



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

Overview

Nick Robinson is among the foremost criminal defence juniors on the Western Circuit: a specialist in serious sexual offences, homicide, and organised crime, ranked without interruption by Chambers & Partners (2019–2026) and the Legal 500 (2011–2026). His acquittal record in the gravest cases – rape, murder, attempted murder, multi-tonne drug importations, and complex fraud – is exceptional. He has 41 appearances in the Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) and has argued a death penalty appeal before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. He is known for devastating cross-examination, powerful closing speeches, and an ability to identify failures in police investigation and prosecution disclosure that others miss.

Nick is a BSB-accredited Direct Access barrister and one of a small number of barristers in England and Wales who is also an accredited litigator. He can be instructed directly – without a solicitor – and can build and lead the complete defence team from the outset: counsel (Silks and juniors), expert witnesses, and investigators. He is available to advise from the earliest stages of any investigation, including pre-charge, when the right strategy makes the greatest difference.

What Others Say

"A first-class and fearless advocate with a very robust and incisive approach to criminal litigation. An exceptional strategist."
– Legal 500 2023

"Nicholas is a dynamic barrister. He is calm, sympathetic and gives a huge amount of effort to every case. He is a strong and persuasive advocate with an eye for persuasive arguments." – Chambers UK 2026

"Nicholas handled the cross-examination deftly but devastatingly. His ability to juggle disclosure requests, client management and legal arguments is remarkable." – Chambers UK 2023

"He has a great practice. He is a smooth advocate who has a great way of speaking to the jury." – Chambers UK 2025

"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

"Mr Robinson, you did an excellent job defending this man. You very skilfully revealed all of the inadequacies in this investigation." – Recorder Don Tait, following acquittal

"Nick – I'm eternally indebted to you and will never be able to thank you enough for today's outcome... you've given me my life back." – Lay Client (Direct Access)

Why Instruct Nick

Specialist in the most serious cases. Nick's acquittal record spans rape, murder, attempted murder, multi-million-pound fraud, serious violence, firearms offences, and organised crime – in particular large-scale drug conspiracies prosecuted by the NCA and regional organised crime units. It is in the defence of serious sexual offences, however, that Nick has built his strongest reputation: he is among the most experienced junior counsel on the Western Circuit in allegations of rape and serious sexual assault, with a record of acquittals in the most difficult and high-profile cases.

A decisive advantage from the outset. Nick has an outstanding record of identifying failures in police investigations and prosecution disclosure – forcing stays of proceedings, exclusion of evidence, and prosecutorial capitulation before or during

trial. His defence statements are crafted to expose weaknesses in the prosecution case and compel full disclosure.

Direct Access. Nick can be instructed directly, without a solicitor, and as one of a small number of BSB-accredited litigators in England and Wales, he can build and lead the complete defence team – counsel, experts, and investigators – from the outset. The earlier he is instructed, the stronger the defence.

Equal commitment to every client. Nick represents private clients and publicly funded defendants with the same rigour. All enquiries are handled with complete discretion. He is available for conferences anywhere in England and Wales, at short notice, in person or by video.

Instruct Nick Robinson

Nick accepts instructions from solicitors, law firms, and – via Direct Access – directly from members of the public. He advises at any stage of a criminal investigation or prosecution, including the pre-charge stage, when the right strategy can make the greatest difference.

All enquiries are handled with complete discretion. Nick can attend a conference in person, by telephone, or by video anywhere in England and Wales, at short notice.

Nick Robinson is regulated by the Bar Standards Board.

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

Expertise

Sexual offences

Nick Robinson is one of the Western Circuit's most experienced sexual offences defence barristers, recommended by the Legal 500 every year since 2011 – with specific recognition of his specialism 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 – and has secured acquittals in cases others regarded as unwinnable.

"He specialises in sexual offence cases, particularly those involving children and historical allegations".

Nick's defining strengths are forensic preparation and fearless cross-examination. He drafts defence statements that force disclosure capable of transforming a case, and he is at his most effective where police investigations have been one-sided, where complainants' accounts do not withstand scrutiny, and where third-party material – from social services, medical records, schools, or the Family Court – fatally undermines the prosecution.

Nick is regularly instructed in cases of acute sensitivity – allegations spanning decades, multiple complainants, or cases with a high media profile – and is equally at home leading a complex trial as he is advising at the investigative stage before charge.

Selected Cases

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 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 (x2), 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.

Homicide (Murder and Manslaughter)

Nick has extensive experience defending in murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, and causing death by driving, appearing as both sole advocate and led junior in complex multi-defendant trials lasting up to twelve weeks. He is regularly led by some of the most prominent King's Counsel on the Western Circuit in cases attracting significant national media coverage – including BBC News, Sky News, ITV, The Guardian, The Telegraph, and the Daily Mail.

Selected Cases

R v JB – (2026) Attempted murder – knife attack. Prosecution’s forensic linguistic expert evidence excluded. Not guilty of attempted murder despite a guilty plea to s.18 wounding. *Reported:* [Dorset Echo](#).

R v X (youth) – Winchester Crown Court (2025) Murder (joint enterprise) – 28-day trial before Mr Justice Linden; led by Zafar Ali KC (23 Essex Street). Four defendants stood trial arising from two linked incidents involving e-bikes being deliberately rammed by vehicles as part of an ongoing feud. Nick’s client, a youth, was alleged to have been accessories to murder in the first incident. Nick drafted and made all legal arguments, secured exclusion of bad character evidence, and made the submission of no-case to answer. The defendant did not give evidence, and the jury acquitted him of both murder and manslaughter after 33 hours of deliberation. *Reported:* [BBC News](#), [Daily Mail](#), [ITV News](#).

R v Edward Jones – Winchester Crown Court (2024) Assisting an offender and fraud linked to a murder investigation; twelve-week trial led by Zafar Ali KC. Previous consistent statement successfully admitted under a hearsay exception. Unanimous not guilty on all counts. *Reported:* [Daily Mail](#), [Andover Advertiser](#).

R v Atiqullah Oryakhail – Bournemouth Crown Court (2024) Attempted murder; defendant aged 17, trafficked from Afghanistan, diagnosed with PTSD. Confession obtained under caution in Vienna challenged and excluded. Not guilty of attempted murder by judicial direction. *Reported:* [Daily Mail](#), [Daily Echo](#).

R v Lawangeen Abdulrahimzai – Salisbury Crown Court (2024) Murder – led by Jo Martin KC; thousands of pages of evidence, including social services records, and material from criminal and civil proceedings in Italy, Norway, and Serbia. Bad character evidence relating to a previous double murder conviction in Serbia. *Reported:* [BBC News](#), [ITV](#), [Sky News](#), [The Guardian](#), [Daily Mail](#), [The Telegraph](#).

R v Benjamin Atkins – Winchester Crown Court (2024) Murder – two-handed trial before Mrs Justice Stacey; led by Zafar Ali KC. Non-defendant bad character evidence admitted regarding the deceased’s drug dealing and violence. Convicted by majority after 33 hours of deliberation. *Reported:* [BBC News](#), [Sky News](#). Prosecution sought 30+ years; 19 years imposed on basis Court accepted defence submissions Atkins acted in excessive self-defence (sentencing remarks); AG Reference increased by only 2 years: Atkins & another [2024] EWCA Crim 1316. *Reported:* [BBC News](#).

R v Jack Hindley – Winchester Crown Court (2022) Murder of a vulnerable adult. Two youth defendants alleged to have carried out a ritualistic knife attack; led by Kate Lumsdon KC. Successful applications to admit co-defendant’s bad character, and to exclude purported confession evidence. Four-week trial before Mr Justice Sweeney. *Reported:* [BBC News](#), [ITV](#).

R v Kieran Cameron – Winchester Crown Court (2015) Attempted murder. The defendant was alleged to have knocked on the door of a drug dealer's home and fired a revolver twice. The complainant instantly telephoned police and named the defendant, who was known to him. The evidence included gunshot residue, cell site, ANPR, over 100 hours of CCTV, and bad character evidence relating to both the defendant's and complainant's membership of organised crime gangs. A novel point of law arose regarding the admissibility of hearsay evidence from three eyewitnesses who refused to attend court; their comments to police at the scene suggested someone other than the defendant was the assassin. Unanimous acquittal. Led by Nigel Lickley KC. *Reported:* [Daily Echo](#).

R v Teresa Sheldon – Winchester Crown Court (2015) Murder and attempted murder. The defendant killed one of her two children and severely injured the second in a suicide attempt by fire. Complex psychiatric evidence; periods of assessment under section 35 of the Mental Health Act 1983. The Crown accepted pleas to manslaughter and arson on the basis of diminished responsibility. At sentence, Mr Justice Dingemans heard victim impact evidence from the children's father in open court and resolved the discrete issue of whether to impose a sentence of imprisonment or a hospital order. Careful submissions were advanced in support of an order without restrictions, which was the sentence passed. Led by Nigel Lickley KC. *Reported:* [BBC News](#).

R v Nicholas Price – Winchester Crown Court (2015) Murder and attempted murder – three-week trial. Loss of control and self-defence in a cuckooing context involving gangland violence and firearms. Led by Nigel Lickley KC. *Reported:* [BBC News](#).

R v Jason Darby – Winchester Crown Court (2015) Attempted murder. Psychotic episode whilst listening to the Archers;

multiple stab wounds to skull, head, and face. Crown accepted a guilty plea to s.18 GBH with intent – following service of psychiatric evidence. *Reported: [Daily Express](#) and [Daily Echo](#).*

R v Nathan Robinson – Winchester Crown Court (2014) Murder. The Crown's case was that the victim was murdered for his money. The defence case was that the defendant, who had a long and complex history of mental ill-health arising from childhood trauma, denied murder on the grounds of diminished responsibility and loss of control. There was significant competing psychiatric evidence. The novel issue in the case was whether the jury were entitled, in the absence of direct evidence, to infer a loss of self-control. Led by Michael Vere-Hodge QC. *Reported: [BBC News](#).*

R v Melling Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) [2014] EWCA Crim 742 – Appeal against murder conviction, Liverpool Crown Court. *Reported: [BBC News](#).*

Financial Crime incl Fraud POCA

Nick has defended individuals and organisations in multi-million-pound mortgage fraud, conspiracy to defraud, rogue trader prosecutions, and regulatory investigations brought by government departments. He has a proven record of exposing disclosure failures and prosecutorial misconduct – including cases where officers in charge have misled prosecution counsel and concealed unused material, resulting in entire multi-defendant prosecutions collapsing. His pre-charge work in fraud investigations has prevented prosecution entirely. He accepts Direct Access instructions in fraud cases and can advise from the earliest stage of an investigation.

Selected Cases

R v AP (Operation Ringwood) – Pre-charge (2019–2022) Pension liberation fraud investigation by Dorset Police. Direct access. Nick represented the client throughout, including advising in relation to Restraint proceedings. Following three years of investigation, the Crown took no further action in October 2022. A clear example of specialist pre-charge advice preventing prosecution entirely.

R v A & Others – (2021) Defence of company and individual defendants charged with criminal offences arising from alleged breaches of planning enforcement notices. Nick negotiated an out of court settlement, and the prosecution offered no evidence on all charges.

R v JW and Others – (2019) Seven-defendant rogue trader conspiracy targeting a vulnerable, partially sighted victim in Bournemouth. The group repeatedly attended the victim's home, posing as tradesmen and officials, and defrauded him over a sustained period. Nick's client was the only defendant acquitted; all six co-defendants were convicted and sentenced to between 21 months and three years and four months' imprisonment. *Reported: [BH Living](#), [Bournemouth One](#).*

R v AP and others – Winchester Crown Court (2015) Multi-defendant fraud prosecution (75 charges; five defendants) brought by the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills. The officer in charge had misled prosecution counsel and concealed disclosure, and the officer in charge and disclosure officer were the same person contrary to the Attorney General's Code of Practice. Fresh review uncovered further suppressed material. Both trials collapsed. All defendants including Nick's client AP were formally acquitted of all charges. High-profile case involving Richard Carr. *Reported: [Daily Echo](#).*

R v JH and others – (2015) Eleven-defendant £4 million mortgage fraud – fabricated occupations and incomes used to obtain mortgages on multiple properties. Nick's client acquitted on two of three counts; 12-month sentence suspended for two years on the third. Co-defendants sentenced to between two and a half and four years' imprisonment. *Reported: [Daily Echo](#).*

R v SM – (2015) Handling stolen goods – proceeds of an insider fraud against a multinational company. Following disclosure applications, it emerged that the employer's investigator had coerced, pressured, and intimidated the defendant – a young woman of good character – into confessing, having promised there would be no police involvement if she admitted the

offences. The employer broke that promise and the Crown prosecuted. Nick's abuse of process application succeeded after contested findings of fact (the investigator denied making the promises); the Crown offered no evidence.

Motoring offences

Nick has appeared at every level from the Magistrates' Court to the High Court (case stated) in the most serious road traffic cases: death by dangerous and careless driving, automatism, drink and drug driving, and novel questions of identification and regulatory compliance.

Selected Cases

R v PB – (2025) Causing serious injury by dangerous driving (three counts). Southern Vectis double-decker bus crash on the A3056, Isle of Wight – the defendant missed a turning, failed to negotiate a bend, and the bus left the road. Twelve passengers on board; three sustained broken backs. Unanimous not guilty on all three counts after 30 minutes of jury retirement. Defendant admitted careless driving – sentenced to a fine and penalty points. *Reported:* [Isle of Wight County Press](#), [Island Echo](#).

R v CC – Magistrates' Court (2024) Drug driving. Direct access. Prosecution failed to provide the second blood sample and analytical data pack for the defence expert – 89 days after a court order. Prosecution offered no evidence. Acquitted.

R v JB – Magistrates' Court (2021) Drink driving. Direct access. Laced drinks defence at trial supported by expert toxicology evidence. Acquitted.

R v IC – (2020) Causing death by careless driving – fatal pedestrian collision. It was not in dispute that the defendant had driven over the pedestrian whilst she lay prone in the carriageway. The Crown alleged his failure to take evasive action amounted to careless driving. The defence was that another vehicle may have caused the fatal injuries before the defendant's arrival and that, confronted with a sudden emergency, he made a wrong decision in the agony of the moment – the collision was explicable by external factors including road conditions, lighting, and weather. Expert evidence from two pathologists and two collision investigators. Bad character and hearsay evidence excluded. Unanimous not guilty after 90 minutes of deliberation in a six-day trial. A second driver pleaded guilty in the Magistrates' Court to careless driving. *Reported:* [The Sun](#), [Daily Mail](#), [Metro](#), [Daily Echo](#).

R v GB – Magistrates' Court (2019) Failure to provide a specimen. Direct Access instruction. No statutory warning given; critical CCTV withheld despite a court order. Prosecution offered no evidence. Acquitted.

R v TM – (2019) Careless driving conviction appeal. Direct Access. Sole prosecution witness an off-duty police officer. Nick's skeleton exposed that the officer had simultaneously acted as investigator, officer in charge, and disclosure officer; that the in-car camera was "non-functioning" without independent verification; that the schedule of unused material was missing; and that the prosecution's own telematics expert had inadvertently corroborated the defence case. A former police officer instructed as defence expert. Crown offered no evidence at appeal; conviction quashed. Costs ordered.

R v DQ – (2018) Causing death by careless driving – fatal collision at a right-turn junction in Ferndown; motorcyclist aged 67 struck and killed. Expert witnesses for both prosecution and defence agreed that parts of the carriageway were obscured by shadows and bright sunlight. Nick successfully argued that a careful driver in the same conditions might have failed to see the motorcycle, and the defendant's account that it was obscured from view was consistent with the expert evidence. Acquitted. *Reported:* [Daily Echo](#).

R v JB – (2016) Causing danger to road users (s.23 RTA 1988). Defendant alleged to have grabbed the steering wheel of a moving vehicle at approximately 70mph on the A35 at 3am, causing it to roll. Three witnesses in the car alleged the defendant caused the vehicle to overturn, seriously injuring its occupants. Nick instructed an independent accident reconstruction expert who challenged the prosecution's vehicle examiner on the significance of the absence of seat belt marks – establishing that in a rollover the absence of marks cannot indicate that belts were not worn. Unanimous not guilty verdict.

R v AM – (2016) Guilty plea to causing death by careless driving whilst unfit through drink. High-profile and tragic case. Defendant was sentenced to 4 years and 4 months imprisonment: *Reported: [BBC News](#)*.

R v AP – Magistrates’ Court (2013) Drink driving in a Ferrari. The defendant's drinks had been spiked without his knowledge. Successful special reasons argument supported by expert evidence, securing no disqualification despite an elevated minimum disqualification period arising from a prior drink driving conviction. Absolute discharge.

R v PH – (2011) Four-day trial. The defendant, a National Express coach driver, lost control of his vehicle in the New Forest late at night, drifting onto the hard shoulder and up an embankment before crossing three lanes of the motorway with 49 passengers on board. With expert evidence from a neurologist and a sleep specialist, Nick successfully argued that the defendant had not fallen asleep as alleged but had suffered an episode of automatism. The jury also accepted that his decision to continue the journey to Ringwood did not constitute dangerous or careless driving. Unanimously acquitted on all counts. *Reported: [Daily Echo](#) and [Daily Echo](#)*.

R v Fitch – High Court (2011) Case stated appeal – s.172 RTA 1988. Obligation to “give” information does not extend to ensuring its safe receipt. Conviction quashed.

R v MH – Magistrates’ Court (2008) Failure to provide a specimen of urine. Legal argument on the proper meaning of “failure to provide”; not guilty in the absence of medical evidence.

Proceeds of crime

Nick has appeared in POCA confiscation hearings, cash detention and forfeiture proceedings, and asset recovery applications including contested matters involving sums in excess of £1 million.

Selected Cases

R v TB – (2021) Possession of criminal property. Over £70,000 in cash found in the defendant’s boot. Prosecution offered no evidence following service of Nick’s defence case statement. Not guilty verdict by judicial direction.

R v NV – (2021) Possession with intent to supply Class A drugs and money laundering. Following argument on the inadmissibility of text messages, Crown accepted a plea to simple possession; prosecution offered no evidence on supply and money laundering counts.

R v TJ [2010] EWCA Crim 3074 – Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) Confiscation Order following defendant’s guilty plea to importing cocaine from Barbados. Crown sought to confiscate over £200,000. Nick instructed on appeal. Court of Appeal acknowledged the “draconian” nature of the POCA regime. Lord Justice Moses: “*We are indebted to Mr Robinson*” for his written grounds and oral submissions.

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) Instructed on a direct access basis at the point of arrest on suspicion of attempted murder arising from the breakdown of a marriage. Early proactive representations to the police and Crown Prosecution Service secured successive reductions in the alleged offence – from attempted murder to ABH, and ultimately to common assault. A defence statement was served and targeted disclosure obtained, producing evidence that shaped the resolution of the case on a favourable basis. A custodial sentence was avoided. A compelling illustration of the value of retaining specialist counsel at the earliest possible 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.

Regulatory crime

Nick defends individuals and organisations in regulatory and corporate criminal proceedings, including health and safety prosecutions, local authority enforcement actions, dangerous dog cases, wildlife offences, and racially aggravated charges. He has particular experience negotiating outcomes that avoid the most serious consequences – including imprisonment, director disqualification, and disproportionate costs exposure – and has secured acquittals in cases attracting significant press attention.

Selected Cases

Dorset Council v Craig Robinson & Ringwood Raceway Ltd – Poole Magistrates' Court (2022). Local authority health and safety prosecution arising from a fireworks display at Ringwood Raceway in November 2021, attended by up to 2,000 people. A lit firework fell into a pickup truck containing unused fireworks stored under a thin plastic sheet, causing the vehicle to catch fire and shooting rockets into the sky. Dorset Council brought seven charges against the defendant; director of Ringwood Raceway Ltd. Nick negotiated a guilty plea to a single offence; the prosecution offered no evidence on the remaining six charges. The defendant was fined and avoided imprisonment, director disqualification, and costs exposure of over £30,000. The council subsequently permitted a display the following year after assisting the defendant to improve his risk assessment. *Reported: [BBC News](#).*

R v KP – (2015) Dangerous dog. The defendant's black Labrador attacked a three-year-old boy at Whitecliff Park, Poole, causing serious facial injuries requiring 40 stitches. The child had been on a family picnic when the dog, which was off the

lead near a children's play area, jumped on him without warning. The jury found the dog was not "dangerously out of control" as required by section 3 of the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991. Acquitted. *Reported: [Daily Mail](#).*

R v JF – Youth Court (2014) Successful defence of a youth charged with two offences, namely an offence of killing a deer contrary to the Deer Act 1991, and in the alternative cruelty to a deer contrary to the Wild Mammals (Protection) Act 1996. *Reported: [Daily Mail](#).*

Drugs Offences

Nick is regularly instructed in the most serious drug cases, from county lines conspiracies to multi-tonne international importations prosecuted by the NCA and SEROCU. His practice encompasses covert surveillance operations, EncroChat prosecutions, cross-border investigations, modern slavery defences, and multi-defendant conspiracies requiring meticulous analysis of voluminous material. He has a proven record of exposing disclosure failings and prosecutorial misconduct – and of drafting defence statements so effective that prosecutions have collapsed before trial.

Selected Cases

R v RH – (2025) Multi-defendant drug conspiracy (Class A and B). The defendant was extradited from South Africa after 12 years abroad, with co-defendants already convicted and serving up to 10 years. Nick identified that the police had misrepresented the charges to the South African courts. Following service of defence statement the prosecution offered no evidence on the Class A cocaine conspiracy. Bail obtained against strong prosecution objection. Agreed basis of plea limited the defendant's role on the Class B count to a single day; following a Goodyear indication, a suspended sentence was imposed.

R v AD and Others – (2024) Conspiracy to supply Class A drugs – the defendant was alleged to be the head of an OCG operating between London and the south coast. He denied involvement and contended he had been set up by informants; the alleged "kingpin phone" had been planted in his car. Eighteen-month covert surveillance operation; cell site and radio frequency evidence; expert DNA evidence on drugs and a cocaine press; telephone schedules; police intelligence. DNA evidence excluded pre-trial. Cross-examination of over a dozen covert surveillance officers exposed disclosure failings; section 8 disclosure applications and a PII application mid-trial. Jury discharged on day 11. Abuse of process argument followed. Prosecution offered no evidence after a case review; formal not guilty verdicts by judicial direction. Nick led [David Jenkins](#) of 3PB Barristers.

R v CL – Oxford Crown Court (2023) Possession with intent to supply 1kg of high-purity cocaine (estimated street value exceeding £100,000) and acquiring criminal property. Scottish and Oxfordshire officers stopped the defendant's Mercedes travelling from Hamilton, Scotland to Bournemouth; the cocaine was concealed in a stage light stored among his equipment as a singer and magician. The defendant maintained he had agreed to transport something he suspected was contraband cigarettes for an acquaintance and knew nothing about the drugs. Good character evidence called from a church minister and former Scottish Football Association referee; full good character direction secured; adverse inference from partial no-comment interview successfully resisted. Unanimous not guilty verdict after approximately seven hours' deliberation; costs awarded. *Reported: [Oxford Mail](#), [Telegraph](#) and [Scottish Sun](#).*

R v EA – (2023) Possession with intent to supply cannabis and four counts of possessing offensive weapons (baseball bats). Drugs and weapons found in the boot of a vehicle. Modern slavery defence on the drugs count. Successful application to adduce bad character evidence of the defendant's handler – a drug dealer and member of an organised crime group – including evidence of threats and violence against the defendant and his parents. Unanimous not guilty on two weapons counts; non-custodial sentence on the remaining two. Hung jury on the drugs charge; the judge observed no realistic prospect of conviction. Prosecution offered no evidence on retrial. Acquitted.

R v RG and Others – Harrow Crown Court (2023) Conspiracy to supply Class A drugs (56kg cocaine). Defendants were Albanian nationals. Nick acted for the principal defendant. Following consideration of extensive disclosure, the defendant pleaded guilty on a basis, and was sentenced to nine years' imprisonment – significantly below the prescribed starting point

in excess of twenty years for quantities far exceeding the Category 1 threshold of 5kg. The Solicitor General referred the sentence as unduly lenient. Nick's submissions in the Court of Appeal limited the increase to just four-and-a-half years (total thirteen-and-a-half years). *Reported: [2023] EWCA Crim 1634.*

R v ED and Others (Operation Whale) –Southampton Crown Court (2023) Conspiracy to import 2.1 tonnes of cocaine (estimated street value £180 million) into Southampton docks – Operation Whale, a joint investigation by SEROCU and the NCA. Police intercepted the motor vessel KAHU in international waters after it had travelled from the Caribbean. The defendant was captain of a motor yacht, Bubble E, intercepted and found to contain hides; the prosecution case was that the defendant and two co-accused were to collect the cocaine offshore. Extensive disclosure spanning Ecuador, St Petersburg, Dubai, and the Caribbean. The prosecution sought a sentence in excess of 20 years; 15 years' imprisonment secured. *Reported: Portsmouth News, Hertfordshire Mercury, Southern Daily Echo, Yahoo, Surrey Live.*

R v WT – (2022) Five counts of concerned in supply of heroin, crack cocaine, cannabis, and cocaine. Drug-dealing messages attributable to another person; no forensic link to a weapon. Crown offered no evidence on four counts; suspended sentence on the lesser remaining count.

R v WG – (2018–19) Seven counts including Supply of Class A (0.5kg cocaine) and Class B (1kg cannabis) drugs, and Possessing Criminal Property (£8,500 cash). Over 127,000 pages of prosecution evidence including raw phone data across four discs. Meticulous preparatory work with the client and a comprehensive defence case statement identified eighteen grounds for suspecting that the co-defendant and an uncharged third party – at whose address and vehicle the cocaine and cannabis were seized – had conspired with police to implicate the defendant, including that the officer in the case had been observed in private conversation with the co-defendant outside court. Disclosure requests forced the Crown to serve the raw telephone data as evidence. Following service of the defence statement, the prosecution offered no evidence on all counts. Not guilty by judicial direction.

R v MHS and Others – (2018) Conspiracy to blackmail arising from an eleven-defendant organized crime group (Operation Firebug). Co-defendant pleaded guilty. Defendant allegedly committed offence immediately following his release from prison following an unrelated Blackmail conviction. Cross-examination of the protected complainant – himself a large-scale drug dealer never prosecuted – established fundamental contradictions in his account. Unanimous not guilty verdict after seven days.

R v DL – (2017) Conspiracy to supply 10kg of heroin and money laundering. Following legal argument the Crown accepted pleas to lesser offences and the defendant received a community order.

R v LT – (2016) Possession of cannabis. Novel defence of lawful possession (s.7(1) MDA 1971) – bar manager conveying a patron's cannabis to police. Unanimous not guilty; costs awarded.

R v KS – (2015) Importation of a controlled drug – 2kg of pure opium concealed in a hollowed-out compartment within a chessboard, intercepted by Border Force at Heathrow en route from Istanbul to the defendant's business premises. NCA investigation. The prosecution relied upon a similar chessboard found at the defendant's home and postal and flight records demonstrating strong links to Istanbul. The issue was whether the defendant was responsible for the package and its contents. Acquitted after trial.

R v NN – (2014) Possession with intent to supply. Prosecution alleged that the defendant threw away 71 wraps of heroin and cocaine when he was approached by two police officers for a stop and search. Defendant denied this and said that the drugs were nothing to do with him and he had been "set up" by the police. Unanimous not guilty.

R v TA – (2013) Possession with Intent to Supply a Class A drug. Defendant was searched as he entered a nightclub to celebrate New Year's Eve. A small bag containing 40 Ecstasy tablets was found tied to the drawstring of his trousers seemingly concealed between his legs. His defence at trial was that they were nothing to do with him and in a rush he had put on trousers belonging to someone else and he was unaware that the drugs were concealed within the clothing. Acquitted.

R v AT – (2013) Six-handed conspiracy to import cocaine – Operation Fabula. A three-year covert joint investigation by Devon and Cornwall Police, Dorset Police, and HMRC. Customs officers at Portsmouth seized 10kg of cocaine from a car arriving from Bilbao, Spain, concealed in fuel tanks. The 14-week trial at Bournemouth Crown Court was reportedly the first to feature an extradition of a co-defendant from Brazil. *Reported: BBC News.*

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) Instructed on a direct access basis at the point of arrest on suspicion of attempted murder arising from the breakdown of a marriage. Early proactive representations to the police and Crown Prosecution Service secured successive reductions in the alleged offence – from attempted murder to ABH, and ultimately to common assault. A defence statement was served and targeted disclosure obtained, producing evidence that shaped the resolution of the case on a favourable basis. A custodial sentence was avoided. A compelling illustration of the value of retaining specialist counsel at the earliest possible stage.

Appeals

Nick has appeared in over 41 appeals in the Court of Appeal (Criminal Division), including 12 against conviction, and in a death penalty appeal before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. His written grounds and skeleton arguments have drawn repeated judicial commendation.

Selected appeals

R v DH [2024] EWCA Crim 1003 – 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 man of effective good character and the family's sole breadwinner – received a community order. At sentencing, the Recorder imposed a wide restraining order without formal application, victim evidence, or notice, notwithstanding active Family Court proceedings. Nick appealed; before Stuart-Smith LJ, Stacey J, and HHJ Conrad KC the Court quashed the order as "*wrong in principle, both substantively and procedurally*" and recorded: "*The Court is grateful to Mr Robinson... for the high quality of his written submissions.*"

R v Simpson [2022] EWCA Crim 201 – Eleven-count indictment; serious sexual offences against stepdaughters. Sentence of 6 years reduced to 5 years 4 months. The Court (Lord Justice Bean, Mr Justice Sweeney, HHJ Griffiths-Jones QC) held that the sentencing judge had given insufficient weight to mitigation and had wrongly conflated plea credit with personal mitigation, including early admissions, remorse, and offending manifestly out of character. HHJ Griffiths-Jones QC commended Nick for having exercised “good judgment.”

R v NT [2016] All ER (D) 56 (Dec) – Appeal against conviction and renewed application for leave to appeal sentence (Elias LJ, Sweeney J, Judge Dean QC). The appellant, aged 64, was convicted by a majority of 10–2 of two historic indecent assaults committed in 1972; acquitted on two further counts. The Crown had adduced bad character evidence – 23 indecent images found on the appellant's laptop – to prove sexual interest in children over 40 years earlier. Nick argued the evidence was incapable of establishing propensity and was unduly prejudicial. The conviction appeal was dismissed, though the Court acknowledged some judges might not have admitted the evidence. On sentence, Nick successfully renewed leave before the Full Court after refusal by the Single Judge. Two consecutive 6-month terms held manifestly excessive and wrong in principle; ordered concurrent; appellant immediately released.

R v Melling [2014] EWCA Crim 742 – Appeal against Murder conviction, Liverpool Crown Court. *Reported:* [BBC News](#).

R v Mansell [2014] – Appeal against conviction for Murder at Winchester Crown Court. Pro bono. *Reported:* [BBC News](#).

R v H [2014] EWCA Crim 168 – Appeal against sentence. The Crown Court Judge had imposed a sentence of 4 years, reached a finding of “dangerousness” and passed an extended license period of 6 years. The Court of Appeal agreed that the sentence was manifestly excessive and wrong in principle. The sentence was quashed and substituted with a term of 2 years and 8 months. As the sentence was less than 4 years the finding of dangerousness and the extended license were also quashed.

R v Smyth [2013] EWCA Crim 385 – Appeal against sentence of 18 months’ imprisonment. The Court of Appeal (Lord Chief Justice, Mackay J and Sweeney J) unanimously allowed the appeal, quashed the sentence of imprisonment and substituted it with a 2-year community order with a mental health treatment requirement.

R v Mark Lee H [2014] EWCA Crim 855 – Appeal against conviction and sentence. Appellant had been tried and convicted by a jury in respect of serious sexual offences. He appealed against his conviction on the basis of information that came to light after the trial, which indicated that the Prosecution had failed to disclose relevant evidence. The Prosecution's investigation resulted in an admission by them that there had been a material non-disclosure. The Court of Appeal held that whilst this caused them “considerable concern” the convictions were not unsafe. The appeal against sentence was allowed. The Court of Appeal quashed the sentence of 3 years and substituted it with a term of 2 years.

R v Knight [2013] EWCA Crim 2486 – Rape conviction appeal; Court clarified the “proper evidential basis” test for admitting evidence of a false previous complaint. Fulford J: Nick’s submissions were “*detailed and able*.”

R v Morris [2013] EWCA Crim 350 – Application for leave to appeal against a sentence for six breaches of a Sexual Offences Prevention Order. Appeal allowed. 16 months substituted with 10 months' imprisonment.

R v Sherriff [2012] EWCA Crim 2381 – s.18 wounding with intent: 9-year sentence. Lord Justice Aikens: “Mr Robinson presented the arguments very concisely, clearly and persuasively.”

R v McDonald [2012] EWCA Crim 1757 – Appeal against sentence. Appellant had been sentenced to 32 months for an offence of inflicting grievous bodily harm contrary to section 20 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861. The appeal was successful and Moses, LJ; Field, J and Keith, J reduced the sentence to 18 months.

R v Windle [2012] EWCA Crim 2379 – Appeal against sentence. Sentencing Judge had wrongly imposed a sentence pursuant to section 116 of the Powers of Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000. The Court of Appeal held that this was unlawful because section 116 was not in force at the time having been repealed in April 2005. Instructed as fresh Counsel following the Crown Court proceedings.

R v Dillon [2011] EWCA Crim 1454 – Appeal against conviction. The appellant, an Australian national, was convicted of one count of indecent assault and two counts of assault of a child by penetration, committed against two young female relatives during visits to the United Kingdom spanning three decades. He was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment. On appeal

before Laws LJ, Lloyd Jones J and Stadlen J, Nick successfully argued that the convictions were unsafe owing to the trial judge's handling of a jury question during deliberations. The jury had requested to re-hear part of the child complainant's ABE interview; the judge read out only the passage the jury asked for but failed to draw their attention to an earlier exculpatory statement in which the child had stated she had told the truth. All three convictions were quashed. A retrial was ordered. Prosecution offered no evidence. Acquitted by judicial direction.

R v Woodcock [2011] EWCA Crim 1347 – Appeal against sentence. Burglary and aggravated vehicle taking: 7 years 6 months reduced to 6 years 4 months. Mr Justice Blair: *"It is submitted by Mr Robinson, who has argued this case well for the applicant, that this is excessive."*

R v Ahmed [2011] EWCA Crim 775 – Appeal against sentence. Sexual offence: 6 months' imprisonment substituted with a community order.

R v Lewis [2011] EWCA Crim 1510 – Bladed article in a public place: 16 weeks reduced to 10 weeks.

Pro bono death penalty work. Nick has advised and acted pro bono in capital appeals against conviction from the Court of Appeal of Jamaica to the Privy Council, including **R v Peter Stewart [2011] UK PC 11**. Led by John Aspinall QC. Nick is a member of the Independent Jamaica Council for Human Rights.

R v Moss [2010] EWCA Crim 2896; [2011] EWCA Crim 252; [2011] Crim LR 560 – Appeal against conviction revolving around (i) the admissibility of recognition evidence of police officers, (ii) Turnbull, (iii) Code D of PACE 1984, (iv) the jury being invited to look at a still image (from CCTV footage) of a person that is alleged to be the accused, and (without the benefit of body mapping evidence) contrasting this with the defendant in the dock.

R v Kløver [2010] EWCA Crim 3237 – Appeal against sentence. The Court of Appeal reduced a compensation order of £23,000 to £2,880. Moses LJ held (at para.4): "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". For reporting of the original case. [Reported: Daily Echo](#).

R v Jacobs [2010] EWCA Crim 3074 – Appeal against sentence. Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 Confiscation Order following defendant's guilty plea to importing cocaine from Barbados. Crown sought to confiscate over £200,000. Court acknowledged the "draconian" nature of the POCA regime. Lord Justice Moses: *"We are indebted to Mr Robinson"* for his written grounds and oral submissions.

R v Bennett [2010] EWCA Crim 1032 – Threat to kill: 21 months reduced to 15 months. Mr Justice Davis: *"Mr Robinson, on behalf of the Appellant, has put the case very well."*