

Mohammed Nawaz KC

Call to Bar: 1995

Silk Year: 2020



Mohammed specialises in serious and financial crime and homicide offences. He has appeared in numerous high profile and serious cases.

Upon instruction he leads the team by establishing clear lines of communication with his junior (where there is one), solicitor and client to ensure that every aspect of the Prosecution case is analysed, considered and understood. Following that and often through a number of pre-trial conferences he ensures that the client's instructions are carefully and meticulously taken in order that he can be advised fully and properly and prepared for trial. His case preparation is thorough and assiduous. His early preparation of cases means that he is able to identify shortcomings in the evidence and any legal points that may assist the client. Taking these points early has led to him having a number of cases dismissed before they reach trial. He is also able to identify the need for specialist expert evidence early in the case, thus allowing for the instruction of defence experts early in the proceedings.

In court his advocacy has been described as "first rate". His cross-examination of witnesses is focused, targeted and surgical. He is regularly commended by judges for his approach. He ensures that his client is always the most prepared witness in the case and is able to anticipate and field all the questions that will arise. His jury speeches are logical, engage the jury fully and at all times and are compelling and powerful.

For many years now and even prior to taking Silk, he has defended in cases of murder, terrorism, serious fraud, people trafficking, sexual exploitation of children, large-scale drug trafficking, bribery and confiscation proceedings. In Silk he has defended in murder cases, serious fraud, historic child sexual offences and privately funded general crime.

His notable cases since taking silk in 2020 include the following:

R v RH – Supply of Firearm - The D was alleged to have supplied the firearm used in a murder. The case required careful analysis of phone and cell site evidence, bad character applications and cross-examining co-defendants in a cut-throat defence. D found Not Guilty.

Contact details:

Mohammed.Nawaz@lincolnhousechambers.com

Clerk Contact details:

Dwright@lincolnhousechambers.com

David Wright - 0161 832 5701

Practice areas:

Business Crime & Financial Regulation
Criminal Law
Immigration & Asylum Law
Regulatory

Professional appointments:

Appointed as Kings Counsel 2020

R v AB – Conspiracy to defraud - The D was the Director of 5 companies alleged to have defrauded elderly people into buying worthless Asset Trust products, which they were told, would avoid them having to pay for care home fees in the future. On the defence application the jury was discharged 12 weeks into the trial. The prosecution offered no evidence and D had a formal Not Guilty verdict recorded.

R v AA – Causing Grievous Bodily Harm with intent - The D was charged with causing GBH in a joint attack in public with witnesses present. He funded his case privately. Mohammed served an application to dismiss the charges. This was argued at a hearing prior to trial. The application was successful and the case against D was dismissed.

R v HK – Evasion of Excise Duty - The D was charged with smuggling and distributing large quantities of counterfeit and non-duty paid cigarettes. He funded his case privately. On the client's instructions, Mohammed negotiated pleas to certain counts on the indictment and agreed a limited amount for the confiscation. The D avoided custody and was able to easily settle his confiscation order without the risk of a period in default.

R v – AE – Murder - The D was charged with a joint enterprise murder. The allegation was that he and his co-accused had attacked and killed the victim with knives. The incident was caught on CCTV. The case required extensive preparation of served evidence and unused material, a careful and painstaking trawl through CCTV evidence (both served and unused) and cross-examination of a large number of civilian and police witnesses. Further a cut-throat defence was being run with the co-accused blaming D. The D was found Not Guilty of murder and manslaughter.

R v SK – Murder -The D was charged with a double murder. Following the killings the D had set the bodies alight. The case involved extensive expert evidence from psychologists and psychiatrists, (the D claimed to be possessed by Djinn and was in a secure psychiatric ward), fire investigation experts and enhanced CCTV analysis.

R v GK – Conspiracy to commit Murder - The D was one of 10 defendants facing the charge. The case had a background of rival gang wars and local youths steeped in drill music glorifying real life events of actual violence and tit for tat escalating incidents of serious violence.

R v DC – Murder -The D a 16 year old youth was charged with a knife murder at a house party. All the eye-witnesses were of a similar age and required careful and sensitive cross-examination.

R V JH – Murder - The D a 16 year old youth was charged with a joint enterprise knife killing of a school boy outside his school. The case generated national publicity and documentaries on national TV and Radio.

R v DF Murder -The D was one of 5 defendants charged with a joint enterprise killing of a man in the city centre. The case had a gangland background, possible drug supply and involved a cut-throat defence with other defendants.

Mohammed Nawaz KC

R v AP – Fraud/Money Laundering -The D was charged with massive VAT fraud, counterfeiting and money laundering offences spanning a number of years. It was at the time of prosecution, the biggest and widest investigation ever launched and prosecution brought. In preparing the case, Mohammed had to co-ordinate the work of a team of 3 solicitors and 5 case workers given the sheer volume of material in the case. The trial lasted for 4 months

R v AK - Murder - The D was charged with a killing a man with a knife. The case involved expert evidence of the operation of knives and a background of drugs and gangs.

Other notable cases Mohammed has appeared in are:

R v FK – Importation of Drug -The D was charged with the importation of 400kg cannabis. The D and his co-accused travelled across parts of Europe and Africa to organise the importation. It was necessary to cross-examine obstructive and volatile co-defendants. Through many conferences the D was very well prepared for the cross-examination he faced and fielded all questions easily. D found Not Guilty.

R v KPR - Immigration Fraud and money laundering -The D was charged with facilitating the illegal entry of hundreds of Indian nationals on religious visas and laundering the proceeds they were paying for the service. The D and his family were alleged to have set up “fake” Temples to flout immigration laws. D was able to demonstrate that he was not involved in illegal activity and acted independently of his family. D found Not Guilty of all charges by the jury.

R v SA- Immigration Fraud -The D was an Immigration Advisor with her own practice and had serious medical conditions, shortened life expectancy and relied on ventilators to breathe. The case required the cross-examination of an extremely vulnerable witness, immigration officers and Home office personnel. Before the trial commenced Mohammed successfully argued that some of the counts should be dismissed. The D was found Not Guilty of further counts by the jury.

R v JM – Conspiracy to defraud - The D was charged with a “cash for crash” conspiracy. Following the successful cross-examination of the Prosecution collision reconstruction expert and exposing the short-comings of his findings, the case was stopped at half time and the D was found Not Guilty.

R v DD – Murder - The D was a foreign national and unfamiliar with the Justice System. He had consumed a large quantity of alcohol and stated that the victim had attacked him. The law on loss of control, self-defence and self-induced intoxication was of relevance in the case. Following negotiations with the prosecution the case was resolved as a manslaughter.

R v X: Inciting terrorism - The D was 15 years old. He was using an alter ego of a Jihadi Commander and incited murder. His age/psychiatric vulnerabilities required vigilance and sensitivity. The case had a number of complexities including the volume of evidence, extensive psychiatric and psychological evidence including that of D being brainwashed by ISIS terrorists and press attempts to report his identity which was successfully resisted. A guilty plea on favourable grounds was negotiated which meant that a sentence that D and his family were happy with was achieved.

R v WA – Rape - The D was charged the rape and sexual exploitation of a child of 14. This case required the marshalling of a vast body of evidence and the careful and sensitive cross-examination of a woman who alleged that she had been sexually assaulted by 300 men. The trial judge commended Mohammed for the way he handled the witness and how he was comprehensive yet sensitive in his cross-examination.

R v TA – Fraud - The D was charged with a £2m fraud trial involving hacking of company emails and creation of bogus online business to defraud customers on Black Friday. There was a vast number of transactions and a 3 way cut-throat defence at trial. In separate confiscation proceedings Mohammed chaired several round-table discussions with the prosecution and counsel for the co-accused. This resulted in the confiscation proceedings being settled on very favourable terms for D and all co-accused.

R v MT – Murder - The D was charged with the “honour killing” of his mother-in-law for her complicity in his wife’s affair. The case required a great deal of sensitivity as it aroused extreme emotions in the wider family and community.

R v ER – Supply of Class A drugs - D counsel in trial of supply of large quantity of Class A drugs. Dft good character, suffering from dyslexia and mild LD.

R v ZS – Murder - The D was charged with killing a rival drug dealer over territory. Issues of self-defence, loss of self-control were of relevance.

R v JI – Conspiracy to defraud -The D owned colleges with Home Office licence to run an international English test. He was the lead D defendant charged with 4 others. The case required extensive, detailed cross-examination of witnesses based on large volumes of material. Legal arguments were deployed to exclude incriminating evidence.

LINCOLN HOUSE CHAMBERS