"Clients love Nicholas. He's a very good lawyer and a persuasive advocate."

"Nicholas handled the cross-examination deftly but devastatingly. His ability to juggle disclosure requests, client management and legal arguments is remarkable."

### **Chambers UK 2023/Crime/Western Bar**

Recent work: Successfully represented a young defendant who was charged with an offence of wounding with intent.

### **Chambers UK 2022/Crime/Western Bar**

Exclusively defends in heavyweight and high-profile criminal cases. Acts in a variety of cases including murder, sexual offences and crimes against children as well as mortgage fraud and armed robbery. He also handles appeals against conviction from the Court of Appeal in Jamaica to the Privy Council.

Strengths: "Has a very positive attitude and his written work is excellent." "He has an approach and flair which juries like."  
Recent work: Represented a defendant charged with serious assaults with weapons and false imprisonment, in relation to two complainants.

**Chambers UK 2021/**Crime/Western Bar

Strengths: "He has a very good reputation and his written work is of the highest quality."  
Recent work: Represented a defendant who was accused of being involved in a serious conspiracy to supply Class A drugs.

**Chambers UK 2020/**Crime/Western Bar

Successfully represented one of two Polish defendants charged with the gang rape of a prostitute.

**Chambers UK 2019/**Crime/Western Bar

Strengths: "He is both responsive and proactive, and his advocacy skills are fantastic."

**Chambers UK 2019/**Crime/Western Bar

**Legal 500**

'Nick is a committed, highly competent and effective criminal barrister. He is an effective trial advocate who gets good results, and his pleas in mitigation are always carefully constructed with great preparation.'

**Legal 500 2025/** Crime (General and Fraud) - Western Circuit

'Nick is diligent and always enthusiastic about his work. His written work is of the highest quality. He is also a very persuasive and effective advocate.'

**Legal 500 2024/** Crime (General and Fraud) - Western Circuit

'Nick is a top level operator. A first-class and fearless advocate with a very robust and incisive approach to criminal litigation. An exceptional strategist.'

**Legal 500 2023 /** Crime - Western Circuit

'Nick's strengths are his intelligence, his ability to fully engage with a jury and his thorough preparation.'

**Legal 500 2022 / Crime - Western Circuit**

'A criminal defence specialist'

**Legal 500 2021 / Crime - Western Circuit**

'A criminal defence specialist'

**Legal 500 2020 / Crime - Western Circuit - Tier 1**

'An expert in defending in serious crime cases.'

**Legal 500 2018/19 / Crime - Western Circuit - Tier 1**

'Self-assured and dedicated.'

**Legal 500 2017 / Crime - Western Circuit**

"Extremely diligent in his approach to cases."

**Legal 500 2016 / Crime - Western Circuit**

'Known for his defence work in the Crown Court, and his practice has an emphasis on serious crime.'

**Legal 500 2015 / Crime - Western Circuit**

'He specialises in sexual offence cases, particularly those involving children and historical allegations of misconduct.'

**Legal 500 2014 / Crime - Western Circuit**

'3PB's Nick Robinson is "a very confident and knowledgeable advocate".'

### **Legal 500 2013 / Crime - Western Circuit**

Nick was also recommended by the Legal 500 directory for 2012 and 2011.

### **Judiciary, Instructing Solicitors, Lay Clients & Social Media Recommendations**

Mr Recorder Don Tait said in open court following the acquittal of Nick's client Mr Reece Creighton:

**"Mr Robinson you did an excellent job defending this man. You very skilfully revealed all of the inadequacies in this investigation ... I am sure Mr Creighton is very grateful."**

Instructing Solicitor

**"Truly grateful for your proactive case management, first class professionalism and dedication".**

Instructing Solicitor

**"This was a difficult case in one sense and your efforts and assistance went beyond the call of duty. I very much appreciate it".**

Instructing Solicitor

**"Please accept my heartfelt thanks and appreciation for all your incredible and excellent hard work on this firm's cases and for always doing over and above what is required in every matter that you deal with. Not only that, well done on all of your outstanding results and faultless client care!"**

Instructing Solicitor

**"Thank you Nick, I am very grateful for your assistance. Your professionalism and support is unbelievable".**

Lay Client

In September and October 2017 at Bournemouth Crown Court Nick represented one of two defendants who faced an Indictment containing six counts. The trial lasted over two weeks and the defendants were found not guilty on all counts. Nick's client sent an email to the CEO Simon Astill where he provided, inter alia, the following appraisal:

**"I write to you to express my sincere gratitude about a member of your Chambers Mr Robinson who defended me at trial ... The case required complete concentration and an eye for detail. This worried me as being on legal aid I thought I might not receive the same service as a client paying privately. This wasn't the case at all and in fact the complete opposite. Mr Robinson genuinely cared about his client and even spent time to reassure my co-defendant ... During the trial Mr Robinson's charisma was a breath of fresh air; he kept the Jury on their toes and concentrated throughout and also he was very calming during the breaks when tensions were high. Finally Mr Robinson's closing speech was mesmerising and got across every possible point I could think of and more. I knew after his speech there was no way I would be convicted. I feel in debt to this man and feel that the literature in my email doesn't allow me to explain my true gratitude."**

Lay Client (defendant's mother)

**"Thank you so much for all the hard work you put into F's case; I can't thank you enough Mr Robinson".**

Lay Client

**"Just wanted to express my thanks, for the confident, reassuring and supportive way that Mr Robinson has handled my case. At short notice he has been able to defend me to his confident best. His caring and clear way in which he dealt with me and my family and friends was top notch".**

Lay Client (Direct Access)

**"Nick - I'm eternally indebted to you and will never be able to thank you enough for today's outcome ... thank you from the bottom of my heart for all you have done for me. You've given me my life back".**

Lay client's relatives (letters to instructing solicitor and Nick respectively)

**"I would also like to say a specific thank you for bringing Nicholas Robinson in as L's barrister. L felt very comfortable talking to Nick, and Nick, in turn, put L at ease. The relationship barristers have with their client, the trust and confidence in the barrister's ability is paramount, and we certainly had that with Nick. I think it also proved that a barristers**

**relationship with his counterparts on the other side is also important and in our case this definitely proved to be significant”.**

**“I just wanted to repeat our thanks for your sterling work in L''s defence”.**

Social Media

**“You can’t beat Nick Robinson when it comes to mitigating circumstances”.**

Social Media

**“You can always rely on Nick Robinson to come up with something original when it comes to mitigating circumstances”.**

## **Academic qualifications**

- BA Criminology & Sociology, The University of Liverpool (First Class Honours)
- Postgraduate Diploma in Law, Manchester Metropolitan University
- Bar Vocational Course, BPP London

## **Professional qualifications & appointments**

- Called to the Bar: 2006.
- Chambers & Partners – Leading Junior: 2019–2026 (Crime – Western Bar).
- Legal 500 – Leading Junior: 2011–2026 (Crime – Western Circuit).
- BSB Direct Access Accreditation – Authorised to accept instructions directly from members of the public.
- BSB Accredited Litigator – Authorised to conduct litigation and to instruct counsel, expert witnesses, and investigators.
- Independent Jamaica Council for Human Rights.

## **Professional bodies**

- Bar Pro Bono Unit
- Criminal Bar Association
- Western Circuit