



LINCOLN  
HOUSE  
CHAMBERS

# Mohammed Nawaz

Call to the Bar: 1995

## Overview

For a number of years, Mohammed has been involved in a significant number of long and complex cases; acting as both the defence and prosecution.

Often, the cases have involved extremely able senior counsel, either leading Mohammed or representing other parties in the case; such opportunities have enabled Mohammed to learn from these advocates, enhancing his own skills in these areas.

Much of the work that Mohammed undertakes often involves grave allegations and complex matters of law; requiring extensive preparation, often taking many months. This has included the marshalling of complex financial transactions, addressing complex legal issues, analysing difficult forensic accountancy reports (R v Patel and Others, R v Zaka Uddin and others, see below) and addressing complicated legal issues. (e.g R v Khan and R v Ahmed, see below)

Mohammed places emphasis on developing good, clear lines of communication with instructing solicitors and, where appropriate, officers involved, so that any developments to the case are frequently informed. This is based on recognition that, as Counsel, he is one step removed from direct knowledge of factual developments. The responsibility of advising on legal and procedural matters thereafter, of course, rests with Mohammed. This is exemplified with R v Pervez and Priddle, where early and regular conferences meant that a murder trial involving 12 witnesses from Pakistan was able to run smoothly and efficiently (see

## Criminal Law

**R v MA and others – Defence – Conspiracy to defraud – The defendant was charged with a catalogue of offences of dishonesty including fraud on insurance companies and money laundering. The prosecution had wanted to try him and his co-accused on an indictment which alleged 33-wide ranging offences. Whilst the offences were properly joined in law, severance was a live issue because of trial management problems and the risk of prejudice to the defendant. Following legal argument the Learned Judge ordered that the indictment be severed and ordered four separate trials. Mohammed had argued for severance and five trials. Led by James Pickup QC, Lincoln House Chambers.**

**R v JG and others (Trial 1) – Defence – Conspiracy to defraud – The defendants were charged with defrauding a Government and EU Development Fund (EMTA) by claiming funding for training and courses they claimed were genuinely being given. In fact the evidence showed that fictitious documents were being created to claim funds. Led by James Pickup QC, Lincoln House Chambers.**

**R v JG and 1 other (Trial 2) – Defence – Conspiracy to defraud – Mr. G and his co-accused were tried for conspiracy to defraud factoring companies and creditors. Mr. G was a qualified chartered accountant and the Financial Director of the Ravelle group of companies which traded in computer hardware equipment. His co-accused was the Managing Director. The MD had been convicted in Trial 1. He was allowed bail pending Trial 2. He absconded before the trial commenced. The learned judge then determined to try that defendant in his absence. His legal team then also withdrew from the case and he was tried in his absence and unrepresented.**

**R v ZU and others – Defence – Money Laundering – The Learned Judge described this defendant as a banker to the “underworld”. He was involved in the laundering of £105m of criminal proceeds, mainly laundering the money by arranging the payment of debts owed to companies in the UK by companies in foreign jurisdictions. Reconciliation would then take place in the foreign jurisdiction between the UK criminal’s associates and the foreign companies. In this way, criminal proceeds were removed from the jurisdiction without being detected through the banking system. Preparation of the case involved the marshalling of many thousands of international financial transactions. The prosecution and defence each commissioned extensive forensic accountancy reports. These were factually complicated and wide-ranging. Furthermore the confiscation aspect of the case involved complex legal and factual matters, especially regarding hidden assets. Led by James Pickup QC.**

**R v BA and others – Multi-track fraud trial listed for 3 days arising from an allegedly induced RTA.**

**R v HA – Advised in an unusual case involving a severely disabled young girl who went into anaphylactic shock during her stay in hospital, having been negligently administered a drug which she was allergic to.**

**R v JB – Advised in a case involving complex issues of law, namely the interpretation and application of the provisions of the Road Traffic Act 1988 in respect of uncoupled trailers and motor insurance bureau claims.**

**R v HS – Prosecution – Murder – This was a case involving “an impossible love triangle”. The defendant and Sair Ali were lovers. Sair Ali married Sana Ali, the victim, but continued his relationship with the defendant. Sair Ali had entered into a “muta” or a temporary marriage with the defendant. This was a practice allowed in his Shia faith. The defendant was Sikh. Sana Ali then became pregnant by her husband. The defendant discovered this fact and decided to travel from Birmingham to Manchester to kill Sana Ali. The case was remarkable in that there was virtually no forensic evidence linking the defendant to the murder and no witnesses. She blamed the husband. He was deeply dishonest and had spent a number of years deceiving his family about his relationship with the defendant, a fact he had to admit to the jury. Following her conviction, the defendant changed her legal team and sought to appeal the conviction. The Single Judge gave her leave to appeal on a number of grounds. However, her appeal was dismissed. In the period pending the appeal, defence counsel served no less than six, extremely lengthy advices and arguments on appeal. Leading Counsel and Mohammed determined that they should respond to each one of these as quickly as possible in order to maintain the efficient progress of the case. This often meant keeping to short deadlines. Led by Peter Wright QC.**



## CONTACT DETAILS

**Email:**  
mohammed.nawaz@lincolnhousechambers.com

**Telephone:**  
0161 832 5701

## PRACTICE AREAS

Criminal Law  
Inquests  
Regulatory

## MEMBERSHIPS

Criminal Bar Association  
Honourable Society of Lincoln’s Inn

## EDUCATION

LLM, Queen’s College, Cambridge  
LLB 1st Class Honours, Thames Valley, London

## LINCOLN HOUSE CHAMBERS

8TH FLOOR, TOWER 12, 18-22 BRIDGE STREET, SPINNINGFIELDS, MANCHESTER, M3 3BZ

T: 0161 832 5701 F: 0161 832 0839 E: info@lincolnhousechambers.com

Twitter: @LincolnHouse Website: www.lincolnhousechambers.com



**R v YP and IP** – Prosecution – Murder – The defendants were lovers. Before their relationship began Yasira Pervez had entered an arranged marriage with her cousin in Pakistan. She appeared initially to be very happy with the marriage. She then met her co-accused and they formed a relationship. They then travelled to Islamabad, Pakistan and lured her husband to a hotel room. There he was fatally stabbed by the defendants. They then set about establishing a false alibi and then boarded a plane to the UK. Their presence in Pakistan was discovered shortly after the discovery of the victim's body and they were arrested in the UK. By the time of the trial their relationship had soured. They were ran cut-throat defences. The case presented very many logistical problems in that the majority of witnesses were from Pakistan, some were illiterate and none could speak English. The Crown arranged travel visas for some and some gave evidence via live TV link. With plenty of advance preparation, conferences and hard work by the officers the trial ran very smoothly. Both were convicted. Led by Peter Wright QC, Lincoln House Chambers.

**R v KK and others** – Prosecution – Murder, perverting course of justice – The defendant was British but was living in Pakistan having got married there. His sisters lived in the UK. A male family member, the victim was alleged to have indecently assaulted the sisters. The defendant travelled to the UK from Pakistan, sourced a sawn off shotgun, tracked down the victim and shot him point blank. He was then assisted by his sisters and boarded a plane to Pakistan. He was eventually arrested in Canada and consented to his extradition to this country where he was tried and convicted of murder.

**R v MAP and others** – Defence – Cheating the Inland Revenue – This case was described by the Crown as the largest Inland Revenue investigation of its kind. The defendant was a director of "Aleef" a retail business with over 60 outlets. The case concerned the evasion of corporation tax by the directors of the business through various means including the selling of "franchises" and failing to declare this to the revenue and a massive under declaration of earnings. Preparation of the case involved many months of analysing and studying many transactions and deciphering extensive and complex forensic accountancy reports. Led by Alistair Webster QC, Lincoln House Chambers.

**R v SF and others** – Defence – Cheating the Inland Revenue – The defendant and his father were major landlords in Nottingham. They, together with their accountant, were charged with conspiracy to cheat the Inland Revenue. They were alleged to have claimed deductions for repairs to their property portfolio that were not actually carried out. They were assisted in this by their accountant. He, however, was charged with a number of other offences. He was carrying out a second manipulation of the already fraudulent accounts thereby further reducing the tax liability. The Fs' would be shown the first set of accounts only. The Inland Revenue were provided with the second manipulations only. The Fields were charged tax on the first set of accounts. The accountant would pay the lower tax due on the second manipulation. He then found a unique and novel way of pocketing the difference.

**R v KW and others** – Defence – Armed robberies – The defendant was 18. He was charged with a number of robberies some involving the use of firearms. Had he been convicted of all the offences on the indictment he would have been at grave risk of being declared a dangerous offender, as was the case for some of his co-accused. The case involved legal arguments concerning bad character applications. The Crown had initially sought to adduce evidence of the defendant's suspected membership of a gang as evidence of bad character. This would have been extremely prejudicial and therefore was resisted.

**R v SK and others** – Defence – Money Laundering – The defendant, a conveyancing solicitor of impeccable good character is charged with laundering the proceeds of a major drug dealer's criminal conduct. The case has involved complex legal issues. The Crown have successfully argued that they be allowed to call the evidence of experts who effectively say that in the position of the defendant they would have made disclosure to the police. The defence had maintained that this was a step too far and touched upon the ultimate issue to be determined by the jury. Led by Abdul Iqbal.



## CONTACT DETAILS

**Email:**  
mohammednawaz@lincolnhousechambers.com

**Telephone:**  
0161 832 5701

## PRACTICE AREAS

Criminal Law  
Inquests  
Regulatory

## MEMBERSHIPS

Criminal Bar Association  
Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn

## EDUCATION

LLM, Queen's College, Cambridge  
LLB 1st Class Honours, Thames Valley, London