



Adam Williams – Barrister

Called 2013

Adam quickly developed a significant practice within the Crown Court as soon as he was on his feet, establishing an excellent reputation throughout the circuits. He is known for providing clear, concise and effective advice for both lay and professional clients. Adam joined Chambers in 2019 having previously been in-house Counsel for a large Solicitors firm based across the Midland, South East and Western circuits.

PRACTICE AREAS:

CRIME:

Adam regularly prosecutes (level 3 panel advocate) and defends in the Crown Court. He has successfully defended in a wide range of offences such as; serious assaults, robbery, drugs, burglary, firearm offences, public disorder, cases involving fatalities, conspiracies and sexual offences.

Whilst defending Adam has successfully dealt with a wide array of offences including those that require the utmost care and sensitivity. He has a reputation for being able to deal with the most complex issues with ease. He has had much success in various legal applications including complex abuse of process and dismissal applications.

As a prosecutor Adam has prosecuted represented and unrepresented defendants. He has successfully prosecuted a wide array of offences such as; assaults, drugs, robbery, theft, burglary, malicious communications and perverting the course of justice.

Adam is regularly instructed in POCA proceedings including full confiscation hearings. He also has extensive experience in dealing with defendants with mental health issues including fitness to plead, stand trial and disposal hearings.

He has been regularly praised for both his written and oral advocacy by Judges he has appeared before.

“In all my time on the bench, this skeleton argument has been the most helpful written advocacy I have received” High Court Judge sitting in the Crown Court

“I find Mr Williams to be an extremely capable advocate and it is a pleasure to have him frequently appear in my Court” Resident Judge in the South Eastern Circuit

PRIVATE CRIME

Adam regularly appears on behalf of privately paying defendants. His work ethic, sound legal judgment and approachability are just some of his attributes to be praised by both his lay and professional clients.



Adam is also regularly instructed on behalf of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA). He has represented the RSPCA in all manner of cases ranging from trials in the Magistrates, to trials in the Crown Court including puppy farming conspiracy cases.

He also accepts instructions from local authorities and police forces to prosecute on their behalf. Adam is regularly instructed by the MET Police in all manner of civil applications in the Magistrates' Court such as Football Banning Orders, Civil POCA, and Closure Orders.

COURT MARTIAL

Having served in the Royal Air Force Reserves (UAS) during his time at University, Adam has an in-depth knowledge of military life, operations and the Court Martial. Before joining Chambers, Adam was the head of the military law department in a large firm of solicitors. Adam has a reputation for fighting for his client's fearlessly and understanding the key differences in the consideration of the Court Martial compared to that of the Crown Court. Adam accepts instructions on both a private and legal aid (AFLAA) basis.

MEDIATION

Adam is a fully qualified mediator having completed his training with the London School of Mediation (LSM). He accepts instructions as a mediator in all areas.

REGULATORY

Adam accepts instructions in all regulatory matters including defending those charged with breaches under their regulatory code of conduct. Due to his close connections with Edge Hill University and the Centre for Sports Law research, Adam is keen to expand his practice further and accepts instructions in Sporting disciplinary hearings.

DIRECT ACCESS

Adam can undertake instructions directly from members of the Public without the need for a solicitor under the Bar Direct Public Access scheme. However please be advised that once he has considered your case it may be that Adam will recommend that you nevertheless consider appointing a solicitor in the usual fashion which is in keeping with his duties. Adam can be instructed on a direct access basis for a wide range of cases such as but not limited to; advice on evidence including prospects at trial; advice on private prosecutions; and road traffic matters.



QUALIFICATIONS

- Bar Professional Training Course, Nottingham Law School
- LLB Hons, Edge Hill University
- Accredited Mediator, London School of Mediation (LSM)

SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS

- Paraded with the Queen's Colour Squadron as part of a Guard of Honour for Her Majesty The Queen and the Royal family at the grand opening of the Bomber Command Memorial in London on the 28th June 2012;
- Livermore, City of Liverpool Citizenship Trophy (awarded to the best Officer on Squadron, LUAS)
- Volunteering Award from Edge Hill University.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

- Criminal Bar Association
- South Eastern Circuit
- Thames Valley Bar Mess
- Inner Temple
- Visiting Practitioner Lecturer Edge Hill University

INTERESTS OUTSIDE WORK

Flying, Parachuting, Shooting, Theatre, Football, Climbing and Hill Walking with Ralph his rescue dog.

NOTABLE CASES:

- R v H Peterborough Crown Court [2022] (privately paid) – Adam was instructed shortly after the defendant had received a summons confirming a charge of death by careless driving whilst over the prescribed limit of a drug. The Prosecution at Court were trying to say it was a matter that fell in the highest category due to the drug blood testing limit being 3 times over the legal limit. On advice from Adam, defence experts were instructed at an early stage to demonstrate that blood drug analysis is much more complicated than being “3 times over the limit” and that the actual carelessness of the defendant was 3 seconds of inattention to the road. Following significant mitigation by Adam on the defendant's behalf, the Judge agreed with Adam that it fell in the lower categories and limited the custodial sentence accordingly.
- R v D Amersham Crown Court [2022] – The case involved a group of youths who had been shouting at a house before walking down an alleyway. When the occupants of the house, an adult male and female, confronted the defendants down an alleyway, the group of 4 defendants attacked the adult male who during the incident suffered a number of stab wounds and a wound to his head from being hit with a bottle. There was significant delay within the case so much so that all defendants having been youths were now adults. There were also procedural irregularities which led to a number of abuse of process arguments being heard. At trial, Adam was prosecuted by a King's Counsel. The Jury acquitted the defendants of a S18 GBH but convicted of S20 GBH and affray. At sentencing, their sentence was limited



to 2 years imprisonment following detailed submission around the youth sentencing principles.

- R v B Luton Crown Court [2022] – The defendant was accused of a joint enterprise street Robbery in which in the earlier hours of the morning the two defendants were alleged to have attacked the victim from behind, put her to the floor, and steal a number of items from her. The co-defendant pleaded guilty, and Adam represented the defendant at trial. Following careful cross examination, the defendant was unanimously acquitted.
- R v D Bulford Court Martial [2022] – A Private was accused of spending the night in female quarters and in the morning alleged to have sexually assaulted her. Whilst there was evidence of alleged confession evidence in messages produced by the Prosecution. Upon forensic cross examination of the messages, their origins, and the differing accounts the complainant had provided, the Board returned a Not Guilty verdict.
- RSPCA v W Aylesbury Crown Court [2022] – Adam successfully prosecuted a defendant who for well over a year failed to seek treatment for their cat who suffered from a serious eye infection and malnutrition which resulted in the animal losing its eye. Suspended period of imprisonment imposed with a disqualification from keeping animals.
- R v R Bulford Court Martial [2022] – A LCpl pleaded guilty to an assault upon a Private during a social function which included a kick to the head. Following extensive mitigation by Adam and a detailed basis of plea, the Board punished the LCpl by way of a fine and refused to reduce him in rank.
- RSPCA v B Northampton Magistrates' Court [2022] – Following a 2 day trial including multiple experts giving evidence, Adam secured the conviction of a defendant who had let her dog suffer in front of her for days which ultimately lead to the dog's death. Rather than seeking any veterinary assistance, the defendant had instead sought to enlist others to dig a grave for the animal. The way in which Adam adduced the evidence showed that the dog had been poisoned with anti-freeze and had been suffering greatly. Immediate imprisonment imposed with a disqualification from keeping animals.
- R v B Cambridge Crown Court [2022] – Adam represented a youth who along with six others were accused of a conspiracy to commit racially aggravated assaults directed at the Chinese community around the city of Cambridge. The case attracted intense media attention as well as political pressure due to the Chinese Embassy becoming involved. The case involved lots of different evidence including over 70 witnesses, telephone evidence, and hours of CCTV alleging over 16 different incidents. On the day of trial, Adam managed to negotiate with the Prosecution to limit his defendant's involvement to a single incident of S4 Public Order rather than a conspiracy. Due to this, his defendant was subsequently sentenced to a mandatory referral order.
- R v C Aylesbury Crown Court [2022] – Adam was instructed the night before trial to represent a Rifleman in the Army who was alleged to have been transporting Class A drugs. When the police tried to stop the defendant, he ran away from the police down an alleyway. Once he was stopped and detained, officers searched the alleyway and found a sock which contained a cardboard box which in turn contained a plastic wrapping containing just under 20 grams of cocaine. DNA analysis was done on the items and the defendant's DNA was found on both the sock and plastic wrapping. In interview the defendant could not account for the DNA present and refused to give the police the pin code to his phone claiming it had been changed by somebody so he did not know it. Following cross examination of the officer who seized the item, Adam was able to demonstrate that secondary transfer could have occurred which could account for the defendant's DNA on the item. Following careful deliberation by the Jury, they



acquitted the defendant on all Counts and the defendant was free to continue his career in the Armed Forces.

- R v G Oxford Crown Court [2021] – Adam was instructed as Junior Counsel being led by Richard Moss. The case involved multiple complex conspiracies to steal from cash machines all over the South East of England by igniting gas that had been pumped into the machines. The case involved 6 co-defendants and 4 conspiracies with the defendant alleged to have been involved in 2 of the 4 conspiracies (Explosions likely to endanger life & Burglary). Adam on behalf of his leader undertook analysing expert reports to see which aspects were supportive and unsupportive of the lay Client’s account. Adam was also heavily involved in drafting a comprehensive basis of plea ensuring that it was all based upon the significant scientific evidence and backed up by the data itself. Adam was led by Richard Moss of 4 KBW.
- R v B Aylesbury Crown Court [2021] – Adam was instructed to represent a defendant who allegedly assaulted two police officers including charging at one of them and knocking them into a glass door. Following cross examination, Adam was able to establish that the officers had already placed the defendant in handcuffs and used CS spray on him when he had not offered any violence. Therefore it was established and accepted by the Jury that the defendant had been acting in self-defence and was duly acquitted.
- R v W Cambridge Crown Court [2021] – The case involved a group of 6 youths who on the prosecution’s case were involved in a violent disorder in which there was a stabbing all of which occurred over 3 years previously. Following a number of disclosure requests, Adam drafted an abuse of process application in regards to youth delay. After hearing submissions, the Learned Judge, agreed to stop the case as an abuse of process which is considered an extremely rare judgment.
- RSPCA v T High Wycombe Magistrates’ Court [2021] – The case involved a serious number Section 4 AWA offences including the throwing of a dog across a garden and the use of an illegal electric shock collar. Adam was instructed to Prosecute on behalf of the RSPCA and following a 2 day trial involving multiple expert’s the defendant was found guilty.
- MET v B Westminster Magistrates’ Court [2021] – Adam was instructed by the MET legal service to make an application for forfeiture of monies under the Civil POCA rules. The case involved a serious allegation outlining a complex wire fraud spanning over several different legal jurisdictions. The two main jurisdictions involved were that of the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The total amount of the fraud was estimated to be in the region of £8 million. Following very diligent work from the investigating officers, 4 bank accounts were identified in the name of the respondent which combined totalled approximately £1.75 million. The main evidence came from a Foreign Dissemination Report (FDR) which was provided to the UK authorities by the FBI. At the full forfeiture hearing, following extensive legal arguments around the admissibility of the FDR, Adam was successful in having the FDR remain as evidence in the case but also strong evidence which the Judge based his ruling on following submissions from Adam that the further enquiries from the investigating officer essentially proved the FDR to be factually correct. The Judge ordered forfeiture of all the monies sought and ordered the respondent to pay the MET legal services costs in bringing the application. In his written Judgment, the Judge adopted Adam’s key submissions about the further investigations following on from the information in the FDR in essence proving its contents. At the time, Adam was told that this was a record amount to be forfeited by the Court and obtained by the MET.



- [R v R Cambridge Crown Court \[2021\]](#) – The defendant alongside a co-defendant was charged with supplying Class A and B drugs along with possessing a bladed article. The defendant's account was that he had some Class A drugs that he would socially supply to friends Class A but he was not apart of any larger joint enterprise given the significant amounts of drugs found. On Adam's advice he pleaded guilty to supplying Class A on a basis and went to trial on the other supply counts and the bladed article. After trial the Jury acquitted the defendant on all remaining counts and convicted the co-defendant on all counts. The Judge following the trial insisted on holding a further Newton hearing after which he accepted the basis of plea from Adam's client. He was then sentenced to a suspended sentence whereas his co-defendant received 5 years imprisonment.
- [Buckinghamshire CC v T High Wycombe Magistrates' Court \[2021\] \(privately paid/direct access\)](#) – The Council brought charges against the defendant for an allegation of using a disabled badge inappropriately. Following Adam being instructed a defence witness was identified and statement served on the Prosecution. This coupled with the breaches of PACE by the Council's own officer, resulted in Adam persuading the Council to offer no evidence against the defendant.
- [R v L Cambridge Crown Court \[2020\]](#) –The defendant was facing trial for being concerned in the supply of drugs. There was no evidence of supply adduced during the trial. The Judge approved a submission of no case to answer and the matter was withdrawn from the Jury, with them directed to return Not Guilty verdicts.
- [R v A Catterick Court Martial \[2020\]](#) – A Sergeant was charged with Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm on an off-duty RAF Police Officer whilst in the Junior Ranks Mess by deliberately head-butting him. The defence put forward was that it was an accident. The Sergeant was acquitted after trial by the board.
- [R v H Aldershot Magistrates' Court \[2020\] \(privately paid\)](#) – High profile client who was under significant media attention and scrutiny. Originally charged with 3 offences. After substantial negotiation and submissions from Adam, on the day of trial, the Prosecution offered no evidence in relation to 2 of the charges and accepted a plea of guilty to a lesser set of facts than originally alleged. The Client expressed how impressed she was with Adam's conduct considering the amount of scrutiny she was under.
- [R v A Cambridge Crown Court \[2020\]](#) – A defendant was observed in suspicious circumstances. Found on him was a mobile telephone and near his feet there were class A drugs. An application to dismiss was successful as it was accepted that whilst there was some evidence of supplying drugs on the phone, it was not the drug which was charged and the phone was more akin to that of a drug users.
- [R v K Guildford Crown Court \[2020\]](#) – A youth trial involving 6 youth defendants and the main prosecution witness was also a youth. The trial involved a number of issues in law but also required sensitive cross-examination of vulnerable witnesses. At the end of the trial Adam was praised by the Client and his parents for how clearly he explained everything to the Client so that he could effectively participate in the proceedings.
- [R v G Aylesbury Crown Court \[2019\]](#) – Prosecuted an unrepresented defendant under the malicious communications act. The prosecution evidence was a significant number of pages due to the amount of emails sent by the defendant. Following an effective review by Adam, the material was condensed into a Jury Bundle which was more manageable for the Jury. The



trial Judge praised Adam's ability following the trial stating his advocacy was "thorough and effective".

- DB v R [2019] Court of Appeal – Successfully appealed against a term of a restraining order prohibiting the appellant from going within 100 metres of the complainant.
- R v A Croydon Crown Court [2019] (privately paid) – Allegation of no insurance. Police officer states they saw the client driving the vehicle and pulled them over. The client factually disputed this stating he had never been in the vehicle. Due to effective cross examination of the officer and his generic computer generated automated statement, the Court were not satisfied the client had been driving and accordingly found him not guilty.
- R v B High Wycombe Magistrates' Court [2019] (privately paid) – Theft of over £2,000 on numerous occasions from a high end supermarket. Due to the nature of the offence and the value, custody was almost inevitable. Following being instructed, Adam advised on the best mitigation to advance which included a mitigation bundle being presented to the Court. Following submissions, the client was sentenced to a low level community order instead of custody.
- R v K Catterick Court Martial [2019] – Desertion from the Army for 10 years. Following mitigation, the client was sentenced to a community order instead of a custodial sentence.
- R v B Catterick Court Martial [2018] – A Corporal had pleaded guilty to fraud by false representation. Following substantial mitigation advanced on his behalf he was sentenced to a suspended period of detention and retained in the service.
- R v W Colchester Court Martial [2018] – A Corporal was originally arrested for attempted murder against an Officer. He was subsequently charged with Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm. There were significant disclosure issues within the case that Adam successfully argued. The client was acquitted after trial by the board.
- R v N Oxford Crown Court [2018] – S20 deferred sentence for client to demonstrate he is addressing his alcohol use with a prohibition on him having any alcohol. Evidence of client breaching prohibition during deferred period, following mitigation HHJ Ross imposed a suspended sentence despite breach.
- R v G Kingston Crown Court [2018] – The defendant denied breaching his criminal behaviour order as he believed he was in Middlesex not Surrey when he committed the offence. Following further disclosure on the day of trial and representations made to the Crown which resulted in them offering no evidence.
- R v E Isleworth Crown Court [2017] – Defendant charged with affray with 3 others. CCTV of incident showed defendant using a belt as a weapon. Raised self-defence, acquitted after trial.
- R v T Reading Crown Court [2017] – The defendant was originally arrested for attempted murder and charged with S18 GBH. After representations were made to the CPS a plea to ABH was accepted. The defendant was eventually sentenced to a suspended sentence order.
- S v R [2017] Court of Appeal – Successfully appealed against an immediate custodial sentence for fraud by false representation which was substantially reduced in length.
- R v R Banbury Magistrates' Court [2017] (privately paid) – Following a successful S8 application being made, disclosure of documents were ordered by the Court. The Crown having not complied with the request by the day of trial, offered no evidence as the Magistrates, following submissions from the defence, refused to adjourn the trial.



- [R v T Bulford Court Martial \[2017\]](#) – Successful appeal against sentence following demotion for disobeying standard orders. Rank reinstated.
- [R v R Bulford Court Martial \[2017\]](#) – A Sergeant pleaded guilty to a number of charges of theft and fraud with the overall value in the tens of thousands of pounds. He was in a significant position of trust as he could self-authorise payments on the services buying system. Following significant mitigation advanced the client was sentenced to a suspended period of detention and retained in service.
- [R v W Colchester Court Martial \[2016\]](#) – A Flight Lieutenant pleaded guilty to a mess deck theft. Considering the significant breach of trust the Court would ordinarily be considering dismissal and custody. Following mitigation, including a psychiatric report, the client was sentenced to a fine and not dismissed from service.
- [R v B Harrow Crown Court \[2016\]](#) – Following an error by previously instructed representation the matter was incorrectly listed for a Newton hearing following an equivocal plea. After identifying the issues it was then listed for an application to vacate plea. Following legal submissions the application was granted and successfully remitted to the Magistrates’ Court for trial.
- [R v J & R Isleworth Crown Court \[2016\]](#) – Application to dismiss a charge of aggravated vehicle taking was successful. The defendants were both passengers of the vehicle and it was raised that there was no evidence that they knew that the vehicle was stolen.
- [R v T High Wycombe Magistrates’ Court \[2016\]](#) – The defendant was successfully acquitted following trial in relation to an allegation of assault by beating. It was alleged that he spat at the complainant and wiped blood upon her.
- [R v C Banbury Magistrates’ Court \[2016\]](#) – The defendant had exited his property with weapons to confront attackers who had attended his back garden. He raised self-defence and defence of property as a defence to the charge of affray. The defendant was successfully acquitted following trial.
- [R v U Oxford Magistrates’ Court \[2015\]](#) – Successful submission of no case to answer in relation to two allegations of assault by beating. One of the allegations involved a child in a pushchair which the complainant and defendant were both tugging back and forth. No physical contact was made with the child.
- [I v R \[2015\] Court of Appeal](#) – Granted leave to appeal sentence in relation to an S5a Stalking offence. Appeal abandoned on the day as appellant was being deported and no longer wished to appeal. Indication from LJ Rafferty appeal would have been allowed.

Contact Details:

Telephone: 0207-822-7000

Email: clerks@4kbw.co.uk