

# WESTGATE CHAMBERS

## Gabrielle Henty

Barrister



Gabby is a measured and sensitive advocate who is well known for her common-sense and practical approach.

Gabby has a broad experience of all aspects of criminal law. She has a strong prosecution practice but also defends. As a defence advocate Gabby represents clients in all types of criminal cases and has also represented clients at tribunals and inquests.

Her meticulous and thorough approach to casework has resulted in her in being instructed as Junior Counsel in a number of voluminous and serious cases including multi-defendant murder and gross negligence manslaughter.

She is regularly instructed to prosecute a wide range of cases including rape, child cruelty serious violence, drugs and fraud.

Gabby specialises in cases involving children and very vulnerable witnesses. She also specialises in serious cases involving Youths in the Crown Court.

Gabby frequently works closely with intermediaries and was invited to contribute to the writing of the Advocate's Gateway Toolkits.

She is a Facilitator for the Inns of Court College of Advocacy Vulnerable Witness Advocacy Training Programme. During 2017 and 2018, she delivered the training to members of Westgate Chambers.

### Achievements, appointments and memberships

- Member of the Criminal Bar Association
- Member of the SE Circuit
- Inns of Court College of Advocacy, Facilitator for Vulnerable Witness Training
- CPS Grade 4 RASSO Advocate
- CPS Grade 4 Advocate

Year of Call: 2003

#### Core Practice Areas:

Crime

WESTGATE  
CHAMBERS

9 Pavilion Parade,  
Brighton,  
East Sussex  
BN2 1RA

#### Telephone

01273 480510

#### Email

ghenty@westgate-chambers.co.uk

# WESTGATE CHAMBERS

## Gabrielle Henty

Barrister

### Criminal barrister Gabrielle Henty's most notable cases include:

**R v W [2018]** Prosecution of serious non-recent child abuse upon a boy who was aged between 10 and 14 at the time. The defendant was a vicar and part of a paedophile ring within the Church of England. Issues of law involved the admissibility of a considerable amount of bad character evidence concerning other victims. The defendant was sentenced to a lengthy period of imprisonment.

**R v G [2018]** Manslaughter. Defence of a young man accused of unlawful act manslaughter arising unusually out of an affray. There was an issue of causation, which eventually resulted in the Prosecution offering no evidence in respect of the allegation of manslaughter.

**R v AM** Prosecution of a stranger rape on a person too intoxicated consent. The gender identity of the survivor was non-binary. The rape resulted in their pregnancy and subsequent PTSD. At the end of the trial, they and the other non-binary witness complimented Counsel and the prosecution team for their sensitivity and understanding in the handling of the case.

**R v M [2017]** Prosecution of a Social Worker charged with a substantial benefit frauds over a lengthy period. The Instructing Senior Lawyer commended Counsel for her Case Summary which was described as "well explained and logical something which is not easily achieved in this case"

**R v TW [2017]** Prosecution of a youth in the Crown Court for a series of rapes committed upon a number of teenage girls. The complainants required sensitive handling and a wide range of

special measures. The defendant upon conviction was found to be dangerous and sentenced to a substantial period of custody.

**R v KF [2017]** Prosecution of a man with a very low IQ who required an intermediary at trial. Ground rules were strict and required pre-prepared cross-examination. The case involved a drugs feud, the kidnap and heavy beating of a man who was then stripped naked and left in a ditch on remote marshland, at night, in freezing conditions. The defendant was convicted and received a lengthy term of imprisonment.

**R v PH [2017]** Defence of a deaf man with a learning disability and communication difficulties. He was charged with numerous alleged rapes and harassment of his partner. He could only lip read. Case preparation, conferences with the client and trial were conducted with the assistance of a Registered Intermediary throughout.

**R v DJ & others [2016]** Successful defence of an 18 year old boy tried with 4 others for conspiracy to do violent disorder, a case involving 3 separate trials of 24 defendants. DJ was eventually one of two acquitted after a 5 week trial involving cell site, mobile phone and CCTV evidence.

**R v AH [2016]** Prosecution of a care worker alleged to have raped a woman who suffered from a severe learning disability. A Registered Intermediary was required to assist in communicating with the court, via video-link from the care home. The defendant was represented by a QC and Junior. Legal arguments on the part of the prosecution concerning the competency of the complainant and the admissibility of the ABE were successful. The case involved much medical and third party material and the cross-examination of psychologists.

# WESTGATE CHAMBERS

## Gabrielle Henty

Barrister

### Criminal barrister Gabrielle Henty's most notable cases include:

**R v K T & R** [2015] Prosecution of, kidnap and false imprisonment involving the "snatching" of a baby which had just been taken into care. Case involved issues of covert surveillance RIPA and cell site analysis.

**R v B** [2014] Prosecution of multiple knifepoint rapes and false imprisonment. The complainant had not made an ABE statement, English was not her first language and she required sensitive handling in the witness box. Expert evidence on blood spatter and bad character evidence of previous acquittals were features of this case.

**R v Z and others** [2011] Led by a QC. Prosecution murder trial of 4 defendants. Issues involved expert evidence relating to blood stains and spatter together with expert psychiatric evidence.

**R v W & W** [2010] EWCA Crim 1474 Appeared as led junior in the Crown Court and Court of Appeal. Prosecution of two directors for gross negligence manslaughter following a massive fire and explosion at their firework factory in which a firefighter and cameraman were killed. A central issue in the case surrounded the duty of care which was still owed to the civilian cameraman even though he may have disobeyed instructions.