

PEER REVIEW OF CRIMINAL FILES

Client Name:

UFN:

Supplier name:

Supplier Area:

Fee Earner (Where Known)

Case complexity/difficulty: Exceptional/Demanding/Routine/Minor

Case Seriousness: Most Serious/Moderately Serious/Least Serious

1 = excellent

2 = competence plus/good

3 = threshold competence

4 = not competent/poor

5 = non-performance/very poor

X = insufficient information to make a judgement

NA = not applicable

Lead charge:

Other Charge(s):

Claim code(s):

A. The file

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| 1. How effective is the composition of the file? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| 2. How appropriate is the level of information recorded? | | | | | | | |
| (a) At investigation stage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | X | N/A |
| (b) Post Charge | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | X | N/A |
| 3. How appropriate was the management of the case throughout? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | X | NA |

Comments:

B. Communication

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. How appropriate were the lawyer's communication and client-handling skills? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | X | |
| 2. How appropriately was the client informed of: | | | | | | | |
| (a) The merits (or not) of their defence/case? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | X | NA |

- (b) All developments (including conclusion) 1 2 3 4 5 X NA
3. How appropriate was the lawyer's communication with others, including the CPS, defence counsel etc.? 1 2 3 4 5 X NA
4. How timely was all communication? 1 2 3 4 5 X NA

Comments:

C. Information and fact gathering

1. How effective was the lawyer in seeking relevant information from the client? 1 2 3 4 5 X
2. How effective was the lawyer in seeking relevant information from the police and/or prosecution:
- (a) At investigation stage 1 2 3 4 5 X N/A
- (b) Post Charge 1 2 3 4 5 X N/A
3. How effective was the lawyer in seeking relevant information from others? 1 2 3 4 5 X NA

Comments:

D. Advice and assistance

1. How good was the advice? 1 2 3 4 5 X NA
2. (a) How appropriate was advice on plea? 1 2 3 4 5 X NA
- (b) If (at any stage) the client was advised to plead guilty, was the timing of the advice:
- (i) too early (ii) appropriate (iii) too late
3. How appropriate was advice on appeal? 1 2 3 4 5 X NA

Comments:

E. The work/assistance

1. Was all work done that should reasonably have been done? Y N X
- If No, specify:

2. How effective was the work done in achieving the client's (reasonable) objectives? 1 2 3 4 5 X

3. What was the impact of the lawyer on:
- (a) Bail: better than expected/as expected/worse than expected/X/NA
 - (b) Mode/venue: better than expected/as expected/worse than expected/X/NA
 - (c) The Process: better than expected/as expected/worse than expected/X/NA
 - (d) What convicted of/or not: better than expected /as expected/worse than expected/X/NA
 - (e) Sentence: better than expected/as expected/worse than expected/X/NA

4. Was the client prejudiced in any way by the work done or not done? Y N
 (If yes, specify)

Comments:

F. Efficiency

- 1. How efficiently was the work carried out? 1 2 3 4 5 X
- 2. Throughout the file, how effectively did the organisation use resources (including experts)? 1 2 3 4 5 X NA
- 3. Were any disbursements incurred appropriate? Y N N/A

Comments:

G. General

1. Where ethical issues arise were they dealt with appropriately? Y N N/A

2. Overall mark

- (a) At Investigation Stage 1 2 3 4 5 X N/A
- (b) At Magistrates Court Stage 1 2 3 4 5 X N/A
- (c) At Crown Court Stage 1 2 3 4 5

3. Overall File Score 1 2 3 4 5

Please write any further comments below or on the extra paper provided.