

The Law of Evidence Sections 7-13

View Online



1

Munday RJC. Evidence. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

2

Durston, Gregory. Evidence: text & materials. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

3

Civil Evidence Act 1995.

4

Munday RJC. Evidence. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

5

Durston, Gregory. Evidence: text & materials. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

6

Criminal Justice Act 2003.

7

Loof R. Obtaining, adducing and contesting evidence from abroad: a defence perspective on cross-border evidence. Criminal Law review 2011;:40-57.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal Law review

8

Hearsay: Same Old Story. Criminal Law Review Published Online First: 2004.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal law review

9

Worthern T. The hearsay provisions of the Criminal Justice Act 2003: so far, not so good? Criminal law review 2008;:431-42.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal law review

10

Ward T. Hearsay, psychiatric evidence and the interest of justice. Criminal Law review 2009;:415-26.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal Law review

11

Denyer RL. Proving bad character. Criminal Law Review 2009;:562-70.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal Law review

12

Costigan R. Identification from CCTV: the risk of injustice. Criminal Law review 2007;:591-608.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal Law review

13

Case Comment Documentary hearsay. Criminal Law review 1991;:707-8.<http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP>

4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal law review

14

Ormerod D, Lake S. Case Comment Evidence: whether Criminal Justice Act 1988, Sch.2, para.3 automatically rendering previous consistent statement admissible as evidence of circumstances from which inference might be drawn as to accuracy or otherwise of documentary hearsay evidence admitted under s.23 of that Act. Criminal Law review 2005;:642-5.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal law review

15

Ormerod D. Case Comment Hearsay. Criminal Law review 2006;:836-40.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal law review

16

Ormerod DC. Case Comment Evidence: hearsay - Criminal Justice Act 2003 s.116. Criminal Law review 2006;:637-9.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal law review

17

Ormerod D. Case Comment Hearsay: approach to admissibility of hearsay evidence of absent witness under s.114(1)(d) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 where conditions in s.116 not satisfied. Criminal Law review 2009;:519-24.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal law review

18

Ormerod D. Coroners and Justice Act 2009: the 'witness anonymity' and 'investigation anonymity' provisions. Criminal Law Review 2010;:368-88.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

19

The right to confront witnesses: meanings, myths and human rights. Criminal Law Review 2010;:255-74.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

20

Hearsay: Same Old Story. Criminal Law Review Published Online First: 2004.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal law review](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal%20law%20review)

21

O'Brian WE. Confrontation: The Defiance of the English Courts. International journal of evidence & proof 2011;**15**:93-116.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

22

Requa M. Absent Witnesses and the UK Supreme Court: Judicial Deference as Judicial Dialogue. International journal of evidence & proof 2010;**14**:208-31.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

23

Jones I. Political Judgment - Reconciling Hearsay and the Right to Challenge,. International journal of evidence & proof 2010;**14**:232-52.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

24

Case Comment Excess alcohol in blood - testing of blood using computer - evidence of results given by scientist. Criminal Law Review 1987;:422-3.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

25

Pattenden R. Machinespeak: section 129 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Criminal Law Review 2010;:623-37.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

26

Jackson JD. The insufficiency of identification evidence based on personal impression. Criminal Law review 1986;:203-14.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

27

Roberts A. Problem of Mistaken Identification: Some Observations on Process. International journal of evidence & proof 2004;**8**:100-19.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

28

Munday RJC. Evidence. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

29

Walker C. Case Comment Terrorism: possessing an article in circumstances giving rise to reasonable suspicion that possession being for...terrorism. Criminal Law review 2008;:71-2.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

30

Munday RJC. Evidence. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

31

Durston, Gregory. Evidence: text & materials. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

32

Keane A, McKeown P. The modern law of evidence. Eleventh edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2016.

33

Russell GA. Recasting the role of the indictment: a new perspective on an old problem. Criminal Law Review 2010;;840-54.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

34

Hungerford-Welch P. Prosecution interviews of defence witnesses. Criminal Law review 2010;;690-701.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

35

Roberts P, Saunders C. Introducing pre-trial witness interviews: a flexible new fixture in the Crown Prosecutor's toolkit. Criminal Law review 2008;;831-53.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

36

Denyer RL. The defence statement. Criminal Law Review 2009;;340-5.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

37

Duff P. Disclosure in Scottish Criminal Procedure: Another Step in an Inquisitorial Direction. International journal of evidence & proof 2007;**11**:153-80.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

38

Quik H. Identifying Miscarriages of Justice: Why Innocence in the UK Is Not the Answer. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2007;**70**:759-77.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

39

Ormerod D. Improving the Disclosure Regime. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2003;**7**:102-29.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

40

Nash S. Non-Disclosure of Prosecution Evidence and Equality of Arms: *Edwards and Lewis v. United Kingdom*. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2004;**8**:130-4.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

41

Redmayne M. Criminal Justice Act 2003: (1) Disclosure and its discontents. *Criminal Law Review* 2004;**44**:441-62.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

42

Munday RJC. *Evidence*. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

43

Durston, Gregory. *Evidence: text & materials*. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

44

Bisgrove M. Judges as tribunals of fact: to what extent do the provisions for a defendant to be tried on indictment by a judge sitting without a jury conflict with the defendant's right to a fair trial where issues of PII are present? *Criminal Law Review*

2010;;702-10.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

45

Case Comment Informer privilege - Canada. Criminal Law Review
2007;;747-8.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

46

Munday RJC. Evidence. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

47

Durston, Gregory. Evidence: text & materials. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

48

Roberts A. R. v Seaton (Oral): legal professional privilege - defendant accused of recent fabrication of evidence. Criminal Law review
2011;;314-6.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

49

Taylor NW. Legal privilege: Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 - impact on common law and statutory rights of legal privilege. Criminal law review
2009;;524-9.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

50

Roberts AJ. Litigation privilege and legal professional privilege. Criminal Law review
2008;;643-5.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

51

Passmore C. The future of legal professional privilege. *International journal of evidence & proof* 1999;:71-86.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=International journal of evidence & proof](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=International%20journal%20of%20evidence%20&proof)

52

Allan TRS. Legal privilege and the principle of fairness in the criminal trial. *Criminal law review* 1987;:449-59.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

53

Zuckerman AAS. The weakness of the PACE special procedure for protecting confidential material. *Criminal Law Review* 1990;:472-8.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

54

Stone RTH. PACE: special procedures and legal privilege. *Criminal Law review* 1988;:498-507.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

55

Loughrey J. Legal advice privilege and the corporate client. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2005;:183-203.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=International journal of evidence & proof](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=International%20journal%20of%20evidence%20&proof)

56

Ormerod D. Coroners and Justice Act 2009: the 'witness anonymity' and 'investigation anonymity' provisions. *Criminal Law Review* 2010;:368-88.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

57

van Harten G. Weakness of Adjudication in the Face of Secret Evidence. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2009;**13**:1-27.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search

58

Munday RJC. *Evidence*. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

59

Durston, Gregory. *Evidence: text & materials*. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

60

Ashworth A. Case Comment Human rights: article 6(1) - privilege against self-incrimination - Austrian equivalent of offence under s.172 of the Road Traffic Act 1988. *Criminal Law Review* 2008;:549-50.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

61

Case Comment Right to silence: confessions - Canada. *Criminal Law review* 2008;:248-9.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

62

Munday RJC. *Evidence*. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

63

Durston, Gregory. *Evidence: text & materials*. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

64

Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984.

65

Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999.

66

Cooper D. Pigot unfulfilled: video-recorded cross-examination under section 28 of the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999. *Criminal Law review* 2005;:456-66.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

67

Plotnikoff J, Woolfson R. Making the best use of the intermediary special measure at trial. *Criminal Law review* 2008;:91-104.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

68

Burton M, Evans R, Sanders A. Vulnerable and Intimidated Witnesses and the Adversarial Process in England and Wales. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2007;**11**:1-23.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

69

Roberts P, Cooper D, Judge S. Monitoring Success, Accounting for Failure: The Outcome of Prosecutors' Applications for Special Measures Directions under the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2005;**9**:269-90.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

70

Ellison L, Wheatcroft J. 'Could you ask me that in a different way please?' Exploring the

impact of courtroom questioning and witness familiarisation on adult witness accuracy. Criminal Law review 2010;:823-39.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

71

Leake S, Ellison LE. Case Comment Evidence: use of special measures in case of intimidated witnesses. Criminal Law Review 2004;:1034-6.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

72

Munday RJC. Evidence. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

73

Durston, Gregory. Evidence: text & materials. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

74

Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994.

75

Spencer, John R., Flin, Rhona H. The evidence of children: the law and the psychology. 2nd ed. London: : Blackstone 1993.

76

Andrew L, Choo T. Confessions and corroboration: a comparative perspective. Criminal Law review 1991;:867-77.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

77

Roberts A. Eyewitness Identification and Expert Insight: R v Forbes. International journal of evidence & proof 2010;**14**:57-62.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search

78

Costigan R. Identification from CCTV: the risk of injustice. Criminal Law Review 2007;;:591-608.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

79

The use at trial of scientific findings relating to human memory. Criminal law Review 2010;;:19-30.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

80

Ormerod DC. Case Comment Evidence: voice recognition - test for admissibility. Criminal Law review 2006;;:427-30.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

81

Roberts AJ. Case Comment Evidence: street identification - distinct clothing case. Criminal Law Review 2007;;:162-5.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

82

Creighton P. Spouse competence and compellability. Criminal Law review 1990;;:34-43.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

83

Birch DJ. A better deal for vulnerable witnesses? Criminal Law Review

2000;:223-49.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

84

Laura C H Hoyano. Variations on a theme by Pigot: special measures directions for child witnesses. *Criminal Law Review* 2000;:250-73.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

85

McEwan J. In Defence of Vulnerable Witnesses: The Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2000;**4**:1-30.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

86

Hoyano LCH. Coroners and Justice Act 2009: special measures directions take two: entrenching unequal access to justice? *Criminal Law review* 2010;:345-67.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

87

Munday RJC. *Evidence*. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

88

Durston, Gregory. *Evidence: text & materials*. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

89

Munday RJC. *Evidence*. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

90

Durston, Gregory. Evidence: text & materials. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

91

Keane A, Fortson R. Leading questions - a critical analysis. criminal law review 2011;;280-95.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

92

Crinion C. Adducing the good character of prosecution witnesses. Criminal Law review 2010;;570-3.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

93

Heaton-Armstrong, Anthony. Witness testimony: psychological, investigative and evidential perspectives. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2006.

94

Refreshing Memory. Criminal Law Review Published Online First: 1978.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

95

Stephenson GM. Should collaborative testimony be permitted in courts of law? Criminal Law Review 1990;;302-14.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

96

Criminal Justice Act 2003.

97

Witness - refreshing memory from document made at time - record not verified -
admissibility. criminal law review
1993;:947-8.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law
review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

98

Criminal Justice Act 2003.

99

Hearsay: Same Old Story. Criminal Law Review Published Online First:
2004.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=
AC_T_M&C=Criminal law review](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=Criminal%20law%20review)

100

Durston G. Previous (in)consistent statements after the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Criminal
law review 2005;:206-14.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law
review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

101

Lewis P. Expert evidence of delay in complaint in childhood sexual abuse prosecutions.
International journal of evidence & proof
2006;:157-79.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3X
P4S&S=AC_T_M&C=International journal of evidence & proof](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=International%20journal%20of%20evidence%20&proof)

102

Lewis P. Delayed complaints in childhood sexual abuse prosecutions - a comparative
evaluation of admissibility determinations and judicial warnings. International journal of
evidence & proof
2006;:104-27.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3X
P4S&S=AC_T_M&C=International journal of evidence & proof](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=International%20journal%20of%20evidence%20&proof)

103

Hamer D. Trying delays: forensic disadvantage in child sexual assault trials. Criminal law
review 2010;:671-89.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law)

review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

104

Crinion C. Adducing the good character of prosecution witnesses. Criminal law review 2010;:570-3.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

105

Ormerod DC. Evidence: hearsay - recent complaint - Criminal Justice Act 2003 s.120. Criminal law review 2006;:918-20.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

106

Ormerod D. Evidence: previous inconsistent statement - admissibility. Criminal law review 2007;:887-90.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

107

Evidence that prosecution witness was a clergyman. Criminal Law review 1999;:911-2.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

108

Ormerod D. R. v Athwal (Bachan): evidence - hearsay - previous consistent statement - admissibility - rebutting fabrication. criminal law review 2009;:726-9.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

109

Hoyano L. Sexual offences: allegations of historic sexual abuse - credibility of complainants at issue. Criminal Law review 2011;:502-5.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

110

Munday RJC. Evidence. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

111

Durston, Gregory. Evidence: text & materials. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

112

wheatcroft JM. Effectiveness of witness preparation and cross-examination non-directive and directive leading question styles on witness accuracy and confidence. International journal of evidence & proof 2010;:187-207.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_B&C=evidence and proof

113

Ellison L. Closing the credibility gap: the prosecutorial use of expert witness testimony in sexual assault cases. International journal of evidence & proof 2005;:239-68.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_B&C=evidence and proof

114

Keane A, Fortson R. Leading questions - a critical analysis. criminal law review 2011;:280-95.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

115

Criminal Justice Act 2003.

116

Tapper C. Criminal Justice Act 2003: Part 3: evidence of bad character. Criminal Law Review

2004;:553-5.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

117

Ormerod D. Case Comment Evidence: admissibility - allegations against persons other than the defendant. Criminal Law review

2007;:165-8.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

118

Criminal Procedure Act 1865.

119

Evidence: hostile witness. Criminal law review

1999;:221-3.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

120

Ormerod DC. Hostile witness: hostile witness maintaining contents of prior statement not true. criminal law review

2009;:197-200.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

121

Munday R. Calling a hostile witness. criminal Law review

1989;:866-76.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

122

Newark M. The hostile witness and the adversary system. Criminal Law review

1986;:441-54.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

123

Pattenden R. The Hostile Witness. Journal of Criminal law Published Online First: 1992. [http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=journal of criminal law](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=journal%20of%20criminal%20law)

124

Durston G. Bad Character Evidence and Non-Party Witnesses under the Criminal Justice Act 2003. International journal of evidence & proof 2004;**8**:233-9. [http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

125

Seabrooke S. The vanishing trick - blurring the line between credit and issue. Criminal Law review 1999;;387-91. [http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

126

Ormerod D. Evidence: previous inconsistent statement - admissibility. Criminal law review 2007;;887-90. [http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

127

Ormerod DC. Trial: previous inconsistent statement - admissibility. Criminal law review 2007;;407-10. [http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

128

Ormerod D. Previous inconsistent statements: directing juries in relation to previous inconsistent statements in view of effect and application of s.119 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Criminal Law review 2009;;529-32. [http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

129

Munday RJC. Evidence. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

130

Durston, Gregory. Evidence: text & materials. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

131

Criminal Justice Act 2003.

132

Tapper C. Criminal Justice Act 2003: Part 3: evidence of bad character. Criminal Law Review 2004;:553-5.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

133

Durston G. Bad Character Evidence and Non-Party Witnesses under the Criminal Justice Act 2003. International journal of evidence & proof 2004;**8**:233-9.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search

134

Hoyano L. ABE interview: retirement - transcript of prosecution witness's video evidence retained by jury. Criminal law review 2011;:227-9.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

135

Roberts A. Evidence - non-defendant's bad character. Criminal Law review 2011;:58-61.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

136

Roberts A. Evidence: bad character witnesses - allegations in police crime reports. Criminal law review 2010;;855-7.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

137

Munday RJC. Evidence. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

138

Durston, Gregory. Evidence: text & materials. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

139

Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1976.

140

Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999.

141

Temkin, Jennifer. Rape and the legal process. 2nd ed. New York: : Oxford University Press 2002.

<http://library.kent.ac.uk/cgi-bin/resources.cgi?url=http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198763550.001.0001>

142

Temkin, Jennifer,
Krahe

, Barbara. Sexual assault and the justice gap: a question of attitude. Oxford: : Hart 2008.

143

Birch D. Editorial Rethinking sexual history evidence: proposals for fairer trials. *Criminal law review* 2002;:531-53.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

144

McEwan J. The rape shield askew? *International journal of evidence & proof* 2001;:257-62.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_B&C=evidence and proof](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_B&C=evidence%20and%20proof)

145

McEwan J. Proving consent in sexual cases: legislative change and cultural evolution. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2005;:1-28.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_B&C=evidence and proof](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_B&C=evidence%20and%20proof)

146

Kibble N. Judicial perspectives on the operation of s.41 and the relevance and admissibility of prior sexual history evidence: four scenarios: Part 1. *Criminal Law Review* 2005;:190-205.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

147

Kibble N. Judicial discretion and the admissibility of prior sexual history evidence under section 41 of the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999: sometimes sticking to your guns means shooting yourself in the foot: Part 2. *Criminal Law Review* 2005;:263-74.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

148

Ellison L. Cross-examination in rape trials. *Criminal law Review* 1998;:605-15.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

149

Hamer D. Trying delays: forensic disadvantage in child sexual assault trials. *Criminal law review* 2010;;671-89.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

150

McGlynn C. Rape, defendant anonymity and human rights: adopting a 'wider perspective'. *Criminal Law Review* 2011;;199-215.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

151

Ellison L. The use and abuse of psychiatric evidence in rape trials. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2009;;28-49.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_B&C=evidence and proof](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_B&C=evidence%20and%20proof)

152

Birch DJ. Evidence: sexual offences - cross-examination about sexual behaviour of complainant. *Criminal Law review* 2001;;911-3.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

153

Kibble N. R. v Harris: evidence - sexual offences - rape - cross-examination of complainant about sexual behaviour. *Criminal Law Review* 2010;;54-61.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

154

Kibble N. Sexual offences: whether judge correct to refuse to allow cross-examination of complainant as to history of homosexual intercourse. *Criminal Law review* 2007;;910-4.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

155

Ormrod D. Sexual history evidence. Criminal Law review 2007;:181-4.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

156

Kibble N. Rape: fresh evidence - evidence of complainant making numerous false complaints - effect on credibility. Criminal Law review 2008;:394-8.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

157

Kibble N. Criminal evidence: cross-examination - complainant's sexual history. Criminal law review 2008;:635-9.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

158

Kibble N. Criminal evidence: sexual history evidence - cross-examination. Criminal Law review 2008;:971-5.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

159

Munday RJC. Evidence. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

160

Durston, Gregory. Evidence: text & materials. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

161

Tapper C. Criminal Justice Act 2003: Part 3: evidence of bad character. criminal Law review 2004;:533-55.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

162

Mirfield P. Character and credibility. Criminal Law review 2009;:135-51.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

163

Spencer, John R. Evidence of bad character. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Hart 2009.

164

Munday R. Cut-throat defences and the 'propensity to be untruthful' under s.104 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Criminal Law Review 2005;:624-37.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

165

Munday R. What constitutes 'other reprehensible behaviour' under the bad character provisions of the Criminal Justice Act 2003? Criminal Law review 2005;:24-43.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

166

Munday roderick. Bad character rules and riddles: 'explanatory notes' and true meanings of s.103(1) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Criminal law review 2005;:337-54.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

167

Tapper C. Criminal Justice Act 2003: Part 3: evidence of bad character. criminal Law review 2004;:533-55.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

168

Waterman A. Bad character: feeling our way one year on. *criminal law review* 2006;:614-28.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

169

Redmayne M. Recognising propensity. *criminal law review* 2011;:177-98.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

170

Mirfield P. Character and credibility. *Criminal Law review* 2009;:135-51.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

171

Fortson R. Bad character evidence and cross-admissibility. *Criminal law review* 2009;:313-34.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

172

Denyer R. Proving bad character. *Criminal law review* 2009;:562-70.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

173

Mirfield P. Character and credibility. *Criminal Law review* 2009;:135-51.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

174

Goudkamp J. Bad character evidence and reprehensible behaviour. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2008;:116-40.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_B&C=evidence and proof](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_B&C=evidence%20and%20proof)

175

Criminal Justice Act 2003.

176

Roberts P. Acquitted misconduct evidence and double jeopardy principles, from Sambasivam to Z. Criminal Law review 2000;:952-70.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

177

Higgins V, Roberts AJ. Evidence: character of accused - character of co-accused. Criminal Law review 2006;:530-4.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

178

Rees T, Roberts AJ. Evidence: Criminal Justice Act 2003 ss.100-112 - bad character of defendant. Criminal law review 2006;:534-40.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

179

Roberts AJ. Bad character: capacity of a single previous conviction to establish a propensity to commit offences of the kind charged. Criminal law review 2007;:637-9.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

180

Roberts AJ. Evidence: Criminal Justice Act 2003 Part II - bad character provisions. Criminal law review 2006;:433-9.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

181

Ashworth AJ. Bad character: multiple complaints - prosecution contending each complainant's evidence being mutually supportive. Criminal law review 2007;:380-3.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

182

Ormerod D. Bad character and cross admissibility. Criminal law review 2009;:103-6.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

183

Ormerod D. R. v O'Dowd: trial - length of trial - whether making trial unfair and conviction unsafe. Criminal Law Review 2009;:827-30.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

184

Roberts AJ. R. v Lafayette: propensity - whether judge's summing-up adequate. Criminal Law review 2009;:809-11.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

185

Roberts AJ. Evidence: bad character - pre-Criminal Justice Act 2003 law. Criminal law review 2008;:303-6.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

186

Roberts A j. Previous convictions: criminal evidence - prosecution witness - previous convictions - admissibility. Criminal law review 2008;:306-8.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

187

Ormerod david. R. v Fox: bad character - causing a child under the age of 13 to engage in

sexual activity. Criminal law review

2009;;881-6.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

188

Roberts A j. Bad character: evidence of previous misconduct - whether misconduct having to do with offence charged. Criminal law review

2007;;969-72.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

189

roberts A j. Evidence: bad character - circumstantial evidence of involvement in linked offences. criminal law review

2007;;976-9.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

190

Ormerod D. Evidence: judge admitting defendants' previous convictions - judge ruling at start of case. Criminal law review

2007;;890-9=894.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

191

Roberts A j. Bad character. Criminal law review

2007;;794-6.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

192

Roberts A. Bad character: whether evidence of oral aggression admissible. Criminal law review

2007;;712-4.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

193

Roberts A. Summing up - direction to jury. Criminal law review

2011;;79-80.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

194

Roberts A j. Evidence: admissibility - bad character - evidence of previous conviction - defendant disputing facts forming background to previous conviction. Criminal law review 2009;;517-9.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

195

Roberts A j. Evidence: criminal evidence - admissibility - evidence of defendant's bad character. Criminal law review 2009;;514-6.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

196

Roberts A j. Evidence: bad character - murder - manslaughter admitted - relevance of 'propensity to violence' where specific intent at issue. Criminal law review 2008;;472-5.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

197

Roberts A j. Evidence: bad character - Criminal Justice Act 2003 ss.101(1)(d) and 103(1) - admissibility of earlier incident for which defendant not prosecuted. Criminal law review 2008;;547-9.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

198

Roberts A. Bad character: character of accused - previous misconduct of accused not subject of criminal convictions - causing death by dangerous driving. Criminal law review 2008;;712-6.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

199

Roberts AJ. Bad character: direction to jury - credibility - propensity - defendant having no relevant previous convictions. Criminal Law review Published Online First: 2008.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

200

Criminal Justice Act 2003.

201

Roberts, Paul, Zuckerman, A. A. S. Criminal evidence. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2010.

202

Tapper C. Criminal Justice Act 2003: Part 3: evidence of bad character. Criminal law review 2004;:533-55.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

203

Roberts AJ. Bad character: character of defendant - attack on another person's character. Criminal Law review 2007;:709-11.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

204

Ormerod D. Evidence: bad character - hearsay - texts sent to defendant - Criminal Justice Act 2003 s.101(1)(f) and (g), (3). Criminal Law Review 2010;:942-5.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

205

Summing up - good character of defendant - relevance to his credibility - relevance to the likelihood of his committing offence - proper direction to jury. Criminal Law Review 1993;:602-5.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

206

Roberts AJ. R. v M: evidence - good character - adequacy of direction to jury. Criminal Law Review 2010;:232-5.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

207

Criminal Justice Act 2003.

208

Roberts, Paul, Zuckerman, A. A. S. Criminal evidence. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2010.

209

Tapper C. Criminal Justice Act 2003: Part 3: evidence of bad character. criminal Law review 2004;:533-55.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

210

Munday R. Cut-throat defences and the 'propensity to be untruthful' under s.104 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Criminal Law review 2005;:624-37.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

211

Denyer RL. Non-compliance with case management orders and directions. Criminal law review 2008;:784-92.http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

212

Criminal Justice Act 2003.

213

Roberts AJ. R. v Ramirez: evidence - admissibility - evidence of bad character of co-accused. Criminal law review

2010;:235-8.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

214

Roberts AJ. Bad character: application by co-accused to adduce bad character evidence. Criminal law review

2008;:632-5.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10)

215

Lloyd-Bostock S. The effects on juries of hearing about the defendant's previous criminal record: a simulation study. Criminal Law review

2000;:734-55.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

216

Lloyd-Bostock S. The effects on lay magistrates of hearing that the defendant is of 'good character', being left to speculate, or hearing that he has a previous conviction. Criminal Law review

2006;:189-212.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

217

Great Britain, Great Britain. Evidence of bad character in criminal proceedings: report on a reference under Section 3(1)(e) of the Law Commissions Act 1965. London: : Stationery Office 2001.

218

Justice for all: presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, the Lord Chancellor and the Attorney General. Norwich: : TSO (The Stationery Office) 2002.

219

Munday RJC. Evidence. Eighth edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2015.

220

Durston, Gregory. Evidence: text & materials. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2011.

221

Redmayne, Mike. Expert evidence and criminal justice. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2001.

<http://library.kent.ac.uk/cgi-bin/resources.cgi?url=http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198267805.001.0001>

222

Home - Law Commission.

223

Dwyer D. Duties of Expert Witnesses of Fact and Opinion: R v. Clark (Sally), The. International journal of evidence & proof 2003;**7**

:264-9.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

224

Walker CP, McCartney C. Case Comment Evidence: expert witnesses seriously disagreeing as to whether cause of death of infants natural or unnatural. Criminal Law Review 2005;:126-30.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

225

Roberts AJ. Case Comment Experts - duties of experts - obligations to court. Criminal Law review

2006;;745-8.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

226

Naughton M, Tan G. Right to Access DNA Testing by Alleged Innocent Victims of Wrongful Convictions in the United Kingdom, The. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2010;**14**:326-45.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

227

Wheate R. Importance of DNA Evidence to Juries in Criminal Trials, The. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2010;**14**:129-45.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

228

Roberts A. Case Comment Evidence: expert evidence in cases involving sudden death of child. *Criminal Law Review* 2010;;945-9.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

229

Keane A. The use at trial of scientific findings relating to human memory. *Criminal Law review* 2010;;19-30.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

230

Coen M, Hefferman L. Juror comprehension of expert evidence: a reform agenda. *Criminal Law review* 2010;;195-211.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

231

Ellison L, Wheatcroft J. 'Could you ask me that in a different way please?' Exploring the impact of courtroom questioning and witness familiarisation on adult witness accuracy. *Criminal law review* 2010;;823-39.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal%20law%20review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search)

232

Expert evidence: difficulties and solutions in prosecutions for infant harm. *Legal Studies* 2010;**30**:279-300.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=legal studies](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=legal%20studies)

233

Redmayne M, Roberts P, Aitken C, et al. Forensic science evidence in questions. *Criminal law review* 2011;;347-56.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=criminal law review](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=criminal%20law%20review)

234

Roberts A. Drawing on expertise: legal decision-making and the reception of expert evidence. *Criminal Law review* 2008;;443-62.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=criminal law review](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=criminal%20law%20review)

235

Roberts A. Rejecting general acceptance, confounding the gate-keeper: the Law Commission and expert evidence. *Criminal Law review* 2009;;551-61.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=criminal law review](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=criminal%20law%20review)

236

Ward T. Usurping the Role of the Jury - Expert Evidence and Witness Credibility in English Criminal Trials. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2009;**13**:83-101.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

237

Klinker M. Forensic Science Expertise for International Criminal Proceedings: An Old Problem, a New Context and a Pragmatic Resolution. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2009;**13**:102-29.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

238

Dwyer D. Legal Remedies for the Negligent Expert. *International journal of evidence & proof* 2008;**12**:93-115.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)

239

Cunliffe E. Without Fear or Favour - Trends and Possibilities in the Canadian Approach to Expert Human Behaviour Evidence. *International journal of evidence & proof*;**10**:280-315.[http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search](http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence%20and%20proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search)