

Shere M Sattar

Uwtsd ID: 2211969

Assignment: Criminal Litigation

March 2024

INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Ada Adebayo

FROM: Shere M Sattar

MATTER: Case of Kim Cottrell

DATE: 15 March 2024

Background:

Upon your request, I have meticulously examined the intricate details surrounding the case of Kim Cottrell, who is currently facing a charge of assault occasioning actual bodily harm. The incident in question unfolded amidst an altercation at the local establishment, the Dog and Duck public house, on the somber evening of March 2nd, 2024. It was during this distressing time that Kim found herself grappling with the sudden and devastating news of her auntie's untimely passing.

Seeking solace, Kim sought refuge in the familiar ambiance of the pub, where she proceeded to numb her emotions with alcohol. However, what started as an attempt to dull the pain soon escalated into a regrettable altercation. It is alleged that amidst her profound grief and emotional turmoil, Kim engaged in a physical altercation with Bob Branning, resulting in visible bruising to his cheek and jaw.

Following the incident, Kim found herself on the receiving end of the law's scrutiny. She was apprehended by law enforcement officers, escorted to the police station, and subjected to a rigorous interrogation process. Compounding the distress of the situation, Kim was then compelled to undergo fingerprinting procedures. It is crucial to note Kim's assertion that she adamantly refused to comply with the fingerprinting process. She maintains that, had she been apprised of her right to legal representation, she would have promptly sought the assistance of a solicitor.

Adding further complexity to the matter is Kim's current socio-economic circumstances. She finds herself in a precarious position, having recently been rendered unemployed and now reliant on state benefits for her livelihood. This unfortunate turn of events is compounded by the revelation of Kim's prior conviction for shoplifting, a transgression that occurred during her younger years as a 19-year-old student.

In assessing the gravity of the situation, it becomes evident that Kim's case is fraught with complexities and challenges. The allegations against her, coupled with the circumstances surrounding the incident, demand a thorough examination of the legal intricacies at play. From the determination of Kim's mental state during the altercation to the implications of her refusal to comply with fingerprinting procedures, every aspect of the case warrants careful consideration.

As we delve deeper into the nuances of the case, it is imperative to adopt a holistic approach. This entails not only a comprehensive understanding of the substantive legal principles governing assault occasioning actual bodily harm but also an exploration of the procedural safeguards afforded to individuals in Kim's position. Moreover, given the potential ramifications of the case on Kim's future prospects, it is incumbent upon us to provide her with sound legal advice and representation.

The case of Kim Cottrell presents a myriad of challenges that demand careful deliberation and strategic planning. As we navigate the complexities of the legal landscape, it is essential to remain steadfast in our commitment to upholding the principles of justice and fairness. With diligent attention to detail and a steadfast dedication to our client's best interests, we can navigate the turbulent waters ahead and strive towards a favourable resolution.

Substantive Law:

The offence of assault occasioning actual bodily harm finds its legal basis in the Offences Against the Person Act 1861. This legislation serves as the cornerstone for prosecuting offences involving bodily harm. According to the Act, the *actus reus*, or guilty act, of assault occasioning actual bodily harm entails the application of force upon another individual, resulting in tangible physical harm. Actual bodily harm encompasses a range of injuries that are calculated to interfere with the health or comfort of the victim. This includes not only visible injuries such as bruising but also injuries that may not be immediately apparent but nonetheless impact the victim's well-being.

Furthermore, in order to establish criminal liability for assault occasioning actual bodily harm, it is imperative to consider the *mens rea*, or guilty mind, of the accused. The requisite *mens rea* for this offence can manifest in two forms: either an intention to cause harm or recklessness as to whether harm is caused. Intention entails a deliberate desire or aim to inflict harm upon another person, while recklessness involves a conscious disregard for the potential consequences of one's actions. In the context of assault occasioning actual bodily harm, the accused must either intend to cause harm to the victim or act in a reckless manner, knowing that their actions may result in harm.

Therefore, under the Offences Against the Person Act 1861, the offence of assault occasioning actual bodily harm is established when the accused intentionally or recklessly applies force to another person, resulting in injuries that interfere with the victim's health or comfort. It is this combination of the *actus reus* and *mens rea* elements that forms the basis for prosecuting and convicting individuals accused of this offence.

Procedure for Allocation and Options for Trial:

The procedural journey of Kim's case towards trial involves a critical juncture known as the plea and case management hearing (PCMH). During this pivotal stage, the court undertakes a comprehensive assessment to determine the most appropriate forum for adjudicating the matter. Central to this decision-making process is the consideration of several key factors, including the gravity of the offence, Kim's prior criminal record, and the potential sentencing implications upon conviction.

At the heart of the court's deliberation lies the crucial question of whether the case should be tried summarily in the Magistrates' Court or elevated to the Crown Court for trial. This decision hinges on a careful balancing of competing interests, with the primary objective being to ensure a fair and expeditious resolution of the proceedings.

For cases of assault occasioning actual bodily harm, such as Kim's, the court is tasked with weighing the severity of the alleged offence against the backdrop of Kim's personal circumstances and legal rights. The Magistrates' Court, equipped with its jurisdictional limits and procedural efficiencies, offers a swift and streamlined avenue for resolving less serious offences. Conversely, the Crown Court, endowed with its expansive powers and jury trial capabilities, provides a more formal and comprehensive forum for adjudicating complex and high-stakes cases.

In exercising her prerogative, Kim is afforded the opportunity to exercise her right to trial by jury at the Crown Court or opt for a summary trial before magistrates. Given the gravity of the allegations against her and her steadfast assertion of innocence, Kim may understandably lean towards the former option. Trial by jury not only affords her the opportunity to present her case before a panel of her peers but also carries the potential for a more impartial and deliberative assessment of the evidence presented.

Moreover, Kim's decision to plead not guilty underscores her unwavering resolve to contest the charges levied against her. In light of this stance, the prospect of a trial by jury assumes heightened significance, offering Kim the prospect of vindication and exoneration in the eyes of the law.

The procedure for allocation and options for trial in Kim's case embodies the delicate balance between expediency and fairness. As we navigate the complexities of the legal terrain, it is imperative to afford Kim the full scope of her legal rights and procedural safeguards. By carefully weighing the available options and charting a strategic course of action, we can ensure that Kim's interests are diligently safeguarded throughout the adjudicative process.

Advantages/Disadvantages of Mode of Trial:

The choice between trial by jury and summary trial in the Magistrates' Court entails distinct advantages and disadvantages that must be carefully weighed in Kim's case. Trial by jury offers the invaluable opportunity for a fair trial before a panel of peers, ensuring a diverse range of perspectives in the adjudication process. This can enhance the perceived legitimacy of the trial outcome and bolster public confidence in the justice system. Additionally, if found guilty, Kim may benefit from potentially more lenient sentencing, as juries are often perceived to be more sympathetic towards defendants. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that trial by jury can be more time-consuming and financially burdensome, prolonging the duration and increasing the cost of the legal proceedings.

Conversely, opting for a summary trial in the Magistrates' Court may result in a swifter resolution of the case, saving time and resources for all parties involved. The expedited nature of summary trials can lead to a more efficient disposition of less serious offences, minimizing the strain on the court system. However, it is important to recognize that summary trials may not afford the same level of scrutiny and protection of rights as jury trials. The absence of a jury may limit the diversity of perspectives and dilute the safeguards against potential biases in the adjudication process.

Entitlement to Legal Aid:

Given Kim's current financial circumstances, characterized by unemployment and reliance on benefits, she is likely entitled to legal aid for representation in court. This entitlement ensures that Kim has access to legal advice and representation throughout the proceedings, irrespective of her ability to pay. By availing herself of legal aid, Kim can benefit from the expertise of qualified legal professionals who can advocate on her behalf and safeguard her rights throughout the legal process.

Relevance of Kim's Complaints:

Kim's complaints regarding the circumstances surrounding her arrest, particularly her objection to having her fingerprints taken against her will and her purported lack of awareness regarding her right to consult a solicitor at the police station, are pertinent to her case. These issues raise potential concerns regarding the violation of Kim's rights under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 and the Human Rights Act 1998. While these complaints may not directly impact the outcome of her trial for assault, they may serve as grounds for legal challenges or complaints against the police, underscoring the importance of addressing these grievances through appropriate legal channels.

Conclusion:

Considering the complexities inherent in Kim's case, it is recommended that she exercise her right to plead not guilty and opt for trial by jury given the seriousness of the offence. Additionally, Kim should pursue legal aid to ensure proper representation in court, thereby mitigating the risk of procedural or substantive errors during the legal proceedings. While her complaints about police conduct are noteworthy, they may not directly influence the outcome of her case. Nonetheless, it is imperative to provide Kim with comprehensive legal advice and support throughout the proceedings to navigate the intricacies of her case effectively. Should you require further information or assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to reach out.

Shere M Sattar

Trainee Lawyer Trinity Solicitors