

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* [Internet]. 2011;(1):40–57. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2004; Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2008;(6):431–442. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2009;(6):415–426. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2009;(8):562–570. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2007;(Aug):591–608. Available from: 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 [Internet]. 1991;(Sept):707-708. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&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 [Internet]. 2005;(Aug):642-645. Available from: 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 [Internet]. 2006;(Sept):836-840. Available from: 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 [Internet]. 2006;(Jul):637-639. Available from: 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 [Internet]. 2009;(7):519-524. Available from: 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 [Internet]. 2010;(5):368-388. Available from: <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* [Internet]. 2010;(4):255-274. Available from:
[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* [Internet]. 2004; Available from:
[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* [Internet]. 2011;15(2):93-116. Available from:
[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* [Internet]. 2010;14(3):208-231. Available from:
[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* [Internet]. 2010;14(3):232-252. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 1987;(June):422–423. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

25.

Pattenden R. Machinespeak: section 129 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Criminal Law Review [Internet]. 2010;(8):623–637. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

26.

Jackson JD. The insufficiency of identification evidence based on personal impression. Criminal Law review [Internet]. 1986;(Apr):203–214. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

27.

Roberts A. Problem of Mistaken Identification: Some Observations on Process. International journal of evidence & proof [Internet]. 2004;8(2):100–119. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&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 [Internet]. 2008;(1):71–72. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2010;(11):840–854. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2010;(9):690–701. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2008;(11):831–853. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2009;(5):340–345. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2007;11(3):153–180. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&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* [Internet]. 2007;70(5):759–777. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search

39.

Ormerod D. Improving the Disclosure Regime. *International journal of evidence & proof* [Internet]. 2003;7(2):102–129. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&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* [Internet]. 2004;8(2):130–134. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search

41.

Redmayne M. Criminal Justice Act 2003: (1) Disclosure and its discontents. *Criminal Law Review* [Internet]. 2004;(June):441–462. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2010;(9):702–710. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

45.

Case Comment Informer privilege - Canada. Criminal Law Review [Internet]. 2007;(Sept):747–748. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2011;(4):314–316. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2009;(7):524-529. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 2008;(8):643-645. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 1999;(3(2)):71-86. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 1987;(Jul):449-459. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 1990;(Jul):472-478. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 1988;(Aug):498-507. Available from:
[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* [Internet]. 2005;(9 (3)):183-203. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=International journal of evidence & proof

56.

Ormerod D. Coroners and Justice Act 2009: the 'witness anonymity' and 'investigation anonymity' provisions. *Criminal Law Review* [Internet]. 2010;(5):368-388. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

57.

van Harten G. Weakness of Adjudication in the Face of Secret Evidence. *International journal of evidence & proof* [Internet]. 2009;13(1):1-27. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2008;(7):549-550. Available from: 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 [Internet]. 2008;(3):248-249. Available from: 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 [Internet]. 2005;(June):456-466. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2008;(2):91-104. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2007;11(1):1-23. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&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* [Internet]. 2005;9(4):269-290. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&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* [Internet]. 2010;(11):823-839. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2004;(December):1034-1036. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 1991;(Dec):867-877. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2010;14(1):57-62. Available from: [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)

78.

Costigan R. Identification from CCTV: the risk of injustice. Criminal Law Review [Internet]. 2007;(August):591-608. Available from: [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)

79.

The use at trial of scientific findings relating to human memory. Criminal law Review [Internet]. 2010;(1):19-30. Available from: [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)

80.

Ormerod DC. Case Comment Evidence: voice recognition - test for admissibility. Criminal

Law review [Internet]. 2006;(May):427–430. Available from:
[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)

81.

Roberts AJ. Case Comment Evidence: street identification - distinct clothing case. Criminal Law Review [Internet]. 2007;(Feb):162–165. Available from:
[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)

82.

Creighton P. Spouse competence and compellability. Criminal Law review [Internet]. 1990;(Jan):34–43. Available from:
[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)

83.

Birch DJ. A better deal for vulnerable witnesses? Criminal Law Review [Internet]. 2000;(April):223–249. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 2000;(April):250–273. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 2000;4(1):1–30. Available from:
[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* [Internet]. 2010;(5):345–367. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2011;(4):280–295. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2010;(7):570–573. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 1978; Available from: [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* [Internet]. 1990;(May):302-314. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 1993;(dec):947-948. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2004; Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2005;(Mar):206–214. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2006;(10(3)):157–179. Available from: [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)

102.

Lewis P. Delayed complaints in childhood sexual abuse prosecutions - a comparative evaluation of admissibility determinations and judicial warnings. *International journal of evidence & proof* [Internet]. 2006;(10(2)):104–127. Available from: [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)

103.

Hamer D. Trying delays: forensic disadvantage in child sexual assault trials. *Criminal law review* [Internet]. 2010;(9):671–689. Available from: [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)

104.

Crinion C. Adducing the good character of prosecution witnesses. *Criminal law review* [Internet]. 2010;(7):570–573. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2006;(Oct):918-920. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2007;(Nov):887-890. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 1999;(Nov):911-912. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2009;(10):726-729. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2011;(6):502-505. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2010;(14(3)):187-207. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2005;(9(4)):239-268. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2011;(4):280-295. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2004;(Jul):553-555. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

117.

Ormerod D. Case Comment Evidence: admissibility - allegations against persons other than the defendant. *Criminal Law review* [Internet]. 2007;(Feb):165-168. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

118.

Criminal Procedure Act 1865.

119.

Evidence: hostile witness. Criminal law review [Internet]. 1999;(Mar):221-223. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2009;(3):197-200. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 1989;(dec):866-876. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 1986;(Jul):441-454. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 1992;(56). Available from: [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.

Durstun G. Bad Character Evidence and Non-Party Witnesses under the Criminal Justice Act 2003. *International journal of evidence & proof* [Internet]. 2004;8(4):233-239. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search

125.

Seabrooke S. The vanishing trick - blurring the line between credit and issue. *Criminal Law review* [Internet]. 1999;(May):387-391. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2007;(Nov):887-890. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2007;(May):407-410. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2009;(7):529-532. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2004;(Jul):553-555. Available from: [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)

133.

Durston G. Bad Character Evidence and Non-Party Witnesses under the Criminal Justice Act 2003. International journal of evidence & proof [Internet]. 2004;8(4):233-239. Available from: [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)

134.

Hoyano L. ABE interview: retirement - transcript of prosecution witness's video evidence retained by jury. Criminal law review [Internet]. 2011;(3):227-229. Available from: [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)

135.

Roberts A. Evidence - non-defendant's bad character. Criminal Law review [Internet]. 2011;(1):58-61. Available from: [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)

136.

Roberts A. Evidence: bad character witnesses - allegations in police crime reports. Criminal law review [Internet]. 2010;(11):855-857. Available from:

http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press; 2002. Available from:
<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 [Internet]. 2002;(July):531-553. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 2001;(5(4)):257-262. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 2005;(9(1)):1-28. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 2005;(Mar):190-205. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 2005;(Apr):263-274. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 1998;(Sep):605-615. Available from:
[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* [Internet]. 2010;(9):671–689. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2011;(3):199–215. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2009;(13(1)):28–49. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_B&C=evidence and proof

152.

Birch DJ. Evidence: sexual offences - cross-examination about sexual behaviour of complainant. *Criminal Law review* [Internet]. 2001;(Nov):911–913. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2010;(1):54–61. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2007;(Nov):910–914. Available from:

http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

155.

Ormrod D. Sexual history evidence. *Criminal Law review* [Internet]. 2007;(feb):181–184. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2008;(5):394–398. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2008;(8):635–639. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2008;(12):971–975. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2004;(Jul):533-555. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2009;(3):135-151. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2005;(Aug):624-637. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2005;(Jan):24-43. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2005;(May):337-354. Available from: 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 [Internet]. 2004;(Jul):533-555. Available from: 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 [Internet]. 2006;(Jul):614-628. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

169.

Redmayne M. Recognising propensity. criminal law review [Internet]. 2011;(3):177-198. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

170.

Mirfield P. Character and credibility. Criminal Law review [Internet]. 2009;(3):135-151. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2009;(5):313-334. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

172.

Denyer R. Proving bad character. Criminal law review [Internet]. 2009;(8):562-570. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

173.

Mirfield P. Character and credibility. *Criminal Law review* [Internet]. 2009;(3):135-151. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2008;(12(2)):116-140. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2000;(Dec):952-970. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2006;(Jun):530-534. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2006;(Jun):534-540. Available from: [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* [Internet].

2007;(Aug):637-639. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2006;(May):433-439. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2007;(May):380-383. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2009;(2):103-106. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2009;(11):827-830. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2009;(11):809-811. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2008;(4):303–306. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2008;(4):306–308. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2009;(12):881–886. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2007;(Dec):969–972. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2007;(Dec):976–979. Available from: [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 [Internet]. 2007;(Nov):890–9=894. Available from: [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 AJ. Bad character. Criminal law review [Internet]. 2007;(Oct):794–796. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2007;(Sep):712–714. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2011;(1):79–80. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2009;(7):517–519. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2009;(7):514–516. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&s=AC_T_B&V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=&S=SC&N=10

196.

Roberts AJ. Evidence: bad character - murder - manslaughter admitted - relevance of 'propensity to violence' where specific intent at issue. Criminal law review [Internet]. 2008;(6):472–475. Available from: <http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law>

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

197.

Roberts AJ. 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 [Internet]. 2008;(7):547-549. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 2008;(9):712-716. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 2008;(9). Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 2004;(Jul):533-555. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. 2007;(Sep):709-711. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2010;(12):942-945. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 1993;(Aug):602-605. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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 [Internet]. 2010;(3):232-235. Available from: 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* [Internet]. 2004;(Jul):533-555. Available from:
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* [Internet]. 2005;(August):624-637. Available from:
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* [Internet]. 2008;(10):784-792. Available from:
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* [Internet]. 2010;(3):235-238. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2008;(8):632-635. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?C=criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2000;(September):734-755. Available from:
[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* [Internet]. 2006;(March):189-212. Available from:
[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 [Internet]. Oxford: Oxford University

Press; 2001. Available from:
<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* [Internet]. 2003;7(4):264-269. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&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* [Internet]. 2005;(Feb):126-130. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&s=AC_T_M&submit=Search

225.

Roberts AJ. Case Comment Experts - duties of experts - obligations to court. *Criminal Law review* [Internet]. 2006;(August):745-748. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Criminal law review&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* [Internet]. 2010;14(4):326-345. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search

227.

Wheate R. Importance of DNA Evidence to Juries in Criminal Trials, *The International journal of evidence & proof* [Internet]. 2010;14(2):129-145. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2010;(12):945-949. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2010;(1):19-30. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2010;(3):195-211. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2010;(11):823-839. Available from: [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* [Internet]. 2010;30(2):279-300. Available from: [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, Jackson G. Forensic science evidence in questions. *Criminal law review* [Internet]. 2011;(5):347-356. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=criminal law review

234.

Roberts A. Drawing on expertise: legal decision-making and the reception of expert evidence. *Criminal Law review* [Internet]. 2008;(6):443-462. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=criminal law review

235.

Roberts A. Rejecting general acceptance, confounding the gate-keeper: the Law Commission and expert evidence. *Criminal Law review* [Internet]. 2009;(8):551-561. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&N=100&L=DF7SM3XP4S&S=AC_T_M&C=criminal law review

236.

Ward T. Usurping the Role of the Jury - Expert Evidence and Witness Credibility in English Criminal Trials. *International journal of evidence & proof* [Internet]. 2009;13(2):83-101. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&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* [Internet]. 2009;13(2):102-129. Available from: http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search

238.

Dwyer D. Legal Remedies for the Negligent Expert. *International journal of evidence & proof* [Internet]. 2008;12(2):93-115. Available from:

http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&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* [Internet]. 10(4):280-315. Available from:
http://df7sm3xp4s.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=DF7SM3XP4S&C=Evidence and proof&s=T_W_A&submit=Search