

‘An outstanding advocate. Exceptional in her understanding of the law. Smooth in Court, and an amazing work ethic.’ (Legal 500 – 2026)

“Her drafting, analysis and tactical approach were exceptional.” (Chambers and Partners 2026)

‘Ruth is an exceptional junior barrister. She has exquisite insight and tactical ability combined with a superb client manner and beautifully written advocacy. She is without doubt one of the stars of the junior criminal Bar.’ (Legal 500 2025)

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. 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. Ongoing instructions include a murder where the death occurred approximately 20 years after the initial assault, giving rise to complicated questions of causation/ medical expertise.

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 dealt with a large number of so-called ‘gang’ cases and has particular expertise in opposing applications to adduce gang evidence, as well as dismantling the rubric adopted by the gangs officers.

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 ‘lawyer’s lawyer’ and loves nothing more than scouring the recesses of the Temple libraries to find lesser known legal authorities to elevate her legal arguments.

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

APPELLANT

Rex v I (and others)

Court of Appeal [Judgement to be delivered 4th March 2026]

Ruth was part of a 13 handed case in which the defence had successfully argued that the proceedings in the lower court were an abuse of process. The Crown appealed against this terminatory ruling. The Court of Appeal’s reasoned decision is pending.

Rex v B

Court of Appeal [2025] EWCA Crim 1275.

Successfully appealed against the defendant's sentence for possession of a firearm.

The authority is "a significant addition to the jurisprudence on sentencing for prohibited firearms offences subject to statutory minimum terms. The case clarifies, as a matter of principle, how courts should adjust sentencing guideline starting points once "exceptional circumstances" have been found which disapply the five-year minimum custodial term under the Sentencing Act 2020."

R v APJ

Court of Appeal [2022] EWCA Crim 942

Conviction overturned on appeal where a judge had wrongly responded to a jury's request to examine particular physical exhibits, where these had not been adduced during the trial.

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 L Represented lead defendant in 2 handed youth murder where D was seen swinging a large machete at the deceased. Defendant acquitted in just over an hour.

R v E Represented lead defendant in murder where defendant seen to hide his knife behind his back while beckoning V towards him. He then stabbed him 5 times.

R v M Represented young defendant indicted with murder of rival drug dealer. Defendant acquitted. Then successfully argued abuse of process for subsequent prosecution for drug offences.

R v M Represented defendant charged with a series of stranger rapes where D arrested while trying to force a heavily intoxicated female to go to his home, against the objections of several bystanders.

R v O Represented prominent drill artist and alleged gang member who was alleged to have been in possession of a firearm with the intent to endanger life. Jury accepted that he was in possession but rejected the Crown's central argument re his intention.

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

R v B Cut throat robbery and murder of property magnate's son.

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 the 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.

Leading/ Sole Counsel: defence

R v D Represented gang member indicted with 2 separate -but joined- sets of firearms offences, attempted murder, drug dealing and possession of a machete.

R v S Represented man charged with encouragement of terrorism

R v B Represented young man said to be gang member in incident involving attempted murder (D2) and s18(D1). Complicated legal issues re anonymity, hearsay, severance vacation of plea, and abuse of process.

R v JJ Represented senior gang member alleged to have been in possession of a firearm with intent to endanger life. 3 separate firearms seizures made on same day, all connected to funeral of another prominent gang member.

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.