



## News Release

22 February 2012

### **RESPONSE TO JUDGMENT IN R -v- MARK HADDOCK AND OTHERS**

**“As Mr Justice Gillen has acknowledged, the criminal law has for centuries recognised the principle that the overriding public interest in the prosecution and conviction of those involved in major crime sometimes requires reliance on evidence from others who were once their partners in crime.**

**“In the modern day context, Parliament has provided a statutory basis to allow this to happen through the enactment of the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act.**

**“In such circumstances the role of the prosecution is to determine whether or not there is sufficient evidence to place the accused on trial. In this case the PPS is satisfied that the prosecution was properly brought. The rejection by the trial judge at the half way stage of a defence application to stop the trial and his conclusion that it was conceivable that he could convict the accused lends support to the view that there was sufficient evidence to proceed with this case. This was the view taken by the trial judge after the cross-examination of the principal witnesses.**

**“However, in order to convict the court must be satisfied of the guilt of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt. In this case, the judge concluded that the credibility of the principle witnesses was not such as to allow him to be satisfied to that high standard.**

**“This is a lengthy and detailed Judgment to which the PPS will give careful consideration”.**

*Media enquiries should be directed to PPS Press Office (028) 90 897187 or  
07799115253*