



Nick Robinson

Year of Call: 2006

Email Address: nick.robinson@3pb.co.uk

Secure Email: nick.robinson@3pb.co.uk.cjsm.net

Telephone: 01202 292 102

Crime and Regulatory Crime

Violent Crime

Nick Robinson defends the full range of serious violent offending. His practice encompasses section 18 wounding with intent, robbery, firearms, false imprisonment, and public order, and his record of acquittals in the most serious cases speaks for itself. He is particularly formidable in self-defence cases, where the ability to construct a coherent, credible account from the earliest stages of a case – and to hold that account under sustained prosecution attack – has repeatedly proved decisive. He is a specialist in cutthroat defences and multi-defendant trials, bringing tactical intelligence and forensic precision to cases where co-defendants run competing defences or where the identification and hearsay evidence demands rigorous challenge.

Selected Cases

R v JK – (2025) s.18 wounding with intent and possession of a bladed article. Complainant had never provided a witness statement; the entire prosecution case rested on untested hearsay. Following service of a detailed defence statement, legal argument and a judicial direction requiring the prosecution to review the case, the Crown offered no evidence. Not guilty verdicts on both counts by judicial direction.

R v TW – (2025) Assault ABH arising in concurrent family proceedings. Nick identified the prosecution's failure to obtain and disclose evidence from related Family Court proceedings; the Recorder refused the prosecution's application to adjourn and directed that an abuse of process argument be heard at the first day of trial. The prosecution subsequently confirmed in writing that it would offer no evidence on the basis of insufficient evidence; formal not guilty verdict entered by judicial direction.

R v ER – (2025) Stalking involving fear of violence and criminal damage – private client with relevant previous convictions; strong risk of immediate custody. Sentence of 12 months suspended for two years, avoiding the custodial starting point of 2 years 6 months.

R v SW – (2025) s.18 GBH with intent and s.20 GBH – retrial before HHJ Evans KC. Single punch captured on CCTV. Serious head and facial injuries caused. Defendant pleaded guilty to s.20. Unanimous not guilty verdict on s.18. Sentenced to 18 months for lesser offence, resulting in immediate release. Defence videos played during sentencing to establish the lower level of harm.

R v DH – (2024) Racially aggravated ABH, ABH, and battery. Neighbour dispute turned violent. Nick demonstrated that the complainant and the purportedly independent witness were in fact friends with a motive to lie. Cross-examination on the dental evidence further undermined the prosecution case. Unanimously acquitted on all counts in under one hour; defendant's costs awarded.

R v HR – (2024) s.20 GBH – complainant refused to support the prosecution. Prosecution sought to prove case with complainant’s hearsay evidence. Applications under ss.116 and 114(1)(d) CJA 2003 refused; prosecution offered no evidence. Not guilty by judicial direction.

R v DW – (2022) s.18 wounding with intent, false imprisonment (×2), and threats to kill (×2). Injuries caused with a hatchet and Stanley knife. Defence of self-defence, supported by mental health evidence. Defendant argued that the two complainants conspired to commit an armed robbery against him. Unanimous not guilty on all five counts.

R v DS – (2022) Attempted robbery. Nick’s written sentencing note persuaded the Judge to impose a two-year community order with Alcohol Abstinence Monitoring, RAR, and Drug Rehabilitation requirements – avoiding the custodial sentence the offence would ordinarily attract.

R v MY – (2022) s.18 and s.20 GBH. Complainant retracted. Nick successfully opposed the Crown’s application for a lengthy adjournment to obtain medical hearsay evidence; prosecution offered no evidence the following day.

R v DSH – (2022) s.20 GBH; pre-emptive self-defence. First jury hung; Nick’s written submissions opposing retrial led to prosecution offering no evidence. Not guilty verdict.

R v TJ and Others – (2022) Robbery – victim stabbed three times, collapsed lung; youth defendant aged 16. Three defendants. Cut-throat defence against a co-defendant across two trials; CCTV, eyewitnesses, and bad character evidence in issue. Unanimous not guilty of robbery; two-year suspended sentence with electronic curfew on lesser offence of theft – well below the guidelines range for the original indictment.

R v DE – (2022) s.18 wounding with intent, ABH, and racially aggravated assault – nightclub incident. Expert neuropsychological evidence supported instinctive reaction while concussed. Acquitted on three counts including s.18 and the racially aggravated assault; convicted of ABH as lesser alternative by majority of 10–2.

R v TT – (2022) Arrested on suspicion of attempted murder; charged with ABH (×2). Direct Access instruction at the point of arrest. Through early representations to the police and CPS regarding the individual circumstances of the alleged offences, the charges were reduced first to ABH and then, following sustained negotiation, to common assault. Pleas to common assault accepted; custody avoided entirely. On appeal, the Court of Appeal further reduced the sentence on technical grounds. A compelling illustration of the strategic value of instructing specialist counsel at the earliest stage.

R v JC – (2022) False imprisonment and threats to damage property – three-day trial. Not guilty on all three outstanding false imprisonment counts. Newton hearing findings on the remaining matters determined in the defendant’s favour.

R v BB – (2021) Affray; one of five defendants; case nearly three years old. Adjournment opposed and refused; prosecution offered no evidence. Not guilty.

R v AR – (2021) Possession of a prohibited firearm (sawn-off shotgun) – mandatory minimum 5 years. Exceptional circumstances established; suspended sentence imposed.

R v VS – (2021) Attempted wounding with intent against an armed police officer. The defendant was pursued by four officers in two Armed Response Vehicles whilst driving a stolen quad bike. When stopped, one officer disembarked and it was alleged the defendant attempted to run him over. All four officers gave evidence that the complainant would have been killed or seriously injured had he not jumped clear. Cross-examination challenged all four officers as either untruthful or mistaken. Unanimous not guilty in under 40 minutes.

R v DF – (2021) Assault ABH. Complainant alleged the defendant stamped on her head several times in an unprovoked attack, supported by two apparently independent eyewitnesses. The defendant’s case was that he had intervened in an altercation between his sister and the complainant and used no unlawful force. Cross-examination of all three prosecution witnesses raised sufficient doubt; unanimous acquittal.

R v JC – (2021) Conspiracy to steal and possession of criminal property; youth defendant aged 17. Defence expert cell site analysis undermined prosecution location evidence; identification failures exposed. Crown offered no evidence on conspiracy and criminal property counts.

R v JT – (2021) s.18 wounding with intent. On day three of trial, following cross-examination of the four principal prosecution witnesses, the Crown's case effectively collapsed and no further evidence was offered; not guilty verdict directed by trial Judge.

R v JC – (2020) Assaulting an emergency worker – two counts. Youth defendant aged 17. Defence statement exposed prior acrimonious dealings between the arresting officer and the defendant's family and inconsistencies in clothing descriptions. Prosecution discontinued proceedings against the defendant.

R v EO – (2020) Threats to kill, two assaults, and criminal damage – domestic context. Rebuttal bad character evidence called for the defence. Acquitted on all counts at retrial.

R v RA – (2020) s.18 GBH with intent – road rage attack with a weapon. Cross-examination established the complainant as the aggressor. Not guilty of the s.18 offence.

R v BC – (2020) Attempted robbery, ABH, possession of an offensive weapon, assault by beating, and coercive and controlling behaviour. Nick's defence statement highlighted disclosure issues fundamentally undermining the complainant's credibility. Crown offered no evidence on the attempted robbery, ABH, and offensive weapon counts; formal not guilty verdicts entered.

R v DL – (2019) False imprisonment (x2) and ABH (x2). The comprehensive defence statement exposed catastrophic failures in the investigation and disclosure process, bad faith by the police, and the withholding of sensitive intelligence regarding individuals and linked offences associated with organised crime groups. The complainants were identified as participants in a fraud conspiracy against elderly victims. Prosecution offered no evidence on the first day of trial; costs awarded.

R v WJ – (2018) Kidnap, assault by beating, and threats to kill arising from a breach of a non-molestation order. Crown offered no evidence on the kidnap count; formal not guilty verdict entered. Assault by beating and threats to kill ordered to lie on the file, substantially limiting the charges the defendant faced at sentence.

R v LR – (2018) Section 18 GBH with intent. The prosecution alleged that the defendant bottled the complainant, knocking him unconscious, then kicked him to the head seven times. The defendant accepted using the bottle but contended he did so in the heat of the moment to protect his friend and that he went too far. He denied kicking the complainant or intending to cause GBH. Unanimous acquittal.

R v LL – (2017) Two counts of ABH and four counts of battery arising from a group altercation at the Bournemouth Sevens Festival. A complex case involving over ten eyewitnesses, five complainants, intoxication and issues of joint enterprise. Five-day trial before HHJ Fuller QC. Unanimously acquitted on all six counts.

R v SL – (2017) Armed robbery of a dwelling captured on CCTV. The defendant's case was that the complainant was his drug dealer who had sold him poor drugs and slept with his wife. Nick established that the complainant had lodged a false insurance claim for a Rolex allegedly stolen during the robbery. At the first trial, cross-examination exposed the officer in charge giving false evidence on oath and the jury were discharged. Prosecutorial misconduct was subsequently exposed: highly probative evidence had been withheld, including intelligence that the complainant was a Class A drug supplier. Defendant was acquitted at retrial, and complainant subsequently charged with criminal offences.

R v KB – (2017) Charged with two others, KB was alleged to have been the leader of a gang in prison who perpetrated a revenge attack against a fellow inmate. The defendant denied being involved in the assault. Unanimous not guilty verdict.

R v LD – (2016) s.20 wounding. Defendant stabbed the complainant with a kitchen knife during an altercation at his home address. He argued that the injury was an accident that was caused whilst he was defending himself from the complainant who was at the time suffering from a psychotic episode. Unanimous not guilty verdict.

R v SB – (2016) s.18 wounding with intent. Complainant suffered a collapsed lung, six broken ribs and a broken jaw. Defendant of previous good character. The defence case was that the complainant had arrived uninvited at the defendant's home and attacked him; the defendant acted in self-defence, which included dragging the complainant down the stairs and out of the property by his ankle. Acquitted by jury.

R v RC – (2016) Burglary. Eyewitness and forensic evidence placed the accused at the scene. Defendant's fingerprints

explained by a legitimate prior visit; fundamental investigation failures exposed. Not guilty verdict. Trial judge, Recorder Don Tait said in court after the acquittal: *"You very skillfully revealed all of the inadequacies in this investigation."*

R v ZA – Leicester Crown Court (2016) The defendant, a probation officer of good character, was convicted in the Magistrates' Court of assault by beating and resisting arrest. On appeal, Nick successfully advanced the defence of non-insane automatism, supported by Professor Seena Fazel (University of Oxford) a Consultant Psychiatrist. The defence case was that the defendant lacked voluntary control of his actions owing to the combined effect of clinical depression, prescribed medication and alcohol – rendering him unable to form *mens rea* by reason of involuntary intoxication and non-insane automatism. Acquitted and defendant's costs recovered.

R v JG – (2016) Conspiracy to inflict GBH with intent and s.18 GBH. Three-defendant trial lasting four weeks. Nick's client was the principal defendant charged with masterminding and orchestrating a violent attack by a hit man hired from London who fractured the victim's spine following a sustained attack that included stamping on the victim's neck. Intimidated witness gave evidence over the video-link from Los Angeles. Background of organised crime, drug dealing, and police informants. *Reported: [Daily Echo](#).*

R v CBC – (2016) Two-handed s.18 GBH. Defendant allegedly part of a joint enterprise to stab a male in the back. Following cross-examination of the complainant, and a successful submission of no case to answer, the defendant – who admitted presence – was acquitted by the jury upon the direction of the trial Judge.

R v HS – (2016) Four-handed s.18 trial. Nick defended the principal defendant. The jury unanimously acquitted all defendants.

R v DC – Portsmouth Crown Court (2015) s.18 GBH with intent. Judge ruled no case to answer following Nick's submission – identification evidence unreliable and unsafe.

R v RB – (2015) s.18 wounding with intent. Stabbing at a shopping center. The defendant pleaded guilty and following submissions and expert evidence was made the subject of a Hospital Order. *Reported: [Daily Echo](#).*

R v SM – (2015) s.18 GBH with intent. Four doormen alleged the defendant fractured a colleague's leg and kneecap in an unprovoked attack. The defendant's case was that any injury was accidental and the consequence of the doormen's own excessive force towards him. Issues of bad character, CCTV analysis, and medical evidence. Acquitted.

R v BH – (2014) s.20 GBH. The defendant, a student of good character, was alleged to have punched and broken the jaw of a teacher during an off the ball incident in a five-a-side football match. Defence of self-defence. Acquitted.

R v GC – (2013) s.18 wounding with intent. The defendant was alleged to have bitten off the complainant's nose during a fight. The case involved a cutthroat defence with a co-defendant, each blaming the other. Forensic odontologists were instructed on both sides. In cross-examination, Nick secured the complainant's concession that he was certain it was the co-defendant who had bitten him. Unanimously acquitted.

R v SH – (2013) s.18 and s.20 GBH. The defendant bit the complainant's face causing a serious wound. At trial he argued he was the victim of a homophobic attack, and acted in self-defence. Unanimously acquitted on both counts.

R v LW – (2013) Two-year sentence for an armed robbery with a handgun at a HSBC bank. Defendant committed offence after drug dealers he owed money threatened to kill his son if he didn't pay up. *Reported: [BBC News](#) and [Daily Echo](#).*

R v DF – (2012) Defendant charged with having an offensive weapon, namely a knuckleduster; assault occasioning actual bodily harm and battery. The allegations arose after an altercation on Trinity Street in Weymouth. Unanimous not guilty verdicts on all counts in under two hours. *Reported: [Dorset Echo](#).*

R v RD – (2011) Five-week trial arising out of an armed robbery at a farmhouse in Bloxworth, Dorset, during which an elderly victim aged 78 was tied up and attacked, and shotguns, money and a vehicle were stolen. Four co-defendants were convicted of robbery and sentenced to between seven-and-a-half and twelve years' imprisonment. Nick's client, aged 21, was unanimously acquitted at trial of handling the stolen shotguns. *Reported: [BBC News](#).*

R v MH – (2009) Assault ABH; defendant a professional mixed martial arts fighter. Not guilty after a one-week trial.

Crime and Regulatory Crime

Private Client Defence: Criminal Allegations in Family & Domestic Proceedings

Nick has particular experience defending private clients – professionals, business owners, and high-net-worth individuals – facing criminal charges arising from the breakdown of a marriage or relationship, where proceedings run in parallel with the Family Court. A recurring feature of this work is one-sided police investigation, prosecution failure to obtain and disclose material from third-party agencies, and criminal charges deployed to gain tactical advantage in ancillary proceedings. Nick has a proven track record of exploiting these failures through targeted disclosure applications and abuse of process arguments. His Direct Access and accredited litigator status means he can be instructed immediately, without a solicitor, to assemble the complete defence team from the outset.

Selected Cases

R v TW – (2025) Assault ABH charge brought by a former partner during contested family proceedings. Nick prepared an abuse of process argument; the Recorder refused the prosecution's adjournment application and listed it for the first day of trial. The prosecution offered no evidence. Formal not guilty verdict entered.

R v DH – (2024) Four charges arising from the breakdown of the defendant's marriage: ABH, two assaults, and coercive and controlling behaviour. Nick secured the prosecution offering no evidence on the two most serious counts; the defendant – a professional of effective good character and the family's sole breadwinner – received a community order. At sentencing, the Recorder imposed a wide-ranging restraining order without formal application or notice, notwithstanding active Family Court proceedings. On appeal, Stuart-Smith LJ, Stacey J and HHJ Conrad KC quashed the order as wrong in principle and recorded the Court's gratitude for the high quality of Nick's written submissions. *Reported: [2024] EWCA Crim 1003.*

R v TT – (2022) Direct Access instruction at the point of arrest on suspicion of attempted murder during the breakdown of a relationship. Through early representations to the police and CPS, the charges were reduced first to ABH and then to common assault. Pleas accepted; custody avoided. On appeal, the Court of Appeal further reduced the sentence. A compelling illustration of the value of instructing specialist counsel at the earliest opportunity.

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