

Anna's experience covers a broad spectrum of criminal law. She prosecutes and defends regularly in the Crown Court, as well as the Magistrates' Court. Aside from her criminal practice, Anna accepts instructions to appear in front of the Nursing and Midwifery Council ('NMC') on behalf of nurses, and appears in civil cases.

Anna has recently completed a three month secondment with the Information Commissioner's Office in Wilmslow. She assisted in criminal prosecutions for offences arising from data protection legislation. She was seconded within the organization when GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018 came into force.

Prior to the bar, Anna gained international experience with the Texas Defender Service, as a case worker on death row appeals. Aside from daily casework and client conferences, Anna was responsible for drafting information documents on the appeals process in Texas. This cemented Anna's desire to represent vulnerable clients facing criminal prosecutions.

Anna spent years volunteering at the call centre of a well known mental health charity, where she gained experience of dealing with those with complex mental health issues.

With a professional background as a legal recruitment consultant in Manchester, Anna has an appreciation of the commercial reality faced by solicitors in the North West.

Anna is a member of the Criminal Bar Association and a member of the Northern Circuit.

### Criminal Law

Anna deals with all aspects of Criminal Law. She has experience of:

- Violent offences
- Drug-related offences
- Sexual offences
- Fraud and theft offences
- Road traffic offences

Anna is regularly instructed to deal with young and vulnerable clients. Included in her Magistrates' Court experience are multiple motoring cases including Special Reasons hearings, Exceptional Hardship arguments and, licencing appeals.

Anna has particular aptitude in the Youth Court where she has dealt with matters of the utmost seriousness

## Regulatory

Having built up experience as a volunteer for the MPTS helpline at BPP Manchester, Anna is now cultivating a practice in healthcare regulatory law. She has appeared in front of the Nursing and Midwifery Council Fitness to Practice Panel on behalf of a registrant.

# Civil

Anna can deal with a range of civil matters. She has provided representation at Stage 3 hearings, small claims trials and fast track trials.

# Health and Safety

The Health and Safety Executive recently instructed Anna as junior counsel in the successful prosecution of a national construction company.



#### CONTACT DETAILS

#### Email:

Anna.Chestnutt@lincolnhousechambers.com

#### Telephone:

0161 832 5701

#### PRACTICE AREAS

Civil Law

Criminal Law

Professional Disciplinary

Regulatory

#### **MEMBERSHIPS**

Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn Criminal Bar Association

#### **APPOINTMENTS**

CPS Grade 1

#### **AWARDS**

Lord Denning Scholarship, Lincoln's Inn
Hardwicke Scholarship, Lincoln's Inn
Wolfson Scholarship, Lincoln's Inn
McDermott QC International Scholarship
Excellence Scholarship, BPP University
Outstanding Contribution to Pro Bono,
BPP University
RG Lawson Prize for Human Rights Law,
University of Manchester
Distinguished Contribution Award,
BPP University

## **EDUCATION**

BPTC - BPP Manchester (Very Competent)
LLB (Hons) - University of Manchester
- First Class







#### Notable Cases:

R v BNMC v MD — Represented a Nurse in front of the NMC. The allegations were of gross misconduct and dishonesty. Upon hearing the evidence and submissions, the panel found the charges not proved.

**G** (youth) — Represented a 15-year-old in a two-day trial for threatening with a knife in a public place and affray. A successful submission was made in relation to both charges at the close of the prosecution case under Limb 2 of R v Galbraith. Both charges were dropped accordingly.

R v TB (youth) — Trial for a 16-year-old defendant of previous good character, charged with the assault of a vulnerable young woman and her mother. Secured an acquittal through exposing the inconsistencies in the prosecution's case and highlighting the evidential weaknesses.

R v TR (youth) — Persuaded judge not to impose the mandatory minimum sentence for possession of a knife, despite the fact that the knife was used in dangerous circumstances, to stab someone in the face. To impose the mandatory minimum would be unjust in all the circumstances. The defendant avoided a custodial sentence.

 $R \ v \ GG$  — This trial concerned six separate charges for breach of a Sexual Harm Prevention Order ('SHPO'). This required rigorous cross examination of police officers who had witnesses the alleged breaches in public places. Successfully dropped the case under Limb 1 of  $R \ v$  Galbraith, as the prosecution had failed to demonstrate each aspect of the alleged breaches.

R v MM — Represented a client charged with the assault of two police officers in the execution of their duty. Through carefully crafted questions in cross examination, demonstrated that the officers were using such excessive force that they were no longer acting within the course of their duty. An element of the offence was missing, so the defendant was acquitted of these charges.

**R v MD** – Professional young man of previous good character charged with possession of cannabis and an offensive weapon. Secured an acquittal, as he may not have been aware of the existence of the items.

**R v CB** — Young man charged with s.20 OAPA (wounding). Victim had sustained life-changing injuries. Persuaded the judge to adopt an exceptional course and sentence outside the range on the sentencing guidelines. Given a 9 month Suspended Sentence Order.

R v PB — Defendant was charged with assaulting his step-son, who had profound educational needs. Defendant was of previous good character. Through prompting further disclosure in drafting a Defence Statement, the prosecution dropped the case before trial.

 $R \ v \ OB$  — Charge of possession of articles for use in fraud (counterfeit bank cards). Although the defendant could not dispute his possession of the cards, he did not understand the cards were counterfeit, or were to be used in the scheme of a fraud. The judge was persuaded by these submissions and acquitted the defendant.

 $R \ v \ SB$  — Trial for fraud by false representation with a value of £23,000. Although the defendant was convicted, the judge was persuaded to go outside the sentencing guidelines for this offence. He was sentenced to a low-level community order with a stand-alone requirement, when the guidelines suggested a custodial sentence.

R v JJ – Successfully excluded medical evidence which was crucial to the Prosecution case under s.78 PACE on the basis it was not properly exhibited, and served late.



#### **CONTACT DETAILS**

#### Fmail:

Anna.Chestnutt@lincolnhousechambers.com

Telephone:

0161 832 5701

#### PRACTICE AREAS

Civil Law
Criminal Law
Professional Disciplinary
Regulatory

#### **MEMBERSHIPS**

Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn Criminal Bar Association

## **APPOINTMENTS**

CPS Grade 1

### **AWARDS**

Lord Denning Scholarship, Lincoln's Inn
Hardwicke Scholarship, Lincoln's Inn
Wolfson Scholarship, Lincoln's Inn
McDermott QC International Scholarship
Excellence Scholarship, BPP University
Outstanding Contribution to Pro Bono,
BPP University
RG Lawson Prize for Human Rights Law,
University of Manchester
Distinguished Contribution Award,
BPP University

#### **EDUCATION**

BPTC - BPP Manchester (Very Competent)
LLB (Hons) - University of Manchester
- First Class



