

CROWN COURT PRACTICE:
TRIAL

Supplement

PETER FALLON
and
RUPERT BURSELL

BUTTERWORTHS

CROWN COURT PRACTICE: TRIAL

SUPPLEMENT

by

PETER FALLON, Q.C., LL.B.,
a Recorder

and

RUPERT BURSELL, LL.B., M.A., D.Phil.,
of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister

LONDON
BUTTERWORTHS
1979

ENGLAND: BUTTERWORTH & CO. (PUBLISHERS) LTD.
LONDON: 88 KINGSWAY, WC2B 6AB
AUSTRALIA: BUTTERWORTHS PTY. LTD.
SYDNEY: 586 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, CHATSWOOD, NSW 2067
Also at MELBOURNE, BRISBANE, ADELAIDE
and PERTH
CANADA: BUTTERWORTH & CO. (CANADA) LTD.
TORONTO: 2265 MIDLAND AVENUE, SCARBOROUGH
M1P 4S1
NEW ZEALAND: BUTTERWORTHS OF NEW ZEALAND LTD.
WELLINGTON: 77/85 CUSTOMHOUSE QUAY
SOUTH AFRICA: BUTTERWORTH & CO. (SOUTH AFRICA) (PTY.) LTD.
DURBAN: 152/154 GALE STREET
USA: BUTTERWORTH (PUBLISHERS) INC
BOSTON: 19 CUMMINS PARK, WOBURN, MASS. 01801



BUTTERWORTH & CO. (PUBLISHERS) LTD.

1979

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying and recording, without the written permission of the copyright holder, application for which should be addressed to the publisher. Such written permission must also be obtained before any part of this publication is stored in a retrieval system of any nature.

ISBN—0 406 19845 4

This book is sold subject to the Standard Condition of Sale of Net Books and may not be resold in the UK below the net price fixed by Butterworths for the book in our current catalogue.

Printed by Henry Burt & Son Ltd., College Street, Kempston, Bedford

This Supplement is up to date to 30th September 1978

Table of Statutes

References in this Table to "Statutes" are the Halsbury's Statutes of England (Third Edition) showing the volume and page at which the annotated text of the Act will be found.

	PAGE		PAGE
Agriculture and Horticulture Act 1964 (1 <i>Statutes</i> 528)—		Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1976 (44 <i>Statutes</i> 164)	A4
Schedule	A25	Protection of Children Act 1978	A31
Criminal Law Act 1977 (47 <i>Statutes</i> 142)—		s. 1	A36
s. 62	A4	(1)-(4)	A36
Firearms Act 1968 (8 <i>Statutes</i> 727)—		2	A36
s. 19	A16	(1)	A36, A37
57	A16	(3)	A37
(4)	A16	3 (1), (2)	A3
Food and Drugs Act 1955—		5	A37
s. 60	A25	6 (2)	A37
Forgery Act 1913 (8 <i>Statutes</i> 257)—		7 (2)-(5)	A37
s. 6, 8	A31	Road Traffic Act 1972 (42 <i>Statutes</i> 1633)—	
Gaming Act 1845 (14 <i>Statutes</i> 523)	A20	s. 7 (1)	A35
General Rate Act 1967 (27 <i>Statutes</i> 72)—		8 (1)	A33
s. 49 (8)	A25, A27	(2)	A33, A34
Homicide Act 1957 (8 <i>Statutes</i> 457)—		(3)	A35
s. 2	A13, A14	(7)	A34
3	A12	9 (1)	A34
Housing Finance Act 1972	A25	(3), (5)	A35
Income Tax Act 1952—		Sexual Offences Act 1956 (8 <i>Statutes</i> 415)—	
s. 505	A25	s. 32	A32
Indecency with Children Act 1960 (8 <i>Statutes</i> 486)	A31	Sexual Offences Act 1967 (8 <i>Statutes</i> 577)—	
Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 (41 <i>Statutes</i> 878)—		s. 1 (1)	A32
s. 5 (2)	A39	Theft Act 1968 (8 <i>Statutes</i> 782)—	
National Health Service Act 1952 (23 <i>Statutes</i> 118)—		s. 15	A19, A20, A22, A24
s. 6	A25	16 (2): A20, A21, A24, A26, A27, A30	
Oaths Act 1978—		Sch. 3, Pt. I	A25
s. 1	A39	Theft Act 1978—	
(1)	A39	s. 1	A19, A21, A22, A23, A27
(2), (3)	A40	(2)	A20, A21, A22, A30
3	A40	2	A19, A21, A23, A24, A27, A28
4	A40	(1)	A25, A26, A27, A28
(1), (2)	A40	(2)	A20, A25, A26
6	A40	(3)	A23, A25, A26
(1), (2)	A40	(4)	A25
Post Office Act 1953 (25 <i>Statutes</i> 413)—		3	A19, A21, A23, A29, A30, A31
s. 11	A37	(1)	A21, A29
		(2)	A21, A29
		4 (2)	A19, A24, A29
		(3), (4)	A29
		5 (1)	A19, A24
		(5)	A19

Table of Cases

In the following Table references are given to the English and Empire Digest where a digest of the case may be found.

	PAGE
Ali [1978] Crim L R 245	A45
Anderson v Miller (1976) 64 Cr App Rep 178	A16
Anderson [1978] Crim L R 223	A18
Ashton-Rickardt [1978] 1 All ER 173, [1978] 1 WLR 37, 142 JP 90, 121 Sol Jo 774, 65 Cr App Rep 67, CA	A38
Aston [1970] 3 All ER 1045, [1970] 1 WLR 1584, 55 Cr App Rep 48, 135 JP 89, 114 Sol Jo 906, CA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1386	A21
Atkinson v Walker [1976] RTR 117	A33, A34
A-G's Reference (No. 3 of 1977) [1978] 3 All ER 1166, [1978] 1 WLR 1123, 122 Sol Jo 641, CA	A36
A-G's Reference (No. 1 of 1978) [1978] RTR 377, 122 Sol Jo 489, C.A.	A33
Bailey (1961) 66 Cr App Rep 31	A1, A13, A14, A43
Baldwin (1978) Times, 3rd May	A3
Barker (1975) 65 Cr App Rep 287	A3
Bayliss v Thames Valley Police Chief Constable [1978] RTR 328	A35
Bayliss and Oliver [1978] Crim LR 361	A1, A39
Beet (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 188	A4, A39
Bell [1978] Crim LR 233	A32
Bello [1978] Crim LR 551	A9, A12
Bennett (1978) Times, 11th August, CA	A41, A42
Bhachu (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 261	A17
Billinghurst [1978] Crim LR 553	A13
Blake (1978) Times, 4th May	A38
Bocking v Roberts [1974] QB 307, [1973] 3 All ER 962, [1973] 3 WLR 465, 138 JP 13, 117 Sol Jo 581, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1070	A38
Boggeln v Williams [1978] 2 All ER 1061, [1978] 1 WLR 873, 122 Sol Jo 94	A16, A17
Bonwick (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 266	A43
Bratty v A-G for Northern Ireland [1963] AC 386, [1961] 3 All ER 523, [1961] 3 WLR 965, 46 Cr App Rep 1, 105 Sol Jo 865, HL, 14 (1) Digest (Reissue) 15	A13
Bryant [1978] 2 All ER 689, [1978] 2 WLR 589, 122 Sol Jo 62, CA	A7, A43
Bundy (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 239, [1977] Crim LR 570	A19
Byrne [1960] 2 QB 396, [1960] 3 All ER 1, [1960] 3 WLR 440, 44 Cr App Rep 246, 104 Sol Jo 645, CCA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1129	A14
Callis v Gunn [1964] 1 QB 495, [1963] 3 All ER 677, [1963] 3 WLR 931, 48 Cr App Rep 36, 128 JP 41, 107 Sol Jo 831, 14 (2) Digest (Reissue) 551	A4
Camplin [1978] QB 254, [1978] 1 All ER 1236, [1977] 3 WLR 929, 66 Cr App Rep 37, affd. sub nom. Director of Prosecutions v Camplin [1978] 2 All ER 168, [1978] 2 WLR 679, 142 JP 320, 122 Sol Jo 281, HL	A11, A12, A13, A42
Carver [1978] QB 472, [1978] 3 All ER 60, [1978] 2 WLR 872, 122 Sol Jo 332, CA	A38
Christie (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 253, CA	A39
Clarke [1976] 2 All ER 696, 63 Cr App Rep 16, 140 JP 469, Digest Supp	A32
Clements v Dams [1978] RTR 206	A33, A34
Collins (1864) Le and Ca 471, 4 New Rep 299, 33 LJMC 177, 10 LT 581, 28 JP 436, 10 Jur NS 686, 12 WR 886, 9 Cox cc 497, 14 (1) Digest (Reissue) 112	A9, A10
Corcoran v Whent [1977] Crim LR 52	A30
Cromack [1978] Crim LR 217	A2, A8
Crook v Edmondson [1966] 2 QB 81, [1966] 1 All ER 833, [1966] 2 WLR 672, 66 Cr App Rep 90, 130 JP 191, 110 Sol Jo 147, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1101	A32
Crook (1973) 65 Cr App Rep 66, CA	A1
Crowley (1977) 64 Cr App Rep 225, [1977] Crim LR 426	A35
Davies v Leighton [1978] Crim LR 575, Times, 29th June	A17
Davies [1953] 1 QB 489, [1953] 1 All ER 341, [1953] 2 WLR 304, 37 Cr App Rep 16, 117 JP 121, 97 Sol Jo 117, CCA 14 (2) Digest (Reissue) 530	A18
Dawes [1978] Crim LR 503	A45
Director of Public Prosecutions v Camplin. <i>See</i> Camplin	
Director of Public Prosecutions v Goodchild (No 2)	
Director of Public Prosecutions v Hester [1973] AC 296, [1972] 3 All ER 1056, [1972] 3 WLR 910, 57 Cr App Rep 212, 137 JP 45, 116 Sol Jo 966, HL, 14 (2) Digest (Reissue) 654	A5

Director of Public Prosecutions v Jordan [1977] AC 699, [1976] 3 All ER 775, [1976] 3 WLR 887, 64 Cr App Rep 33, 120 Sol Jo 817, HL, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1043	A36
Director of Public Prosecutions v Nock [1978] 2 All ER 654, [1978] 3 WLR 57, 122 Sol Jo 417, [1978] Crim LR 483, HL	A8, A9, A10, A41
Director of Public Prosecutions v Ray [1974] AC 370, [1973] 3 All ER 131, [1973] 3 WLR 359, 58 Cr App Rep 130, 136 JP 744, 117 Sol Jo 633, HL, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1390	A29
Director of Public Prosecutions v Turner [1974] AC 357, [1973] 3 All ER 124, [1973] 3 WLR 352, 57 Cr App Rep 932, 137 JP 736, 117 Sol Jo 664, HL, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1388	A25
Dodd (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 87, CA	A32
Doukas [1978] 1 All ER 1061, [1978] 1 WLR 372, 66 Cr App Rep 228, 122 Sol Jo 30, CA	A19
Edwards v Ddin [1976] 3 All ER 705, [1976] 1 WLR 942, 63 Cr App Rep 218, 121 JP 27, 120 Sol Jo 587, [1976] RTR 508, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1256	A30
Edwards [1978] Crim LR 49	A19
Ellerton [1978] Crim LR 166	A15
Farrance [1978] RTR 225, [1978] Crim LR 496, CA	A8, A33
Feely [1973] QB 530, [1973] 1 All ER 341, [1973] 2 WLR 201; 57 Cr App Rep 312, 137 JP 157, 117 Sol Jo 54, CA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1264	A17
Folley [1978] Crim LR 556	A42
Ford [1978] 1 All ER 1129, [1977] 1 WLR 1083, 66 Cr App Rep 46, 142 JP 264, 121 Sol Jo 528, CA	A32
Gilbert [1977] 66 Cr App Rep 237	A11, A13
Goodchild (No 2) [1978] 1 All ER 649, [1977] 1 WLR 1213, 65 Cr App Rep 165, 121 Sol Jo 644, CA, revsd. sub nom. Director of Public Prosecutions v Goodchild [1978] 2 All ER 161, [1978] 1 WLR 578, 142 JP 338, 122 Sol Jo 263, HL	A39, A43
Gurney [1977] RTR 211, CA	A45
Hack [1978] Crim LR 359	A17
Hadley [1970] 3 All ER 1045, [1970] 1 WLR 1584, 55 Cr App Rep 48, 135 JP 89, 114 Sol Jo 906, CA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1386	A21
Harries [1978] Times, 28th April	A45
Hatton [1978] RTR 357, CA	A34
Haughton v Smith [1975] AC 476, [1973] 3 All ER 1109, [1974] 2 WLR 1; 58 Cr App Rep 198, 138 JP 31, 118 Sol Jo 7, HL, Digest Cont Vol D 149	A9, A10, A41
Head and Head [1978] Crim LR 427	A39, A40
Hector [1978] Times, 19th January	A10
Hehl [1977] 65 Cr App Rep 45, CA	A17, A18
Henn [1978] 3 All ER 1190, [1978] 1 WLR 1031, 122 Sol Jo 555, CA	A42
Hewett [1978] RTR 174, [1977] Crim LR 554, CA	A43
Hier v Read [1978] RTR 114, [1977] Crim LR 483	A35
Hierowski [1978] Crim LR 563	A39
Hillman [1978] RTR 124, CA	A35
Hills. See Metropolitan Police Comr v Hills	
Holmes v Chief Constable Merseyside Police [1976] Crim LR 125	A38
Houghton (1978) 142 JP 396, 122 Sol Jo 456, CA	A3, A4, A15
Hunjan (1978) Times, 3th June	A6
Hunt (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 105, CA	A16
Hussein [1978] Crim LR 219	A10
Isitt [1978] RTR 211, CA	A11
Jones (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 250, CA	A8
Jones [1978] RTR 137, CA	A15
Josephs (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 253, CA	A39
Kaplan [1978] RTR 119, CA	A1
Keane (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 247	A6, A7, A11
King v R [1969] AC 304, [1978] 2 All ER 619, [1968] 2 WLR 391, 52 Cr App Rep 353, 112 Sol Jo 419, 12 WIR 268, PC, 14 (1) Digest (Reissue) 216	A4
King [1978] Crim LR 228	A38
Kuruma v R [1955] AC 197, [1955] 1 All ER 236, [1955] 2 WLR 223, 119 JP 157, 99 Sol Jo 73, PC, 14 (2) Digest (Reissue) 470	A4
Kwabena Po-ku [1978] Crim LR 488	A4

	PAGE
Large [1978] Crim LR 222	A52
Lewis (1975) 62 Cr App Rep 206, CA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1391	A23, A28
Leyland JJ, <i>ex parte</i> Hawthorn (1978) Times, 25th July	A3
Locker [1971] 2 QB 321, [1971] 2 All ER 875, [1971] WLR 1302, 56 Cr App Rep 375, 135 JP 437, 115 Sol Jo 346, CA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1389	A23
Lyons (1974) Times, 12th July	A5
McHugh [1977] RTR 1, 64 Cr App Rep 92	A30
McLean [1978] Crim LR 430	A2
M'Pherson (1857) Dears & B 197, 26 LJMC 134, 29 LTOS 129, 21 JP 325, 3 Jur NS 523, 5 WR 525, 7 Cox CC 281, 14 (1) Digest (Reissue) 112	A9, A10
McPherson [1973] Crim LR 191, 117 Sol Jo 13, CA	A30
McShane (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 97	A8, A15
McVitie [1960] 2 QB 483, [1960] 2 All ER 498, [1960] 3 WLR 99, 44 Cr App Rep 201, 124 JP 404, 104 Sol Jo 510, CCA, 14 (1) Digest (Reissue) 284	A1
Madge [1978] Crim LR 305	A3
Mallet [1978] 3 All ER 10, [1978] IWLK 820, 122 Sol Jo 295, CA	A31
Mansfield [1978] 1 All ER 134, [1977] 1 WLR 1102, 65 Cr App Rep 276, 121 Sol Jo 709, CA	A3
Matheson [1958] 2 All ER 87, [1958] 1 WLR 474, 42 Cr App Rep 145, 102 Sol Jo 309, CCA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1129	A14
Maxwell [1978] Crim LR 422	A8
Metropolitan Police Comr v Charles [1977] AC 177, [1976] 3 All ER 112, [1976] 3 WLR 431, 63 Cr App Rep 252, 140 JP 531, 120 Sol Jo 588, HL, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1390	A23, A28
Metropolitan Police Comr v Hills [1978] 2 All ER 1105, [1978] 3 WLR 423, 122 Sol Jo 555, HL	A2
Mills [1963] 1 QB 522, [1963] 1 All ER 202, [1963] 2 WLR 137, 47 Cr App Rep 49, 124 JP 176, 107 Sol Jo 38, CCA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1201	A38
Mills and Lemon [1947] KB 297, [1946] 2 All ER 776, 32 Cr App Rep 23, [1974] LJLR 447, 111, JP 70, 63 TLR 37, 45 LGR 102, CCA, 14 (2) Digest (Reissue) 580	A44
Mirrless (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 250, CA	A8
Moghal (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 56, CA	A1
Morgan [1978] 3 All ER 13, [1978] 1 WLR 735, 122 Sol Jo 366, CA	A6
Mountain and Kilminster [1978] Crim LR 550	A45
Muir v Smith [1978] Crim LR 293	A2, A3, A38, A39
Murdoch v Taylor [1965] AC 574, [1965] 1 All ER 406, [1965] 2 WLR 425, 49 Cr App Rep 119, 129 JP 208, 109 Sol Jo 130, HL, 14 (2) Digest (Reissue) 634	A2
Mustafa (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 26, CA	A5
Neal v Gribble [1978] Crim LR 500	A35
Neilson [1978] RTR 232, CA	A33
Nelson (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 119, CA	A1
Newlove [1978] RTR 150, 66 Cr App Rep 1, CA	A45
Nicholls [1978] Crim LR 247	A45
Norbury [1978] Crim LR 435	A38
Nye (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 252	A34
Oakwell [1978] 1 All ER 1223, [1978] 1 WLR 32, 66 Cr App Rep 174, 142 JP 259, 122 Sol Jo 30, CA	A43
O'Driscoll (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 50, [1977] Crim LR 960, CA	A9, A12, A15
Page [1971] 2 QB 330, [1971] 2 All ER 870, [1971] 2 WLR 1308, 55 Cr App Rep 184, 135 JP 376, 115 Sol Jo 385, CA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1388	A22, A23
Palmer v R [1971] AC 814, [1971] 1 All ER 1077, [1971] 2 WLR 831, 55 Cr App Rep 223, 115 Sol Jo 264, 16 WIR 499, PC, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1171	A43
Parsley v Beard [1978] RTR 263	A33
Partington v Williams (1975) 62 Cr App Rep 220, 120 Sol Jo 80, CA, 14 (1) Digest (Reissue) 113	A10
Peach [1974] Crim LR 245, CA	A6
Pearce [1973] Crim LR 321, CA	A35
Peterborough JJ, <i>ex parte</i> Hicks [1978] 1 All ER 225, [1977] 1 WLR 1371, 142 JP 103, 121 Sol Jo 605	A31
Pettigrew v Northumberland Police Authority [1976] RTR 177, [1976] Crim LR 259	A35
Pilgrim v Rice-Smith [1977] 2 All ER 658, [1977] 1 WLR 671, 65 Cr App Rep 142, 141 JP 427, 121 Sol Jo 333	A17

Pitham (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 45, CA	A17, A18
Powles [1977] RTR 69, CA	A9
Power (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 159	A2
Reader (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 33, CA	A9, A42
Rickwood v Cochrane [1978] RTR 218	A33, A34
Ring (1892) 61 LJMC 116, 66 LT 300, 56 JP 552, 8 TLR 326, 17 Cox CC 491, 14 (1) Digest (Reissue) 112	A10
Rivett (1950) 34 Cr App Rep 87, CCA, 14 (1) Digest (Reissue) 49	A14
Rowell [1978] 1 All ER 665, [1978] 1 WLR 132, 142 JP 181, 121 Sol Jo 790, 65 Cr App Rep 174, CA	A39
Royle [1971] 3 All ER 1359, [1971] 1 WLR 1764, 56 Cr App Rep 131, 136 JP 106, 115 Sol Jo 910, CA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1390	A20
Russell [1971] 1 QB 151, [1970] 3 All ER 924, [1970] 3 WLR 977, 55 Cr App Rep 29, 135 JP 78, 114 Sol Jo 805, CA, 14 (2) Digest (Reissue) 645	A1
Scarrott [1978] QB 1016, [1978] 1 All ER 672, [1977] 3 WLR 629, 65 Cr App Rep 125, 142 JP 198, 121 Sol Jo 558, CA	A5
Scott (1978) Times, 4th July	A41
Searle v Randolph [1972] Crim LR 779	A1
Seneviratne v Bishop [1978] RTR 92	A34
Sheerin (1976) 64 Cr App Rep 68, CA	A1
Shepherd v Karulo-k [1978] RTR 85	A34
Silver [1956] 1 All ER 716, [1956] 1 WLR 281, 40 Cr App Rep 32, 120 JP 233, 100 Sol Jo 228, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1229	A32
Smith (1978) Times, 12th April	A45
Spicer v Holt [1977] AC 987, [1976] 3 All ER 71, [1976] 3 WLR 398, 63 Cr App Rep 270, 140 JP 545, 120 Sol Jo 572, HL, Digest Supp	A34
Stagg [1978] Crim LR 227	A18
Stamford [1972] 2 QB 391, [1972] 2 All ER 430, [1972] 2 WLR 1055, 50 Cr App Rep 398, 139 JP 522, 116 Sol Jo 313, CA, Digest Cont Vol D 726	A37
Stanley [1965] 2 QB 327, [1965] 1 All ER 1035, [1965] 2 WLR 917, 49 Cr App Rep 175; 129 JP 279, 109 Sol Jo 193, CCA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1039	A37
Stannard (1837) 7 C&P 673, 14 (2) Digest (Reissue) 500	A7
Steele (1976) 65 Cr App Rep 22, CA	A31
Stoddart v Balls [1977] RTR 113, DC	A34
Singh (1977) 15 SASR 591, [1978] 7 CL 54	A3
Straker [1965] Crim LR 239	A37
Sutton (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 21, CA	A31
Sutton and Moore [1978] Crim LR 442	A45
Tanner (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 56, CA	A2
Taylor [1978] Crim LR 92, CA	A44
Thomas [1957] 2 All ER 342, [1957] 1 WLR 747, 41 Cr App Rep 121, 121 JP 338, 101 Sol Jo 430, CCA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1229	A32
Tomkins [1978] Crim LR 290	A3
Thorne (1977) 66 Cr App Rep 6, CA	A5, A6
Treacy [1944] 2 All ER 229, 30 Cr App Rep 93, 60 TLR 544, 88 Sol Jo 367, CCA, 14 (2) Digest (Reissue) 550	A44
Tricoglus (1976) 65 Cr App Rep 16, CA	A5
Turnbull (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 242, CA	A7, A13, A14
Urbanowski [1976] 1 All ER 679, [1976] 1 WLR 455, 162 Cr App Rep 229, 140 JP 270, 120 Sol Jo 148, CA, 14 (1) Digest (Reissue) 316	A1
Vardy [1978] RTR 202, CA	A34
Virgo [1978] Crim LR 557, Times, 14th March, CA	A42
Wade [1978] Crim LR 378	A7
Wainwright (1925) 19 Cr App Rep 52, CCA, 14 (2) Digest (Reissue) 489	A6
Walker v Lovell [1975] 3 All ER 107, [1975] 1 WLR 1141, 139 JP 708, 119 Sol Jo 544, [1975] RTR 377, HL, Digest Cont Vol D 884	A34
Walmsley, Dereya and Jackson [1978] Crim LR 287, CA	A31
Walton v R [1978] 1 All ER 542, [1977] 3 WLR 902, 66 Cr App Rep 25, 142 JP 151, PC	A14

	PAGE
Waterfall [1970] 1 QB 148, [1969] 3 All ER 1048, [1969] 3 WLR 947, 53 Cr App Rep 596, 134 JP 1, 113 Sol Jo 872, CA, 15 Digest (Reissue) 1388	A22
Wershof v Metropolitan Police Comr [1978] Crim LR 424, Times 23rd March	A15
West (1978) Times, 11th August, CA	A41, 42
Wilfred (1978) Times, 11th August, CA	A41, 42
Wilkinson v Button [1978] Crim LR 436	A35
Williamson [1978] Crim LR 229, CA	A16
Woodward [1944] KB 118, [1944] 1 All ER 159, 29 Cr App Rep 159, 113 LJKB 97, 170 LT 296, 109 JP 64, 60 TLR 114, 42 LGR 43, CCA, 14 (1) Digest (Reissue) 319	A5
Young and Robinson [1978] Crim LR 163, CA	A44

Contents

	PAGE
<i>Table of Statutes</i>	v
<i>Table of Cases</i>	vii
Noter-Up	A1

NOTER-UP

Note The numbers in the left-hand margin refer to the page numbers in the main volume.

Page lvi Table of cases

Add: *Kaplan* [1978] RTR 119 . . . 482.

Page lxi Table of cases

Add page reference to *Moghal* of p. 39.

Page lxiix Table of cases

Delete page reference to *Searle v. Randolph* of p. 555 and substitute p. 535.

Page 9 B. Grounds for Quashing

After first paragraph add: "If a defect is not cured by amendment the Court of Appeal has no power to amend the indictment on appeal: *Nelson* (1977) 65 Cr App Rep 119. However a failure to comply with the Indictment Rules renders an indictment defective, rather than null and void, and an indictment which is defective may be considered by the Court of Appeal: *Nelson* (op. cit.) applying *McVitie* [1960] 2 Q.B. 483, [1960] 2 All E.R. 498 44 Cr. App. Rep. 201, approving *Urbanowski* [1976] All E.R. 679, 62 Cr. App. Rep. 229 and *Sheerin* (1976) 64 Cr. App. Rep. 68, and disapproving of *Crook* (1977) 65 Cr. App. Rep. 66."

Page 11 A. The Statutory Provisions

Ludlow v. Metropolitan Police Comr. is also reported at [1971] A.C. 29 at 38.

Page 30 footnote 12

At the end of the footnote add: "See also *Similar Fact Evidence and Corroboration* [1978] Crim. L.R. 185".

Page 39 footnote 8

For *Mogham* read *Moghal*.

Page 52 footnote 1

Add: "See also *Bayliss and Oliver* [1978] Crim. L.R. 361 and commentary".

Page 61 (vii) Evidence where duplicity

In quotation from *Greenfield* delete “court” in line 7 and substitute “count”.

After quotation from *Greenfield* add: “It also seems that a judge may look at the depositions for this purpose in order to see what further and better particulars of a count would have been given if applied for: *Hills* [1978] 2 All E.R. 1105 at 1108, [1978] 3 W.L.R. 423 at 427 per Viscount Dilhorne.”

Page 62 footnote 4

At the end of the footnote add: “See also *Power* (1977) 66 Cr. App. Rep. 159; *Cromack* [1978] Crim. L.R. 217; *Muir v. Smith* [1978] Crim. L.R. 293 and commentary. In any event it seems that a judge may look at the depositions to see what particulars would have been given if applied for: *Hills* [1978] 2 All E.R. 1105 at 1108, [1978] 3 W.L.R. 423 at 427.”

Page 70 footnote 9

At the end of the footnote add: “In *McLean* [1978] Crim. L.R. 430 it was held that it was not an imputation within the meaning of section 1(f) merely to say that a man was intoxicated or swearing on a particular occasion.”

Page 74 footnote 20

At the end of the footnote add: “See also *Tanner* (1977) 66 Cr. App. Rep. 56.”

Page 83 (ii) Same Offence

Delete text from end of first sentence including quotation from *Russell* and footnote 19 and substitute: “[T]he offences . . . must be the same in all material respects including the time at which the offence is alleged to have been committed, and a distinct and separate offence similar in all material respects to an offence committed later, no matter how short the interval between the two, cannot properly be regarded as “the same offence” . . . [W]here persons are jointly charged with one offence and the charge is not bad for duplicity, they are charged with the same offence within the meaning of the Act. If charged separately with offences, a test of whether they are charged with the same offence is whether they could have been charged jointly . . . “[S]ame offence” in the proviso means an offence which is the same in all respects”, per Viscount Dilhorne in *Hills* [1978] 2 All E.R. 1105 at 1109, [1978] 3 W.L.R. 423 at 428-429.

Thus two defendants who severally drove motorcars which killed a pedestrian in a collision cannot be charged with “the same offence”. At pp. 1109 and 428, Viscount Dilhorne observed that it was wrong to conclude as in *Russell* [1971] 1 Q.B. 151, [1970] 3 All E.R. 924, 55 Cr. App. Rep. 23, that Lord Donovan, in *Murdoch v. Taylor* [1965] A.C. 574, [1965] 1 All E.R. 406, had taken the view that there should be a wide interpretation of the words ‘the same offence’.”

Page 85 footnote 2

At the end of the footnote add: "Where the prosecution knows of the existence of witnesses whom they do not intend to call, failure to notify the defendant of their existence may amount to a breach of the rules of natural justice: *R. v. Leyland J.J.) ex parte Hawthorn*, (1978) Times, 25th July."

Page 87 footnote 3

At the end of the footnote add: "See now *Baldwin* (1978) Times, 3rd May. It is wrong for a judge to insist on the prosecution calling a witness whom Crown counsel is reluctant to call."

Page 89 C. Application to permit a witness to refresh his memory from a previous statement

Add new footnote: "10A See *Refreshing Memory* [1978] Crim. L.R. 408."

footnote 12

At the end of the footnote add: "In *Singh* (1977) 15 S.A.S.R. 591, S. Aust. Sup. Ct. [1978] 7 C.L. 54, a second police officer, present at the time when the first constable made notes, but who could not recall the conversation without reference to the first constable's notes, was not permitted to refresh his memory from those notes."

Page 97 (4) Privilege

After line 5 add: "Once a document is in the hands of the prosecution it may be given in evidence as privilege relates only to its production and not its admissibility: *Tomkins* [1978] Crim. L.R. 290."

Page 99 E. Source of information

After line 8 add: "There is no duty to disclose the source of the information without any request being made: *Madge* [1978] Crim. L.R. 305."

Page 100 footnote 15

In line 18 after the words "to isolate the guilty one" add: "(see also *Muir v. Smith* [1978] Crim. L.R. 293)."

Page 101 footnote 18

Barker is also reported at (1975) 65 Cr. App. Rep. 287. *Mansfield* is also reported at [1978] 1 All E.R. 134, 65 Cr. App. Rep. 276.

Page 107 Para (c)

At the end of paragraph (c) add: "See also *Houghton* (1978), Times June 21 142 J.P. 396."

Page 107 footnote 14

At the end of the footnote add: "See *Kwabena Poku* [1978] Crim. L.R. 488 (innocent misrepresentation)."

Page 108 line 1

For "All Er" read "All E.R."

Page 110 footnote 19

At the end of the footnote add: "See now Home Office Circular no. 89/1978."

Page 111 footnote 1

At the end of the footnote add: "The section came into force on 18th June 1978.

In *Houghton* (1978) 142 J.P. 396, it was said that except under the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1976 the police had no power to arrest anyone so that they could make enquiries about him. If they thought that there was any difference between detaining and arresting they were mistaken. What had been described as a "standard practice" was contrary to the provisions of section 62 of the Criminal Law Act 1977. Lawton, L. J., said that judges had a discretion to disallow evidence, even if, in law, it was relevant and admissible if its admissibility would operate unfairly against an accused: *Callis v. Gunn* [1964] 1 Q.B. 495 at 501. It would operate unfairly if the evidence had been obtained in an oppressive manner by force or against the wishes of an accused person, or by a trick (*Kuruma v. R.* [1955] A.C. 197 at 204) or by conduct of which the Crown ought not to take advantage (*King v. R.* [1969] A.C. 304 at 319). A judge had to ask himself what had led the accused to say what he did. If on the evidence there was reason to think that a defendant had been improperly kept in isolation for the purpose of getting him to crack under the strain of being alone and he had made admissions because he could not bear to be alone any longer there could be good grounds for exercising the discretion. See also *Beet* (1977) 66 Cr. App. Rep. 188.

In *Houghton* there was no evidence that the defendant had been kept in isolation for the purpose of putting pressure upon him or that what he did was brought about by his isolation. Nor was there any basis for inferring that what he did had been brought about by his isolation. Had he been unfamiliar with police methods or of limited intelligence (he had been to public school and university, was an antique dealer, had five previous convictions for dishonesty and had served two substantial prison sentences) or had there been evidence that he had asked for, and had been denied, the advice of his solicitor the Court of Appeal might have drawn such an inference. On the facts of the case the Court of Appeal held that, even if the judge had wrongly failed to exercise his discretion, such irregularities as had happened had no bearing upon Houghton's

decision to talk to the police and to make a written statement. He had acted as he did because he thought that the police had agreed to grant him and some of his co-defendants immunity from prosecution but there was no evidence of any such agreement and the police had neither done nor said anything to arouse in him any expectation of such an immunity."

Page 111 At the end of chapter add new section

5. APPLICATIONS TO DISPENSE WITH COUNSEL'S SERVICES

When a defendant is represented by counsel it is a matter of discretion for the trial judge whether he should be permitted to dispense with counsel's services.

If, at the beginning of a trial, a defendant wishes on good grounds to defend himself he should be permitted to do so: *Woodward* [1944] K.B. 118, [1944] 1 All E.R. 159 (the defendant had had no opportunity of seeing counsel who was going to defend him). If counsel has examined witnesses, still more if he has addressed the jury for the defence, the defendant cannot say that he wishes to take over his own defence and to put questions to witnesses who have already been examined or to supplement the remarks which counsel has already made by observations of his own: *Woodward* op. cit. at pp. 119 and 160.

In *Lyons* (1974) Times, 12th July, the defendant sought to dispense with his counsel's services at the end of the prosecution's case. The trial judge refused his application and refused to hear the defendant give reasons for making it. The Court of Appeal held that in most cases a defendant's application should be allowed and he should be allowed to give his reasons, but that in the end it was a matter for the judge's discretion.

Page 118 footnote 16

Scarrott is also reported at [1978] 1 All E.R. 672 at 676.

Page 122 Scarrott is also reported at [1978] 1 All E.R. 672.

footnote 14

At the end of the footnote add: "See also p. 29, footnote 6 and *Similar Fact Evidence and Corroboration* [1978] Crim. L.R. 185".

Page 123 Para (v)

Add new footnote: "17A For recent applications of the principle see: *Tricoglus* (1976) 65 Cr. App. Rep. 16 (rape), *Mustafa* (1977) 65 Cr. App. Rep. 26 (identification), *Large* [1978] Crim. L.R. 222 (to explain reason for setting of trap)."

Page 129 line 7

At the end of line 7 add: "Provided an adequate warning is given a jury may convict on the uncorroborated evidence of the accomplice: *Thorne* (1977) 66 Cr. App. Rep. 6, *Director of Public Prosecutions v. Hester* (supra)."

Page 130 line 2

Peach is now reported at [1974] Crim. L.R. 245.

Page 132 (ii) The evidence of children

After last paragraph add: "In *Morgan* [1978] 3 All E.R. 13, [1978] 1 W.L.R. 735 it was held that although the judge had erred in not warning the jury to seek corroboration of the evidence of a thirteen year old witness who at the age of twelve had given evidence concerning an indecent incident involving his younger brother, it was impossible to state as a general proposition what the age was above which it became unnecessary for a judge to give such a warning. It was the type of problem which fell within the general discretion of the judge."

Page 135 footnote 19

At the end of the footnote add: "See also *Defences of General Application*: (3) *Entrapment* [1978] Crim. L.R. 137."

Page 136 (3) Matters capable of amounting to corroboration

As to corroboration and similar fact evidence see *Similar Fact Evidence and Corroboration* [1978] Crim. L.R. 185; see also page 29, footnote 6 and page 222.

Page 151 (vi) Directing a jury on lies

After: "evidence" in penultimate line on page add footnote reference: "6A".

Add new footnote: "6A As Lawton, L.J., said in *Thorne* (1977) 66 Cr. App. Rep, 6 at 18:

"The prosecution alleged that these alibis had been fabricated to deceive the jury . . . Counsel (for the appellant) did not suggest that alibis fabricated with such intent could not be corroboration. In our judgment they can provided that the jury is satisfied that the falsity has not arisen from mistake and that the fabrication has not come about through panic or stupidity."

Page 152 footnote 7

At the end of the footnote add: "; *Keane* (1977) 65 Cr App. Rep. 247".

Page 155 (1) Evidence of identification generally

After: "photographs" in line 2 add footnote reference: "9A".

Add new footnote:

"9A As to the use of photographs for identification see *Wainwright* (1925) 19 Cr. App. Rep. 52, *The Use of Photographs for the Purpose of Identification* [1978] Crim. L.R. 343 and *Identification Parades and the Use of Photographs for Identification*, Home Office circular no. 109/1978. See also *Hunjan* (1978) Times, 13th June."