

Rupert Hallows

Rupert is a very experienced senior junior who has been defending exclusively for the last 10 years. He has considerable recent experience of defending in more evidence heavy cases such as homicides (murder and attempted murder), frauds, drugs conspiracies and firearms offences. He is now regularly instructed in more complex multi-count / multi-defendant cases as leading junior counsel. Rupert is especially comfortable in and enjoys defending in multi-handed cases, particularly when cut-throat defences are involved.

Rupert's willingness to pursue all legal avenues on behalf of his clients is reflected in the fact that, since 1999, Rupert has appeared in the Court of Appeal Criminal Division on over 110 occasions, usually defending. Of his appeals against conviction, eleven have resulted in the appellant's convictions being quashed. The three appellants whose convictions were most recently overturned (all the subject of separate appeals) were all separately acquitted at their respective retrials. Rupert has also previously been instructed by the Crown Prosecution Service to represent the Crown's interests, both in the Divisional Court and in the Court of Appeal.

Rupert's Crown Court defence practice, which is focused primarily in London and on the South Eastern Circuit also encompasses sexual crime and, in particular, offences against children, due to Rupert's experience in dealing with vulnerable people and those with mental health problems. He was one of the first to undertake the Advocacy and the Vulnerable Course run by the Inns of Court.

In the last few years, Rupert has been regularly instructed to represent privately paying defendants, who are either ineligible for legal aid or who prefer to pay privately in order to guarantee continuity of counsel.

Rupert is an extremely thorough advocate who prepares his cases meticulously. He can be robust or sensitive when dealing with witnesses at trial depending upon what the situation demands. He has a wealth of experience of defending in complex trials, multi-handed or otherwise. He is willing to raise any arguable point of law and enjoys exploring interesting legal issues. He gives his clients practical and comprehensible advice in conference and does not attempt to avoid difficult clients or apparently hopeless cases. If circumstances warrant a guilty plea, Rupert has managed to secure non-custodial disposals in a number of very challenging cases where the custody threshold has often been comprehensively crossed.

Rupert is a qualified pupil supervisor and the joint head of the chambers pupillage committee.

‘Rupert is simply fantastic. He is incredibly personable and gets on well with clients. He is fiercely intelligent and leaves no stone unturned in advancing a defence. He is also first class in court; articulate and charismatic in his delivery.’ (Legal 500, 2023)

“Rupert is very impressive – he is intellectually brilliant. He is a formidable jury advocate and has a wonderful ability to effectively communicate even the most complex cases. He’s a fearless advocate in court and a real fighter. He has the ear of judges.” (Legal 500, 2021)

“He cross-examines with tenacity and precision.” (Legal 500, 2020)

Qualifications

BA Classics (First Class) – Bristol University

Professional Associations

Criminal Bar Association
Fraud Lawyers Association
South Eastern Circuit
Inner Temple

Recent Instructions

2024

R v JB – instructed to represent one of two brothers accused of attempting to murder three family members with machetes in a targeted attack. Trial due to last 2 to 3 weeks.

R v JC – instructed to represent a homeless man accused of stabbing a man in the back. Acquitted of both section 18 and section 20 wounding.

2023

R v SM – instructed as junior counsel (led by Brian St Louis KC) to represent a woman accused of murdering her ex-partner’s new lover. 5 week trial.

R v JD – instructed to represent a man accused of sexually assaulting his daughter-in-law at a family barbecue. Immediate complaint. Client did not give evidence. Acquitted.

R v DJ and another – instructed as leading counsel to represent one of two brothers indicted with 28 counts of serious sexual abuse over three generations. Following a 5 week trial, jury unable to reach a verdict on any count. Retrial in 2025’.

R v MM – instructed to represent a young man with undiagnosed autism who was alleged to have attempted to murder his father with a weapon. Plea to attempting to cause GBH with intent accepted.

R v EB – instructed to represent Kurdish asylum seeker accused of attempting to rape an intoxicated, sleeping female he had only just met – acquitted.

R v MSA and others – instructed as junior counsel (led by James Wood KC of Doughty Street Chambers) to represent husband of a Pakistani woman alleged to have been held in servitude by his family under the Modern Slavery Act 2015. Significant legal precedent set by virtue of application under s.78 PACE (ex parte his co-defendants) to exclude aspects of his private life ruled upon at a preparatory hearing. Interlocutory appeal to Court of Appeal, whose judgment will be published at conclusion of proceedings in the Crown Court.

R v LN – instructed to represent married man accused of raping 14 year old babysitter. Acquitted after complainant confronted by text messages which substantially undermined the credibility of her allegations.

R v BK – instructed to represent a man accused of money laundering the proceeds of a boiler room fraud in the sum of £2.6 million. Following a 3 week trial, jury unable to reach a verdict – discharged. Retrial in 2024.

2022

R v MS – instructed as leading counsel to represent a woman with mental health difficulties accused of playing a part in the abduction of a 13 year old runaway girl and thereafter grooming her and subjecting her to a campaign of sexual abuse – mixed verdicts following a 4 week trial.

R v AC – privately instructed to represent a 75 year old man accused of sexually interfering with his granddaughter – acquitted following a 7 day trial.

R v SL – privately instructed to represent a church leader accused of sexually assaulting a singer at an organised event. Guilty plea entered on a basis resulting in the imposition of a Community Order.

R v DM – privately instructed to represent a prison officer accused of violently assaulting a young offender in his care. Following service of a carefully drafted abuse of process argument, prosecution discontinued – acquitted.

R v GM and others – instructed as sole counsel to represent ‘the front man’ in an eight handed conspiracy to export half a tonne of MDMA to Australia in the arm of an excavator. Following a 4 month trial, Rupert’s client, who did not give evidence, was acquitted.

R v VY – instructed to represent a very vulnerable female alleged to have made a false accusation of gang rape. Following representations regarding evidential deficiencies and public interest considerations, prosecution offered no evidence.

R v JPS and another – instructed to represent the male defendant charged with causing or allowing his baby daughter to suffer GBH and with child cruelty in a case in which the co-defendant mother was making serious allegations of domestic violence against him. Basis of plea to failure to secure prompt medical attention for the child accepted. Community Order imposed.

R v MV – instructed to represent a 72 year old lady of good character accused of attempting to murder her daughter by stabbing her in the stomach with a knife. Plea to section 18 wounding accepted. Due to exceptional mitigation, suspended sentence order imposed.

R v OFB and others – instructed to represent one of 4 defendants accused of conspiring to commit violent robberies of householders in Sussex. All defendants absconded either before or during the course of the trial, which lasted 5 weeks and involved substantial volumes of phone material and other documentary evidence.

2021

R v AL and others – instructed to represent one of 3 defendants indicted with serious allegations of child cruelty towards his 5 young children. The trial, which lasted 3 weeks, was preceded by 3 days of section 28 cross-examination when the children were cross-examined on behalf of all 3 defendants.

R v TG and others – instructed as junior counsel (led by Tana Adkin KC) to represent the lead defendant of 4 teenagers accused of murder by stabbing. TG did not give evidence. Verdict of manslaughter returned following a 5 week trial.

R v DE – privately instructed to represent man of good character accused of sexually assaulting his best friend. Following various section 8 applications for additional disclosure of phone material and service of a section 41 application to adduce evidence of previous sexual behaviour, Crown offered no evidence.

Recent reported Court of Appeal cases

R v Stephen Wright-Hadley [2022] WLUK 740; [2022] EWCA Crim 446 – analysis of statutory test for making of a deprivation order. Order quashed.

R v Mizan (Ibrahim) [2021] 1 Cr.App.R.(S) 51 – conviction for failing to surrender following deferral of sentence quashed for lack of jurisdiction.

R v Jackson (David Gareth) [2019] 4 W.L.R. 43, CA – judgment of the Vice President of the Court of Appeal clarifying the mens rea ingredients in offences of indecent assault.

R v NC [2017] 1 Cr.App.R.(S) 13; [2017] Crim L.R. 334; [2016] 10 Archbold Review 3, CA – approach of the Crown Court to the making of Sexual Harm Prevention Orders.

KK v DPP [2016] 4 WLR 162, [2016] Crim LR 868 – conviction for knifepoint robbery quashed consequent upon District Judge taking into account of the inadmissible evidence of a co-defendant who had pleaded guilty giving evidence in a Newton hearing heard simultaneous to Appellant’s trial in the Youth Court.

R v Varma [2013] 1 A.C. 463; [2013] 1 Cr.App.R. 115; [2013] Crim L.R. 166; [2012] UKSC 42; The Times, 29/10/12 – junior counsel for the Respondent (on appeal from the Court of Appeal’s reported decision from 2010) – The Supreme Court delivered judgement on 10th October 2012 reversing the decision of the Court of Appeal and ruling that the Crown Court can combine a confiscation order with a conditional discharge.

R v Wright (Barrington) [2012] 2 Cr.App.R.(S) 46(11) – reduction in sentence for a member of the public gallery found in contempt of court for shouting out to his son as a jury found the son guilty of serious offences.

R v Evans (Scott Lennon) [2012] 2 Cr.App.R. 22; [2012] 1 WLR 1192; The Times, 16/1/12 – junior counsel for the Crown. Court of Appeal clarified the meaning of surrendering to bail in the Crown Court for the purposes of section 2(2) of the Bail Act 1976. Also reported at (2012) 176 J.P. 139.

R v Chrysostomou [2010] Crim L.R. 942 – whether text messages fall within statutory definition of hearsay; conviction quashed due to unfairness of allowing such evidence to be adduced as bad character where purpose purely to blacken D’s name.

R v Magro; R v Brissett; R v Smith; R v Varma [2010] Crim L.R. 787; The Times, 26/8/10; [2010] 2 Cr.App.R. 25 – Extent to which a five-judge court can overrule a decision of a three-judge court in the Court of Appeal (Criminal Division); whether Crown Court empowered to combine confiscation order with conditional discharge (N.B. Point of general public importance certified by Court of Appeal – application for leave to appeal to Supreme Court granted).

R v Lancaster [2010] 2 Cr.App.R. 7; [2010] 1 W.L.R. 2558; [2010] Crim L.R. 776; The Times, 2/6/10 – definition of “omits a material particular” under ss.17(1) and (2) of the Theft Act 1968.

Burwell v DPP [2009] Crim LR 897, (2009) 173 J.P. 351 – a prosecutor’s certificate under the Computer Misuse Act 1990, s.11(4) normally determinative of jurisdiction.

R v Ellis [2009] 2 Cr.App.R.(S) 73 – reduction in sentence for offence of aggravated burglary

R v Freeman; R v Crawford [2009] 1 Cr.App.R. 11; [2009] 1 W.L.R. 2723; [2009] Crim L.R. 103 – judgment clarifying legal principles in relation to cross-admissibility of counts in indictment under bad character provisions.

Other notable Court of Appeal cases

R v Glidewell [1999] 163 J.P. 557, The Times, 14/5/99 – Forgetfulness as a reasonable excuse for possession of offensive weapon.

R v Kartal & Ors [1999] 10 Archbold News 2, 31 Criminal Law Week 1, 16/8/99 – Excessive judicial intervention infringing D’s right to a fair trial.

R v Denton [2001] 1 Cr.App.R. 16; [2001] Crim L.R. 225; The Times, 22/11/00 – Reading of statements under s.23 CJA 1988. Failure to give reasons in ruling.

R v Lee Oosthuizen [2006] 1 Cr.App.R. 73 – circumstances in which judge may withhold discount for early guilty plea or impose deterrent sentence in view of guidelines issued by the Sentencing Guideline Council.

R v Ashton, Draz, O’Reilly [2006] 2 Cr.App.R. 15; The Times, 18/4/06, CA – impact of procedural or jurisdictional failures in the Crown Court on the safety of convictions.

R v Jean-Paul Holman [2007] 1 Cr.App.R.(S) 52 – reduction in sentence for offence of false imprisonment in domestic circumstances.

R v David Curtis [2007] 2 Cr.App.R.(S) 52 – applicability of guideline case in burglary with significant aggravating features committed by offender with bad record.

R v Jales and Lawrence [2007] Crim L.R. 800 – judge's findings of contempt of court quashed due to substantial failures of legal procedure.

R v Noble, The Times, July 21, 2008, CA – failure to answer a summons cannot be an offence under Bail Act 1976 nor a common law contempt.