



Gavin Holme – Barrister

Called 1999

Gavin's practice profile consists of serious criminal cases. He is routinely instructed in complex drug conspiracies, sexual offences, financial offences and serious offences of violence.

He is a commanding, yet highly considered, advocate with an ease of style that is born out of careful preparation and an empathetic approach to his clients. His submissions are well crafted, and balanced. His cross examination is well prepared and effective, often setting the tone for the trial. He remains calm and in control, even when the landscape is changing fast.

His thorough and committed approach to each case, alongside his focus on client care, means that he is often first choice for many of his clients.

In September 2020 he was elected as Head of Chambers.

Testimonials:

"Gavin Holme is a formidable advocate, advancing strong well thought out legal arguments, putting forwards his case with tenacity and flair. An excellent lawyer who enjoys the respect from others within the profession"
– Chris Albin - Partner, Albin & Co

Notable cases:

R v A - represented a defendant accused of kidnap and blackmail, a man was taken on Christmas Day and held until the evening before managing to escape. The case involved considerable cross examination of the complainant who had lied about his knowledge of the defendant. He had previously represented the defendant in robbery trial where the jury acquitted him.

R v B – represented a defendant accused of masterminding the kidnap of a foreign national. The complainant had moved to the Ukraine but was unable to return to the UK because of an outstanding European Arrest Warrant, which led to a complicated legal argument as to the potential use of a live link for him to be able to give evidence.

R v Bi – represented a defendant accused of conspiracy to kidnap. The case involved a number of members of a motorcycle club travelling to the south west of England in order to intimidate a person that had fallen out with another member of the club.

R v Be – represented a defendant accused of kidnap. Following detailed cross examination of the complainant the jury acquitted the defendant of the kidnap.

R v M – represented a defendant in an historic **child cruelty** case. The Allegations dated back to the early 1980s and involved the dynamic of the relationship between a stepmother and her stepchildren. Due to the passage of time care had to be taken in cross examination in order to establish what was a fact from what was fantasy.



R v K – represented a young defendant in a conspiracy to commit false imprisonment. Issues were raised regarding disclosure, the most important of which was a mobile telephone. The Crown were forced to accept that there were issues and ultimately, having considered the new material, offered no evidence against the defendant and he was acquitted. He represented the same defendant subsequently in relation to a number of drugs cases.

R v T - represented a defendant in a conspiracy to supply three kilograms of cocaine. The prosecution alleged that the defendant was a trusted lieutenant in charge of the production of crack cocaine. A drugs expert needed to be cross examined as to elements of production and the increasing purity of powdered cocaine.

R v C – represented a defendant in a joint enterprise production of crack cocaine. As the case developed one of the co-defendants sought to blame C. After a successful cross examination of the co-defendant the defendant was acquitted.

R v I – represented the first defendant in a conspiracy to supply class B drugs and possession of a prohibited firearm. The case started with numerous disclosure issues that after legal argument led to the exclusion of a vast amount of the prosecution evidence.

R v L - represented a defendant in a conspiracy to supply class A drugs. This was described as a classic ‘county lines’ case.

R v Ba – defended in a large Inland Revenue fraud.

R v D – leading prosecution counsel in a garage lien fraud. The defendants advertised services that they had no intention of performing. Once the vehicle was in their possession, they would remove the engine and use it to force the victim to either pay for its return or pay for further works.

R v RM & C - represented the director and company in a conspiracy to defraud based on ‘clocking’ cars imported from Japan.

R v Bu – defending in a large money laundering case where the accusation was that the defendant was working with her husband and his business partner to defraud investors.

R v R – defended a man accused of being involved in a fraud where elderly people were persuaded to undertake unnecessary repairs to their roofs.



Qualifications:

BA (Hons) History – Leeds University 1996

CPE – Guildford College of Law 1998

BVC – ICSL 1999

Professional memberships:

Inner Temple

Criminal Bar Association

South Eastern Circuit

Thames Valley Bar Mess – Treasurer

Contact Details:

Telephone: 0207-822-7000

Email: clerks@4kbw.co.uk