



## Ruth Zentler-Munro

Ruth is a formidable advocate, with a keen eye for the law and real flair with juries. Ruth has a wealth of experience across the spectrum of criminal work.

She has undertaken homicide cases for approximately a decade and has spent much of the last 2 years, doing predominantly murder cases. These cases have spanned gang-land reprisal attacks, diminished responsibility, provocation, honey-trap scenarios and as well 'spontaneous' murders, which emanate from an escalation of other underlying offences e.g. drug dealing or robbery.

As sole counsel Ruth has dealt with terrorism, attempted murder, serious organized drug cases), kidnapping, firearm conspiracies, arson (with endangerment of life) and several serial 'stranger' rapists.

Ruth has particular expertise in dealing with vulnerable clients, having dealt 'with a number of cases of insanity, diminished responsibility, non-insane automatism, lack of mens rea due to mental health difficulties and also conducted a number of 'fact finding hearings' following on from her clients being deemed to be unfit to plead. Ruth therefore has an excellent grasp of the legal and practical subtleties in this particular area of law.

Ruth is a member of Lawyers for Liberty, Amnesty International, the Criminal Bar Association and is a mentor to disadvantaged teenagers through the Social Mobility Foundation.

Ruth is a CPS panel advocate, a qualified clerk for schools admission & disciplinary appeals and is qualified to conduct regulatory hearings on behalf of the NMC.

### Notable Cases

#### HIGH COURT

Regina v H

Court of Appeal [2009] EWCA Crim 469

Ruth was commended for her careful and forceful submissions in relation to an appeal against conviction involving the Judge's direction on self-defence. (In the subsequent case of R v Keane and McGrath [2010] EWCA Crim 2514, the Court of Appeal specifically approved the direction that Ruth had encouraged the Judge to give 'It seems to us that that kind of homely expression, can quite well encapsulate the question which may arise if an original aggressor claims the ability to rely on self-defence. We would commend it as suitable for a great many cases.')

R (on the application of Bromley LBC) v Bromley Magistrates Court [2011] EWHC 432 (Admin)

Ruth was commended for her advocacy by both of their Lordships 'Miss Zentler-Munro, appearing on behalf of the claimant, the London Borough of Bromley, today and who has put the matter very well indeed, has been able to make her points succinctly and forcefully.'

P v DPP

[2012] EWHC 1657 (Admin); [2013] 1 W.L.R. 2337; [2013] 1 Cr. App. R. 7; [2013] Crim. L.R. 151; [2012] A.C.D. 90

Ruth stated a case to the High Court, in relation to whether snatching a cigarette from someone's hand can constitute the use of force, where there is no evidence that contact was made with the person's hand. The High Court agreed with Ruth's submissions and overturned the conviction.

#### As led junior counsel

R v E Cut throat 'honey trap' robbery and murder where D had mental health difficulties.

R v B Cut throat robbery and murder where D's actions were caught on excellent quality cctv

R v Y Murder and attempted murder arising out of tit for tat gang violence

R v F Domestic murder where D pleaded diminished responsibility

R v G Multi-handed murder where assisting in the defence of the person first on the indictment where a) the deceased and b) all remaining defendants said that he was the stabber.

R v P Multi-handed murder arising out of tit for tat violence, egged on through the medium of grime music.

R v D Multi-handed drug-related murder, where one of the defendants turned QE and implicated the client who became first on the indictment.

R v R Multi-handed drugs conspiracy involving months of surveillance.

### **Sole Counsel: defence**

R v S Represented man charged with encouragement of terrorism

R v H Represented man who pleaded insanity in relation to stabbing his elderly parents in the head and chest.

R v G represented defendant in multi-handed conspiracy to defraud case worth £300 000.

R v B Represented man charged with a campaign of rape against his wife.

R v T Representing a defendant in one of the encrochat cases where the conspiracy covers approximately 80 kilograms of class A drugs over 1 month.

R v M Representing a defendant in one of the encrochat cases where D alleged to have been exporting cocaine to Australia and supplying drugs domestically under the guise of a black cab driver.

R v W Represented man charged with rape, a series of ABH's and controlling and coercive behaviour, which formed the background to the Crown's submission that the defendant should have known that any ostensible consent to his advances was mere submission.

R v K Represented man charged with robbery and false imprisonment.

R v O Represented man charged with section 18 wounding where he stabbed the complainant over 15 times and denied an intent to cause really serious harm.

R v W representing arsonist where this is the third allegation of arson and the defendant suffers from Korsakoff syndrome.

R v B Representing defendant who remains civilly sectioned who is in a cut-throat conspiracy to burgle trial.

R v B Represented defendant originally charged with attempted murder, who had stabbed the complainant on 2 separate occasions, including one incident, where the defendant had broken into the complainant's home in the middle of the night and stabbed him in the neck while he was in bed.

R v S Represented defendant alleged to have been involved in several large volume importations of drugs.

R v V Represented defendant alleged to have been involved in large conspiracy to burgle and conspiracy to steal.

R v P Represented defendant alleged to have been involved in a gun-point robbery, who was acquitted despite having admitted the robbery.

R v B Multi-handed interception of communications, corruption and perverting the course of justice trial. Assisting in sifting and analysing the evidence in relation to the hacking allegations on behalf of the first defendant.

R v H Represented defendant who organised and was chief protagonist in a series of gun-point robberies organised through the Gumtree.

R v A Represented young male with mental health difficulties who was first on the indictment in relation to a group sex attack on a young girl. Almost every legal argument was advanced: section 41, bad character, hearsay and section 78.

R v S Drugs case involving unauthorised surveillance.

R v W False imprisonment, burglary and ABH of vulnerable complainant.

R v Z Section 18 where the complainant gave evidence for the defence!

R v M Represented a footballer charged with assaulting a woman in a

R v B International drugs importation involving undercover

R v St L Drugs offences dropped after extensive disclosure requests pertaining to the police officers' (im)propriety.

R v S Section 20 against a police officer where the young defendant was acquitted despite giving evidence contrary to 5 police officers.

## **Prosecution**

R v C & others Prosecuted multi-handed aggravated burglary.

R v B & another Prosecuted 2 defendants for possession of a prohibited firearm.

R v R Prosecuted defendant for aggravated burglary.

R v J Prosecuted defendant for money-laundering in connection to a DX fraud worth well over a £1,000,000.

R v A-S Conducted a benefit fraud prosecution on behalf of a local authority where the defendant had been fraudulently claiming for over 10 years but some of the original documentation was available.

R v R & others Prosecuted multi-handed violent disorder and associated weapons offences.

R v B Prosecuted 2 joined cases of theft in breach of trust. It was the first time the defendant was convicted despite having been charged with similar offences 6 times previously.

R v E Threats to kill, witness intimidation and dangerous driving.

R v W Section 20 against a mentally vulnerable complainant

R v M Professionally organised theft of vast amounts of copper from the railway.

R v W Affray and section 20.

R v W Multi-handed violence and public disorder.

R v W Straightforward ABH and bladed article made more complicated by the fact that the defendant claimed to be unfit to be tried.

“Ruth is an outstanding lawyer. She is a superb defence advocate and pleasure to work with.”  
(Legal 500 – 2024)

### Qualifications

Durham University LLB – 2:1

Bristol University LLM – Merit

Nottingham Law School – Very Competent

### Professional Associations

Level 2 advocate on CPS list of appointed advocates

Member of Criminal Bar Association

Member of Lawyers for Liberty

Fraud Lawyers Association