

EXTRACT FROM DIRECTOR'S GUIDELINES

DECISION TO PROSECUTE

The prosecution process should be initiated or continued wherever it appears to be in the public interest. That is the prosecution policy of the prosecuting authorities in this country and in England and Wales. If it is not in the interests of the public that a prosecution should be initiated or continued then it should not be pursued. The scarce resources available for prosecution should be used to pursue, with appropriate vigour, cases worthy of prosecution and not wasted pursuing inappropriate cases.

It is a two tiered test:-

- (i) is there sufficient evidence?; and
- (ii) does the public interest require a prosecution?

(i) Sufficient Evidence

- A prima facie case is necessary but not enough.
- A prosecution should not proceed if there is no reasonable prospect of conviction before a reasonable jury (or Magistrate).

A decision by a Magistrate to commit a defendant for trial does not absolve the prosecution from its responsibility to independently evaluate the evidence. The test for the Magistrate is limited to whether there is a bare prima facie case. The prosecutor must go further to assess the quality and persuasive strength of the evidence as it is likely to be at trial.

The following matters need to be carefully considered bearing in mind that guilt has to be established beyond reasonable doubt:-

- (a) the availability, competence and compellability of witnesses and their likely impression on the Court;
- (b) any conflicting statements by a material witness;
- (c) the admissibility of evidence, including any alleged confession;
- (d) any lines of defence which are plainly open; and
- (e) any other factors relevant to the merits of the Crown case.

(ii) **Public Interest Criteria**

If there is sufficient reliable evidence of an offence, the issue is whether discretionary factors nevertheless dictate that the matter should not proceed in the public interest.

Discretionary factors may include:-

- (a) the level of seriousness or triviality of the alleged offence, or whether or not it is of a 'technical' nature only;
- (b) the existence of any mitigating or aggravating circumstances;
- (c) the youth, age, physical or mental health or special infirmity of the alleged offender or a necessary witness;
- (d) the alleged offender's antecedents and background, including culture and ability to understand the English language;
- (e) the staleness of the alleged offence;
- (f) the degree of culpability of the alleged offender in connection with the offence;
- (g) whether or not the prosecution would be perceived as counter-productive to the interests of justice;
- (h) the availability and efficacy of any alternatives to prosecution;
- (i) the prevalence of the alleged offence and the need for deterrence, either personal or general;
- (j) whether or not the alleged offence is of minimal public concern;
- (k) any entitlement or liability of a victim or other person to criminal compensation, reparation or forfeiture if prosecution action is taken;
- (l) the attitude of the victim of the alleged offence to a prosecution;
- (m) the likely length and expense of a trial;

- (n) whether or not the alleged offender is willing to co-operate in the investigation or prosecution of others, or the extent to which the alleged offender has done so;
- (o) the likely outcome in the event of a conviction considering the sentencing options available to the Court;
- (p) whether the alleged offender elected to be tried on indictment rather than be dealt with summarily;
- (q) whether or not a sentence has already been imposed on the offender which adequately reflects the criminality of the episode;
- (r) whether or not the alleged offender has already been sentenced for a series of other offences and what likelihood there is of an additional penalty, having regard to the totality principle;
- (s) the necessity to maintain public confidence in the Parliament and the Courts; and
- (t) the effect on public order and morale.

The relevance of discretionary factors will depend upon the individual circumstances of each case.

The more serious the offence, the more likely that the public interest will require a prosecution.

Indeed, the proper decision in most cases will be to proceed with the prosecution if there is sufficient evidence. Mitigating factors can then be put to the Court at sentence.

THE DECISION TO PROSECUTE PARTICULAR CASES

Generally, the case lawyer should at least read the depositions and the witness statements and examine important exhibits before a decision whether or not to indict, and upon what charges, is made.

Where the case lawyer has prosecuted the committal hearing, it will generally not be necessary to wait for the delivery of the depositions before preparing a draft indictment. Unless the matter is complex or borderline, the case lawyer will often be able to rely upon his or her assessment of the committal evidence and its impact upon the Crown case without delaying matters for the delivery of the transcript.

(iii) Child Offenders

Special considerations apply to child offenders. Under the principles of the Juvenile Justice Act 1992 a prosecution is a last resort.

- The welfare of the child and rehabilitation should be carefully considered;
- Ordinarily the public interest will not require the prosecution of a child who is a first offender where the offence is minor;
- The seriousness of the offence or serial offending will generally require a prosecution;
- Driving offences that endanger the lives of the child and other members of the community should be viewed seriously.

The public interest factors should be considered with particular attention to:-

- (a) the seriousness of the alleged offence;
- (b) the age, apparent maturity and mental capacity of the child (including the need, in the case of children under the age of 14, to prove that they knew that what they were doing was seriously wrong and was deserving of punishment);
- (c) the available alternatives to prosecution, and their efficacy;
- (d) the sentencing options available to Courts dealing with child offenders if the prosecution was successful;
- (e) the child's family circumstances, particularly whether or not the parents appear able and prepared to exercise effective discipline and control over the child;
- (f) the child's antecedents, including the circumstances of any previous caution or conference and whether or not a less formal resolution would be inappropriate;
- (g) whether a prosecution would be harmful or inappropriate, considering the child's personality, family and other circumstances; and
- (h) the interest of the victim.

(iv) **Aged or Infirm Offenders**

Prosecuting authorities are reluctant to prosecute the older or more infirm offender unless there is a real risk of repetition or the offence is so serious that it is impossible to overlook it.

In general, proceedings should not be instituted or continued where the nature of the offence is such that, considering the offender, a Court is likely to impose only a nominal penalty.

When the defence suggests that the accused's health will be detrimentally affected by standing trial, medical reports should be obtained from the defence and, if necessary, arrangements should be sought for an independent medical examination.

(v) **Peripheral Defendants**

As a general rule the prosecution should only proceed against those whose participation in the offence was significant.

The inclusion of defendants on the fringe of the action or whose guilt in comparison with the principal offender is minimal may cause unwarranted delay or cost and cloud the essential features of the case.

(vi) **Sexual Offences**

Sexual offences such as rape or attempted rape are a gross personal violation and are serious offences. Similarly, sexual offences upon children should always be regarded seriously. Where there is sufficient reliable evidence to warrant a prosecution, there will seldom be any doubt that the prosecution is in the public interest.

(vii) **Sexual Offences by Children**

A child may be prosecuted for a sexual offence where the child has exercised force, coerced someone younger, or otherwise acted without the consent of the other person.

A child should not be prosecuted for:-

- (a) A sexual offence in which he or she is also the "**complainant**", as in the case of unlawful carnal knowledge or indecent dealing. The underage target of such activity cannot be a party to it, no matter how willing he or she is: R v Malony [2000] QCA 355.
- (b) For sexual experimentation involving children of similar ages in consensual activity.

TERMINATION OF A PROSECUTION BY ODPP

- (viii) A decision to discontinue a prosecution or to substantially reduce charges on the basis of *insufficient evidence* cannot be made without consultation with a Legal Practice Manager. If, and only if, it is not reasonably practicable to consult with the Legal Practice Manager, the consultation may be with a principal crown prosecutor, in lieu of the Legal Practice Manager.

- (ix) Where the charges involve *homicide, attempted murder* or matters of *public notoriety* or high *sensitivity*, the consultation must then extend further to the Director or Deputy Director. The case lawyer should provide a detailed memorandum setting out all relevant issues. The Director may assemble a consultative committee to meet with case lawyer and consider the matter. The consultative committee shall comprise the Director, Deputy Director and two senior principal prosecutors.
- (x) In all cases the person consulted should make appropriate notes on the file.
- (xi) A decision to discontinue on *public policy grounds* should only be made by the Director.

If, after an examination of the brief, a case lawyer or crown prosecutor is of the opinion there are matters which call into question the public interest in prosecuting, the lawyer, through the relevant Legal Practice Manager, should advise the Director of the reasons for such opinion.

- (xii) Once a determination has been made to discontinue a prosecution, the decision will not be reversed unless:-
- significant fresh evidence has been produced that was not previously available for consideration or the decision was obtained by fraud; and
 - in all the circumstances, it is in the interests of justice that the matter be reviewed.

CONSULTATION WITH POLICE

The relevant case lawyer or prosecutor must advise the arresting officer whenever the ODP is considering whether or not to discontinue a prosecution or to substantially reduce charges.

The arresting officer should be consulted on relevant matters, including perceived deficiencies in the evidence or any matters raised by the defence. The arresting officer's views should be sought and recorded prior to any decision. The purpose of consultation is to ensure that any final decision takes account of all relevant facts.

It is the responsibility of the Legal Practice Manager to check that consultation has occurred and that the police response is considered before any final decision is made.

If neither the arresting officer, nor the corroborator, is available for consultation within a reasonable time, the attempts to contact them should be recorded.

After a decision has been made, the case lawyer must notify the arresting officer as soon as possible.

CONSULTATION WITH VICTIMS

The relevant case lawyer or prosecutor must also seek the views of any victim whenever serious consideration is given to discontinuing a prosecution for violence or sexual offences.

The views of the victim must be recorded and properly considered prior to any final decision, but those views alone are not determinative. It is the public, not any individual interest that must be served (see Guideline 0).

Where the victim does not want the prosecution to proceed and the offence is relatively minor, the discretion will usually favour discontinuance. However, the more serious the injury, the greater the public interest in proceeding. Care must also be taken to ensure that a victim's change of heart has not come from intimidation or fear.

REASONS FOR DECISIONS

- (xiii) Reasons for decisions made in the course of prosecutions may be disclosed by the **Director** to persons outside of the ODPP.
- (xiv) The disclosure of reasons is generally consistent with the open and accountable operations of the ODPP.
- (xv) But reasons will only be given when the inquirer has a legitimate interest in the matter and it is otherwise appropriate to do so.
 - Reasons for not prosecuting must be given to the **victims** of crime;
 - A legitimate interest includes the interest of the media in the open dispensing of justice where previous proceedings have been **public**.
- (xvi) Where a decision has been made not to prosecute prior to any public proceeding, reasons may be given by the Director. However, where it would mean publishing material too weak to justify a prosecution, any explanation should be brief.
- (xvii) Reasons will **not** be given in any case where to do so would cause unjustifiable harm to a victim, a witness or an accused or would significantly prejudice the administration of justice.

DIRECTED VERDICT/NOLLE PROSEQUI

If the trial has not commenced, ordinarily, a nolle prosequi should be entered to discontinue the proceedings.

In the absence of special circumstances, once the trial has commenced, it is desirable that it end by verdict of the jury. Where a prima facie case has not been established, this will be achieved by a directed verdict.

Special circumstances which may justify a nolle prosequi instead of a directed verdict will include circumstances where:-

- (a) without fault on the part of the prosecution, it is believed there cannot be a fair determination of the issues: for example: where a ruling of law may be the subject of a Reference;
- (b) a prosecution of a serious offence has failed because of some minor technicality that is curable; or
- (c) matters emerge during the hearing that cause the Director or Deputy Director to advise that it is not in the public interest to continue the hearing.

