SOUTHWELL -&-PARTNERS

Sally Grieveson Consultant Solicitor Advocate

Practice & Background

Sally is a Consultant Solicitor Advocate at Southwell and Partners. Her professional career in criminal law began in 2009 at a busy criminal defence firm in North London.

Sally has extensive experience as a criminal defence solicitor and undertakes all types of general crime including but not exclusive to allegations of violence (sometimes resulting in death); weapons; drugs supply and fraud.

A tenacious and fearless defender who will consistently fight her client's corner with passion. Sally excels in representing young and vulnerable defendants, ensuring that confidence and trust is fully established. She is also very personable putting people at ease with her warm and patient nature

Sally regularly defends heavily at the front line attending police stations and Magistrates' and Youth Courts. She will always strive to achieve the best possible result for her clients and has an admirable success rate in her case load, regularly obtaining acquittals in all Courts and at the initial police station investigation due to her hard work and intricate knowledge of the law.

Very well versed in issues of Modern Slavery with an in depth knowledge of the surrounding legislation and National Referral Mechanism. Sally often spots indicators of slavery which have been overlooked by other professionals in the same individual for years.



Noteable cases:

- R v S client charged with section 18 Grievous Bodily Harm. Complainant suffered multiple stab wounds, named JS and positively identified them in identification procedures. Identification excluded by legal argument and JS was acquitted.
- R v B B was a youth accused of bringing weapons into his school. After an Abuse of Process argument and proving that B was a victim of Modern Slavery; following robust representations the Crown discontinued their case agreeing that it was not in the public interest to continue the prosecution.
- R v W and Others client charged with Violent Disorder after organised football violence broke out in a pub. Police officer gave evidence that they identified W through CCTV. Facial recognition expert instructed and successful argument to exclude the officer's evidence. Following arguments advanced on behalf of W not only was he acquitted but four (4) of their co-defendants were too on the back of our arguments.
- R v H client charged with distributing extreme pornography videos and images. The sentencing range was between a two (2) and four (4) year custodial sentence and following robust submissions from the defence they received a twelve (12) month Conditional Discharge.
- R v R client accused of supplying kilos of Class A and B drugs; there was also an unfortunate amount of incriminating telephone evidence which spanned over several years of supply. Indictment carved and a basis of plea was agreed following evidence from a drug expert instructed by the defence. Client received a suspended sentence order and unpaid work.
- R v K, L, J and Others represented three of the nine co -defendants in Britains largest jewellery heist at the time worth approximately £40 million to Graff Jewellers. Two of the clients were acquitted and the case attracted significant media attention.
- R v A Client accused of possessing a firearm found in the wardrobe of his house where he lived alone and bullets were scattered across their living room. A acquitted after trial.
- R v H Appeal against sentence following charges of Assaulting an Emergency worker. Sentence halved on appeal.
- R v K Client accused of rape and attempted rape of a colleague of who he was the manager of. Another one of his collegues gave evidence to support the complainant. Robust defence raised at interview including the provision of defence witnesses, personal correspondence and details of where the police would find CCTV footage to support his defence. No Further Action.
- R v J Successful Abuse of Process argument following a broken promise not to prosecute by the police – acquitted.
- v M M accused of Obstructing a Drug Search after uncovering an amount of flaws in the police procedure the Crown were forced to offer no evidence and M was acquitted.