

WARNING: reporting restrictions may apply to the contents transcribed in this document, particularly if the case concerned a sexual offence or involved a child. Reporting restrictions prohibit the publication of the applicable information to the public or any section of the public, in writing, in a broadcast or by means of the internet, including social media. Anyone who receives a copy of this transcript is responsible in law for making sure that applicable restrictions are not breached. A person who breaches a reporting restriction is liable to a fine and/or imprisonment. For guidance on whether reporting restrictions apply, and to what information, ask at the court office or take legal advice.

This Transcript is Crown Copyright. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part other than in accordance with relevant licence or with the express consent of the Authority. All rights are reserved.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL
CRIMINAL DIVISION



Neutral Citation Number:
[2023] EWCA Crim 1651

CASE NO: 2023 01851 B1

Royal Courts of Justice
Strand
London
WC2A 2LL

Thursday 21 December 2023

Before:

LORD JUSTICE DINGEMANS

MR JUSTICE HILLIARD

HIS HONOUR JUDGE DREW KC

REX

v

MAX PERRY MANUS PRIOR

Computer Aided Transcript of Epiq Europe Ltd,
Lower Ground, 18-22 Furnival Street, London EC4A 1JS
Tel No: 020 7404 1400; Email: rcj@epiqglobal.co.uk (Official Shorthand Writers to the Court)

Non-counsel application

J U D G M E N T

MR JUSTICE HILLIARD:

1. On 25 March 2022, in the Crown Court at Teesside, the applicant was convicted of wounding with intent. On 24 June 2022, he was sentenced to an extended sentence of 8 years, with a custodial term of 6 years and an extension period of 2 years' further licence. He now renews his application for an extension of time of 409 days in which to apply for leave to appeal and for leave to appeal against conviction after refusal by the single judge.
2. On 14 October 2021, the applicant hit his victim in the face with a glass in a public house. He gave evidence at trial accepting this but saying that he was acting in self-defence because the victim had threatened to hit him. The judge gave the jury appropriate directions in his summing-up about the elements of the offence and about self-defence.
3. The grounds of appeal can be shortly set out and we will deal with what in our judgment is the response to each of them. They have been drafted by the applicant himself. That will not have been an easy matter for him and we have made every allowance for that.

Ground 1

4. The applicant says that he was denied a representative from his solicitors at the police station and at court on 16 October 2021. The answer is that the applicant could have had a solicitor if he wanted one. Most important of all, he was represented before and at his trial.

Ground 2

5. The CCTV he was shown at the police station was of poor quality and he was told it could not be used at court. The answer is that it was in fact of good enough quality to be used.

Ground 3

6. The witness statement of Louise Taylor had been changed. The applicant has not said how he says it has been changed or why that matters and so this point does not go anywhere.

Ground 4

7. The applicant says his barrister at trial was the prosecutor in the magistrates' court. The answer is that he was not the barrister in question, as has been explained. The applicant is mistaken about this.

Ground 5

8. The applicant says that CCTV was changed for the trial. The answer is that it may have been shown on a different screen at different times but there is no evidence that the film itself was altered in any way.

Ground 6

9. The applicant says his defence was not properly advanced. The answer is that he told his advocate not to ask questions of prosecution witnesses. Counsel followed his instructions and in our judgment the applicant was properly represented at his trial.

Ground 7

10. The applicant was not arrested at the scene of the offence. The law does not, however, require this. It is of no consequence where the applicant's arrest took place.

Ground 8

11. The applicant said he was arrested for one offence and then charged with a more serious offence. We can explain that that does often happen but does not present a problem at all and there was more than enough evidence to justify a conviction for the offence of wounding with intent.
12. Accordingly, for all these reasons, there are no arguable grounds of appeal. There would be no point to be served in granting the long extension of time which is required. Thus all these applications must be refused.

Epiq Europe Ltd hereby certify that the above is an accurate and complete record of the proceedings or part thereof.

Lower Ground, 18-22 Funnival Street, London EC4A 1JS
Tel No: 020 7404 1400 Email: Rcj@epiqglobal.co.uk