

# Glenn Gatland

Call 1972

"He has a quietly forceful manner that is incredibly powerful and particularly effective with juries" Legal 500

## EXPERTISE

### Crime

He has prosecuted in the most serious crime including Capital murder but specialises in defending all aspects of criminal work including Courts Martial. He is regularly instructed in the most high-profile criminal cases in the North East and is described as one of the leading Counsel on the North Eastern Circuit.

### Regulatory

He is a highly qualified pilot who takes an interest in Defending pilots and flying instructors in Civil Aviation Authority prosecutions.

Glenn was called to the Bar in 1972 and has remained in practise in the North East Circuit throughout his career save for two years on secondment to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office as an Attorney General.

Glenn is recognised for his excellence in oral advocacy and as a skilful and very articulate advocate who impresses Judges and Juries in some of the heaviest criminal cases. He is a formidable opponent and a first class trial advocate with great presence in court but is described as being adept at putting clients at ease. His incisive cross-examination is second to none and his ability to engage a jury with his outstanding closing speeches makes him first choice Counsel for any trial. He fights every case with passion and determination and is always committed to achieving the best result.

He is regularly instructed as a Leader in serious criminal cases including Murder, Rape, Supply of Class A drugs and fraud. He has presented landmark cases in the House of Lords ( R v Crossman ) and the Court of Appeal ( R v Eastlake). He has successfully defended in Courts Martial in England and abroad.

Glenn has extensive experience defending serious motoring offences including causing death by dangerous or careless driving. He appeared in the House of Lords (now the Supreme Court) in the landmark case of R v. Grossman which involved the question of whether a lorry driver who had an insecure load was guilty of dangerous driving. Glenn has defended high profile public figures and personalities.

Glenn was instructed as Leader in Operation Sanctuary in Newcastle, the first large scale "grooming" case where his client was acquitted of sexual offences, including rape. Glenn has recently successfully defended a 7 week trial of "Optic 1" which was a case involving allegations of sexual grooming and rape of girls under the age of 13. There were significant failings of disclosure because police officers had failed to record unused material accurately and to store it. Glenn was also Leading in "Optic 2" which involved sexual offences including rape. A Not Guilty verdict was entered.

## APPOINTMENTS



## Expertise

Criminal

Regulatory

Private Prosecutions

International & Offshore

## Clerking team



**Liam Gorman**  
Lead Criminal &  
Regulatory Clerk  
0191 245 9521



**Chris Gibbin**  
Clerk  
01642 247 569



**Chloe Lau**  
Criminal & Regulatory  
Clerk  
0191 245 9550



**Edward Shepherd**  
Criminal & Regulatory  
Clerk  
0191 245 9542

- Former Attorney General and Member of Legislative Assembly
- Deputy Governor of a British Dependant Territory
- Commonwealth Parliamentarian
- Grade 4 Crown Prosecution Prosecutor (Highest Grade)
- Crown Prosecution Service Grade 4 specialist Rape and Serious Sexual Offences (RASSO) Prosecutor
- Former RAF (Reserve) Officer

## MEMBERSHIPS

- Criminal Bar Association
- Association Military court Advocates
- Caribbean Law Association

## EDUCATION

LLB (Hons) Liverpool University

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- Former Member of Oxford University panel on White Collar Crime
- Former Advisor to United States Drug Enforcement Agency , FBI and US Department of Justice on Extradition. On the 28 November 1991 complimented in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for his involvement in the Anti-Narcotics Campaign in the Caribbean.
- Qualified RAF Firearms Instructor with an extensive knowledge of many types of firearms, firearm trajectory and firearms residue.
- Qualified Multi Engine Instrument rated Pilot and Flying Instructor.



## What Others Say

66

"Glenn is a go-to counsel for serious criminal cases. Excellent on his feet. A very persuasive man, whose abilities are only enhanced by an endearing charm."

**Legal 500 2022**

"He has a quietly forceful manner that is incredibly powerful and particularly effective with juries"

**Legal 500 2021**

"His calm, understated cross-examination can be devastatingly effective."

**Legal 500 2020**

"A talented barrister with a calm cross-examination technique"

**Legal 500 2019**

"An incisive cross-examiner, who is more than capable of holding his own against silks"

**Legal 500 2017**

## Notable Cases

### Crime

- R v S Leading the successful defence in the Quilted Camel murder.
- R v B Leading the successful prosecution for Conspiracy to Murder using a firearm
- R v M Successfully defending an undercover British agent who was given a new identity by security services and was then tried for perverting the course of justice.
- R v C Leading the successful defence in Very High Costs case involving drug supply.
- R v F Leading the successful defence in a High Profile case involving supply of cocaine and cannabis where the defendant was alleged to be the ringleader.
- R v G Successful defence of a Company Director of a mortgage advising company alleged to be involved in mortgage fraud.
- R v C Leading the successful defence in an alleged conspiracy to Murder involving use of firearms.
- R v W Successful defence of a special forces soldier charged at Court Martial in Germany with assault on "Abu Grade" prison photographer.
- R v K Successful defence of a soldier charged at Court Martial in Germany with racially aggravated assault of a taxi driver.
- R v R (2014) Leading the successful defence of brothers involved in an alleged "sex ring"
- R v C (2014) Successfully defending in a seven week multi million pound waste disposal fraud prosecuted by the Environment Agency.
- R v D (2014) Successfully defending in a four week trial for Supply of Cocaine and perverting the course of justice.
- R v R (2014) Successfully defending a jeweller in a three week trial of Conspiracy to burgle dwelling houses.
- R v T (2015) Leading the successful defence in a six week Murder trial which involved a "missing body" case. This defendant was the co-accused charged with fraud, forgery, and perverting the course of justice and the jury did not convict
- R v K (2015) Leading the successful defence in a seven week trial for Rape, drug supply, administering a noxious substance and Conspiracy to incite prostitution.
- R v D (2015) Successfully defending a S.18 wounding using a machete to try and cut the arm off.
- R v M (2016) Leading the successful defence of the alleged ringleader in a high profile trial involving allegations of two separate conspiracies to supply high value cocaine in a six week trial.
- R v M (2016) Successful defence at trial in an allegation of historic Rape.
- R v F (2017) Successful defence at trial in an alleged "gangland" Arson with intent to endanger life.
- R v S (2017) Successful defence at trial in an alleged attempted wounding of three prison officers by a serving prisoner.
- R v D (2017) Successful defence at trial in an alleged large scale fraud involving a garage owner allegedly obtaining credit by fraud on many high value motor vehicles.
- R v W (2017) Successful defence at trial in an allegation of inflicting grievous bodily harm with intent by blinding an elderly woman in one eye.

- R v M (2017) Successful defence at trial of a restaurateur charged with a serious sexual offence.
- R v S (2017) Successful defence at trial of a partially sighted, deaf defendant charged with wounding with intent using a knife to stab.
- R v F (2017) Successful defence at trial where defendant charged with wounding with intent alleged to have used a Stanley knife to slash the face needing 110 stitches.
- R v A (2018) Successful defence in 4 week trial where defendant charged with attempted murder and possession of a firearm with intent to endanger life where a shotgun was discharged, involved complex disclosure issues.
- R v K (2018) Leading Junior instructed in £8.5 million fraud/money laundering trial. Substantial issues involving forensic accountant. Vulnerable defendant suffering complex medical issues. Not guilty verdict entered.
- R v M (2018) Successful defence at trial where defendant charged with "perverting the course of justice" by producing a false holiday booking form whilst on trial for conspiracy to supply Class A drugs (a charge he was acquitted of).
- R v N (2018) Successful defence of a company accountant charged with a £4,800,000 HMRC income tax and national insurance fraud together with three separate VAT frauds valued at £1,055,000 involving three separate companies. This was a long standing fraud and the trial took four weeks. The case involved voluminous paperwork (over 15,000 pages of documents).
- R v B (2018) Successful defence where defendant charged with kidnap and assault. Not Guilty verdict entered.
- R v A (2019) Leading the successful defence in a 7 week trial, Optic 1 where the Defendant was alleged to be part of a gang who groomed and raped under age girls.
- R v S (2019) Leading the successful defence in a trial Optic 2, which involved allegations of grooming and rape. Because of the serious disclosure failings, the Crown offered no evidence and a Not Guilty verdict was entered.
- R v K (2019) Successful defence at Bradford Crown Court of the son of a prominent local businessman charged with S18 wounding with intent to cause grievous bodily harm using weapons. Issues at trial involving admissibility of hearsay telephone recordings.
- R v R (2019) Successful defence of female primary school teacher charged with assault.
- R v W (2019) Successful defence of Defendant charged with three others with affray and possession of offensive weapons including knives and baseball bats. The three other Defendants pleaded guilty. There was legal argument that where the Defendant was standing was not a "public place". The Judge agreed and directed the jury to acquit of possessing the weapon. The jury acquitted the Defendant of affray.
- R v B (2019) Following four day trial successful defence of Defendant charged with threat to kill, possession of a knife and affray. Defendant alleged to have forced his way into former partner's home, held a flick knife to her throat and said he would stab her. Defence was that the Defendant himself was subject to manipulative domestic abuse by his former girlfriend and she threatened him with a knife.
- R v C (2019) Defendant after four day trial was acquitted of a night-time occupied dwelling house burglary. The Defence was that his DNA found at the scene was on a movable article and his presence in a house where the burglars had run to was not conclusive evidence of involvement. The case of R v Tsekiri [2017] EWCA Crim 40 was argued. His co-accused was convicted.
- R v R (2019) Defendant after four day trial was acquitted of rape. The complainant alleged that she was so drunk as to be incapable of consenting and she had been a lesbian of seven years and would never consent to sex with a man. Close examination of unused material revealed that the complainant had spoken to medical staff and friends which undermined her assertions.
- Gateshead Council v L (2019) Successful defence of Defendant after trial for offences of breaching the Environmental Protection Order 1990 and the Control of Pollution (Amendment) Act 1989. A s.78 PACE application was made by the Defence to exclude a purported identification of the Defendant which was allowed. Evidence of an alleged photograph of a suspect vehicle was also excluded on the basis it had not been correctly obtained. A submission of no case was allowed.
- R v M (2019) Successful defence of Defendant charged with s.18 wounding with intent. Close, detailed scrutiny of CCTV at the scene showed Defendant was not the attacker.
- R v S (2019) Successful defence of Defendant charged with a "stranger" rape in a park. The Defendant's acquittal for a previous rape was successfully excluded. The Defendant's DNA was found on the complainant. Her account was successfully challenged after detailed analysis of over 1,000 items of unused disclosed material was examined.
- R v T (2019) Conducted a s.28 Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act pre-recorded cross-examination of a vulnerable witness. As a result of the cross-examination no evidence was offered and the Defendant acquitted.
- R v C (2020) Defendant charged with harassment with threat of violence. Defendant an elderly male with complex psychiatric and physical disabilities. Advice given on the appropriate medical reports to be obtained. Prosecution offered no evidence and not guilty verdict entered. An application for a restraining order post acquittal was made and resisted and no order made.
- R v W (2020) Appeal against conviction. Vulnerable 13 year old child facing Section 2 harassment charge. Issue over voice identification on telephone recording of alleged perpetrator. Successful submission on identification and appeal allowed.
- R v P (2020) Defendant charged with fraudulently failing to pay duty of £360,000 on alcohol he was found in possession of in a warehouse he was in control of. Telephone records implicated the Defendant in payments of large sums of money transferred to a bank. This was a HMRC investigation and the trial was listed for 4 weeks. The Defence statement raised the issue of the failure of HMRC to keep the exhibits to demonstrate duty had not been paid. The prosecution offered no evidence and a not guilty verdict entered.
- R v C (2020) Successful appeal against conviction before the Court of Appeal (Criminal Division). The Defendant had been convicted of a large-scale conspiracy to supply cocaine where the evidence was from a "supergrass" who gave evidence against five alleged conspirators. It was argued in the Court of Appeal that each Defendant charged must be proved to have shared a common purpose rather than a similar or parallel purpose see Shillam 2013 EWCA Crim 169 which was argued. The Court agreed that in this Defendant's case the evidence was insufficient to establish he was party to a larger conspiracy.
- R v W (2020) Successful defence in seven day post Covid trial where Defendant, a university undergraduate, facing allegations of rape and other sexual allegations on two separate complainants over a substantial time gap of many months. The alleged circumstances

were “coincidental” and similar said the Crown. Rigorous examination of the “unused” material schedule disclosed evidence the Crown were not relying on which was crucial to the defence case eg laboratory results and two witnesses of fact who gave evidence at trial for the defence.

- R v C (2020) Successful defence in a post Covid trial of a highly qualified young female University graduate charged with S47 assault on male colleague. A conviction would seriously harm her employment and working abroad prospects. She was physically and mentally vulnerable which required gentle re-assurance during the trial process. The complainant in cross-examination accepted at one stage he was not acting in self-defence and had been “vindictive”.
- R v A (2021) Successful defence of a businessman of good character indicted for “outraging public decency”. His defence required the obtaining of medical evidence in an admissible form from a remote, overseas country. Advice given how to obtain and present the evidence which was critical to his defence.
- R v W (2021) Successful defence of middle aged man charged with causing a displaced fracture to the nose of a young woman. She was with her Mother and Aunt who allegedly witnessed the unprovoked attack and gave evidence. CCTV from a metro station obtained and close frame by frame examination supported the defendant’s account that he was attacked by her and he was acting in self-defence.
- R v K (2021) Successful defence of a businessman of good character charged with the wholesale theft of gas at a restaurant over a five year period. Close examination of leases, accounts and the Companies Register of Directorships demonstrated the defendant not responsible for the premises at the relevant time or the gas supply. Jury returned Not Guilty verdict.
- R v W (2021) Successful defence before a jury of a young woman with complex medical difficulties, including bipolar disorder and alcoholism charged with unlawfully inflicting grievous bodily harm on a hospital security guard. Complex causation issues as to fractured knee, detailed examination of medical records demonstrated may have been other causes of injury.
- R v J (2021) . Successful defence after a five day trial of a schoolteacher charged with four offences of sexual activity with children (who were teenagers) in his care whilst in a position of trust. The defence required extensive research and examination of 196 pages of unused material for example school attendance records to demonstrate the witnesses’ recollections were wrong and could not be accurate. Other documents were obtained from disciplinary hearings the police had not seized or obtained which could establish a motive for false complaint.
- R v H (2022). Successful defence of a Defendant who was alleged to have been involved in organising others and taking part in an attack on two men where attempts were made to cut feet off with machetes and hammers, resulting in life threatening injuries. Significant disclosure issues in relation to police involvement which resulted ultimately in no evidence being offered and not guilty verdicts on two S18 wounding with intent offences.
- R v M (2022). Defendant acquitted after high profile three week jury trial on allegations of rape, assault and stalking over a five year period. The Defendant was Egyptian and the evidence had to be given through interpreters. There were over 200 pages of defence documents in Arabic which had to be translated, considered and prepared. Four defence witnesses were called, three of whom English was not their native language and one needed a lip-reader as profoundly deaf. There were legal arguments as to hearsay admissibility of an Egyptian lawyer.
- R v J (2022). Defendant faced trial for supplying cocaine and ketamine. The evidence was that his fingerprints were found on black bin liners containing high value drugs in a house where drugs supplied from. Successfully argued that although defendant had recent previous convictions for drug supply the prosecution could not prove that (a) the bin liners were not related to the previous supply of which he was already convicted or (b) that as the bin liners were “moveable” property that the defendant’s fingerprints may have been put on prior to their use in this drug supply. Defendant acquitted.
- R v M (2022). Defendant faced trial for robbery of a taxi-driver. The alleged robbery involved taking the money and mobile phone of the driver. The incident was fully caught on CCTV which showed the defendant outside the taxi punching and kicking the taxi-driver to the floor. The defence case was the taxi-driver had been offered and taken the defendant’s phone as security for the journey that didn’t happen and the defendant wanted his phone back. The driver denied ever having the defendant’s phone. Frame by frame analysis of the CCTV showed a light in the back of the taxi consistent with the phone being handed over. The taxi-driver’s phone was found in a back lane behind the flat where the defendant was found. The prosecution alleged this was consistent with the defendant disposing of it. Careful review of the unused material disclosed body worn footage from attending police which appeared to show relatives of the taxi-driver attending at the scene and shortly after being seen coming from the area where the taxi-driver’s phone was recovered. The defendant was acquitted.
- R v B (2023). Defendant in an eight day trial faced allegations of digital penetration, rape and harassment. The issue on the sexual matters was consent and in relation to harassment, “reasonable excuse”. There were lengthy legal arguments as the admissibility of phone records and photographs where “provenance” was argued and material excluded. The defendant was acquitted.
- R v S (2023) . Successful defence in 5 day trial of stepfather alleged to have committed serious sexual offences against his step-daughter. Defence relied on detailed cross- examination of complainant and “ recent complaint” witnesses (2 young female friends ) to demonstrate clear inconsistencies between complainant’s allegations and what told others.
- R v R (2023). Defendant, non-English speaking (required interpreter), charged with two offences of rape on a family member. Detailed examination of the unused medical records of the complainant undermined her credibility. Part of the defence was that the complainant’s family were coercive and financially controlling and wanted the defendant to lose his immigration status which was the motive for the false complaint of rape against him. The family members gave evidence and were challenged in detail. The defendant was found not guilty on both counts after a 7 day trial.
- R v G (2023). Acting for defendant in four day trial for dangerous driving and racially aggravated assaults during an alleged “road rage” incident. As a result of careful analysis of dash cam footage it showed the defendant was not responsible for the collision. Requests for

999 calls not served nor initially disclosed confirmed the defendant was a distance from the scene where the alleged racial assaults were alleged to have occurred. Defendant found Not Guilty on all charges.

- R v B (2023). Defendant charged with attempted wounding with intent to cause serious bodily harm. Alleged to have used a knife to stab at a man in a parked car and then chased him, stabbing and slashing towards him with the knife. CCTV and 'Ring' doorbell evidence clearly recorded the incident. The defence was that although the defendant had a knife, his objective was to cause fear, not cause severe harm. Careful examination of CCTV showed the defendant had ample opportunity to stab but did not do so. The defendant was acquitted.
- R v S (2024). Defendant taxi driver charged with sexual assault of young female passenger. Close examination of unused material revealed police errors in transmission of clothing. Advice given about obtaining measurements of the taxi which showed how difficult it would have been to carry out the alleged assault of the passenger on a back seat from the driver's position in the front. Not guilty verdict following a jury trial.
- R v L (2024). Defendant charged with Aggravated Burglary. Injured parties identified defendant from Facebook pictures. Argument as to admissibility as a result of significant inconsistencies on which photos identification made as a result of careful examination of unused material. Further inconsistencies highlighted in witness statements as to the injured parties' drug taking habits after examination of extensive unused medicals records. Prosecution offered no evidence and Not Guilty verdict entered.
- R v W (2024). Defendant charged causing unlawful grievous bodily harm to a doorman by breaking his leg. The defence was that the defendant and the injured party had both fallen to the ground. Frame by frame examination of CCTV confirmed they had both fallen to the ground. The prosecution still maintained this was reckless causation. Further examination of unused Facebook material showed the doorman's wife had said he had slipped on a wet floor. After jury sworn, the injured party was asked and he confirmed that he had slipped on a wet floor and broken his leg and the defendant was not responsible. No evidence offered and Not Guilty verdict entered by the jury.