



Liam Edwards

Called: 2014

Email: clerks@187chambers.com

Telephone: 020 7430 7430

Liam specialises in general crime and fraud & financial crime, with a strong focus on defence.

Ranked as a Leading Junior in The Legal 500 for general crime, he is regularly instructed in serious and complex cases involving serious violence, large-scale drug conspiracies, sexual offences, and driving matters.

He also has a thriving practice in fraud and financial crime, acting for both individuals and corporate clients facing allegations of fraud, bribery, corruption, and money laundering. Renowned for his sharp eye for detail and skill in navigating complex financial evidence, Liam is a trusted choice in heavyweight financial proceedings.

Liam brings a calm, strategic approach to high-pressure trials and has been led in numerous high-profile, multi-handed cases. His meticulous preparation and advocacy make him a go-to counsel for demanding defence briefs.

He is frequently instructed to represent vulnerable clients, including those with serious mental health conditions or substance misuse issues. Known for his compassionate and approachable manner, Liam ensures his clients feel supported and that their voices are heard throughout the legal process.

Specialist Areas

Criminal Defence

Fraud & Financial Crime

Asset Forfeiture and Confiscation

Inquests & Inquiries

Public Law

Sports Law

Criminal Prosecution

Private Prosecution

Professional Discipline

Regulatory Law

Courts Martial & Military Law

Testimonials

'Liam is a fantastically hardworking and bright individual.'



Legal 500 2026

"Liam is a strong and persuasive barrister who can build a strong rapport with a range of different types of clients and personalities."

Legal 500

Ranked In



Cases

Criminal Defence

R v Tsekiri [2017] EWCA Crim 40- Junior alone in appeal against conviction.

Junior alone in appeal against conviction. This appeal clarified the law on submissions of no case to answer where the sole evidence in the case is DNA deposited on a moveable object.

R v Vaughan [2018] EWCA Crim – Junior alone in appeal against sentence.

This appeal concerned section 51A of the Firearms Act 1968. Fresh evidence adduced from firearms expert David Dyson which demonstrated the firearm in question was not subject to the minimum 5-year sentence. Sentence for possession of an imitation firearm with intent to endanger life reduced from 6 years to 4 years imprisonment.

R v JD [2023] – Conspiracy to supply class a and b drugs- Leading Junior

Liam represented the First Defendant in a nine-handed drugs conspiracy. The case involved allegations relating to the supply of £4,000,000 worth of class a drugs per week in a large-scale 'chemsex' drugs conspiracy. The jury returned directed not guilty verdicts on all counts after successful submission of no case to answer after six-week trial.

R v SN [2023] – Conspiracy to supply class a drugs- Junior alone.

Case involved a complex cell site evidence relating to the possible co-location and non-



colocation of a telephone number (line) being used to supply class a drugs throughout London. The case involved multiple defendants and cut throat defence. The jury returned directed not guilty verdicts on all counts after successful submission of no case to answer after six-week trial.

R v TD [2023] – Rape – Junior alone

The Defendant was charged with rape, assault by penetration, assault by beating and making a threat with a knife. The Complainant reported to the police that she had discovered a video of her lying naked in the back of the Defendant's case with blood around her vagina. The Complainant had consumed a considerable amount of alcohol and had no memory of the incident. The Defendant was interviewed and confirmed sexual intercourse had taken place. The video showed the Complainant either asleep and it was the Prosecution case that this was taken moments after the sex had taken place. The Defendant's case was that the sex took place earlier in time and that this video was taken after another video of the Complainant outside of the car and in a state in which she was incapable of giving consent. The case involved complex arguments on the role of intoxication on the ability to consent to sex. The case was complicated by the Complainant's Polycystic Ovary Syndrome which causes bleeding after intercourse.

R v PH [2023] – Sexual assault of a child under 13- Junior alone

The Defendant was charged with the sexual assault of a child aged under 13 (7 years old at the time of the offence). The offence involved an allegation that the Defendant had abducted a young boy and taken him to the toilet of a restaurant and committed a serious sexual offence. The case was complicated by the learning difficulties suffered by the Defendant and the young age of the Complainant. The Complainant was cross-examined in advance of the trial under s.28 of the YJCEA 1999 notwithstanding the fact the offence was charged three years after the allegation was made and the Complainant was ten years old at the point the case came to trial. This case also involved complex DNA evidence dealing with the source of DNA and the absence of amylase (commonly detected in saliva). Kerri Allen from Keith Borer was instructed on behalf of the Defence and utilised to neutralise the Prosecution DNA evidence.

R v MC [2023] – Making indecent images of children – Junior alone

The Defendant (a 45-year-old woman of previous good character) was charged with three counts of making indecent images. The Prosecution alleged that the Defendant had downloaded three category videos of a indecent nature. The Defence instructed an expert to consider how the videos could have been located in the sent folder of the Defendant's WhatsApp folder. The Defendant raised the statutory defence at trial, that one of the videos was sent via Whats App without being requested and thereafter deleted. The Defence were able to establish that the Defendant had 25,000 messages on her WhatsApp account and was the member of over 500 groups. The Defence were able to establish that there was no evidence of the videos ever being sent or received in any chat that remained on the device. The jury unanimously acquitted the Defendant of all three counts of making indecent images of children.

R v MS [2023] – Rape and inflicting grievous bodily harm with intent – Junior alone

This case involved allegations of rape and s.18 GBH. The Defendant is alleged to have attacked a female in his flat causing serious injury and thereafter raping her multiple



times. The Defence at trial was that no sexual intercourse had taken place. The case involved forensic evidence (presence of semen not suitable for comparison on the DNA database) which was nullified by the Complainant's own admission that she had had unprotected sex 48 hours before the alleged rape. The case involved the service of a large amount of unused material pertaining to the Complainant which had to be deployed in cross-examination. The Defence instructed a DNA expert to consider the complex issue of the effect of FGM Type 3 on the presence of semen after sex and the likelihood of the Defendant's DNA not being present should he have acted as alleged. The jury unanimously acquitted the Defendant of all three counts of rape.

R v LS [2023] – Committing an offence with intent to commit a sexual offence – Junior alone

This matter concerned an allegation of committing an offence (assault occasioning actual bodily harm) with the intent to commit a sexual offence. A preparatory sexual offence under s.66 of the Sexual Offences Act. The Prosecution case was that the Defendant had assaulted the Complainant (a lone female in dark park), in order to go on and commit a sexual offence. The case involved complex legal argument on whether the Prosecution were required to specify which offence the Defendant intended to commit. The Defence was that the witnesses had mistakenly identified the Defendant and had lied about the fact that they had themselves apprehended him in the course of the offence (to bolster their genuine belief that he must have been the male responsible having matched the general description). The jury unanimously acquitted the Defendant of both the ABH and s.66 SOA 2003 offence.

R v SB [2023] – Rape – Led Junior

Involving allegations of rape within a marriage spanning over a decade, as well as coercion over various aspects of the Complainant's life including forcing her to undertake medical procedures. There was in excess of 14,000 pages of used and unused material. The Defendant was unanimously acquitted.

R v C [2023] – Stalking involving violence – Led Junior

Involving allegations of stalking over a period of three years involving multiple methods. The case involved over 5,000 pages of unused material and there were over 100 separate crime reports. The case involved a large amount of cell site evidence presented by two experts. The case was of such complexity that the Prosecution instructed a KC. The Defendant was acquitted in relation to three of the six charges.

R v NH [2021] – Robbery – Junior alone

Isleworth Crown Court- Secured a suspended sentence for a Defendant who pleaded guilty to robbery. Successfully argued at a Newton Hearing that the Defendant did not threaten the victim with a weapon.

R v M [2021] – Possession of criminal property – Junior alone

Canterbury Crown Court- Secured a suspended sentence for a Defendant found with £50,000 worth of criminal property.

R v H [2021] – Lewes Crown Court – Junior alone



Case involved a knife-point robbery on a train. Successfully reduced the starting point from 4-years to 2-years imprisonment after a Newton Hearing and persuaded the Court to suspend the sentence for a young Defendant with autism and learning/behaviour needs.

R v AS [2020] – Inner London Crown Court – Junior alone

Case involving allegations of coercive and controlling behaviour (5-day jury trial)

R v T [2020] – Inner London Crown Court – Junior alone in a case involving allegations of conspiracy to supply over 5 kilograms of high purity cocaine.

The case involved seven defendants and complex cell site evidence. Defendant acquitted after three-week trial. The other six defendants were either convicted or pleaded guilty.

R v SS [2019] – Leicester Crown Court – Led by Jason Bartfeld QC in a murder trial in which the Defendant was alleged to have stabbed the Complainant in the chest with a knife during a workplace dispute. The trial involved legal arguments relating to the partial defence of loss of control. <https://www.lbc.co.uk/crime/builder-who-knifed-colleague-to-death-jailed-for-1/>

R v D [2019] – Blackfriars Crown Court – Junior alone in case alleging allegation of assault occasioning actual bodily harm.

The Defendant was alleged to have broken a bottle of the head of the head of the Complainant in the middle of the Elephant and Castle Bingo Hall. The jury unanimously acquitted the Defendant.

R v C [2019] – Led by Greg Unwin in a multi-handed case concerning an allegation of conspiracy to transfer criminal property.

Case involved a four-year pre-charge investigation and over 80,000 pages of served evidence. Defendant acquitted after a six-week trial.

R v O [2019] – Led by Andrew Fitch-Holland in a complex child neglect case involving 13 children and 31 separate allegations of neglecting a child.

Case involved the late service of 10,000 pages of social service records during the trial. Defendant was acquitted of 8 of the 13 offences alleged against him. Appeal pending.

R v C [2019] – Defending a man accused of public order offences within a church on Remembrance Sunday. Client was conditionally discharged by the Court after mitigation had been advanced relating to the Defendant's severe form of tinnitus. <https://www.lynnnews.co.uk/news/man-threatened-elderly-man-during-remembrance-sunday-church-disturbance-court-told-9094120/>

R v A [2018] – Blackfriars Crown Court- Junior alone in case alleging possession of identity documents with improper intent.

Defendant received a suspended sentence.



R v L [2018] – Ipswich Crown Court- Junior alone in two-handed trial involving allegation of actual bodily harm that took place in a nightclub in Colchester.

Suspended sentence secured. <https://www.eadt.co.uk/news/jade-and-toni-lewis-sentenced-for-colchester-assault-2479368>

R v D [2018] – Woolwich Crown Court – Junior alone in a case alleging possession with intent to supply class a drug.

A large amount of class-a drugs were found in the defendant's coat pocket. Case resulted in a hung jury.

R v H [2018] – Inner London Crown Court- Junior alone representing the first defendant in a 'Chem-sex' case involving the supply of large amounts of crystal methamphetamine and gamma-Butyrolactone. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-6388517/Cookery-teacher-49-revelled-double-life-chemsex-drug-dealer-jailed-45-months.html>

R v J [2017] – Woolwich Crown Court- Junior alone in multi-handed case involving allegation of conspiracy to transfer criminal property.

Defendant received a suspended sentence after pleading guilty on a basis which was fundamentally different to that alleged by the prosecution.

R v N [2017] – Kingston Crown Court- Junior alone in conspiracy to commit fraud.

Fraud involved multiple fraudulent applications for pay-day loans with stolen credit card details. The estimated loss was over £100k.

R v K [2017] – Snaresbrook Crown Court- case involved a large-scale fraud of John Lewis. Successful application to dismiss advanced.

R v R [2017] – Inner London Crown Court- obtained a suspended sentence for a case of class a street dealing in a significant role after a fully contested Newton Hearing.

R v W [2017] – Blackfriars Crown Court- Junior alone defending in a case of theft where the defence was mistaken identity. The case involved complex gait-analysis evidence. Not guilty verdicts on all counts.

R v Z [2017] – Kingston Crown Court- Junior alone defending a multi-count indictment alleging offences of sexual assault and exposure and against multiple complainants. Not guilty verdicts on all counts.

R v T [2016] – Kingston Crown Court – Junior alone in a stranger robbery.

R v A [2016] – Woolwich Crown Court – Junior alone in multi-handed burglary of a commercial premises. Successful submission of no case to answer made based on weak identification evidence.

R v T [2016] – Inner London Crown Court – Junior alone in two-handed case involving allegations of actual bodily harm where the complainant had been slashed multiple times with a knife.



R v D [2016] – Croydon Crown Court – Junior alone in case involving an allegation of having a bladed article- Not guilty verdict after a reasonable excuse was successfully advanced.

R v W [2016] – Woolwich Crown Court – Junior alone in case involving multiple allegations of breaching a Non-Molestation Order. One allegation was dismissed after a successful submission of no case to answer. The jury unanimously acquitted the defendant in relation to all other counts.

R v A [2017] – Inner London Crown Court – Junior alone in a case involving allegations of theft from a high-profile Chinese television presenter of over £100,000.

R v N [2017] – Southwark Crown Court – Junior alone in a case involving multiple allegations of breaching a restraining order. The prosecution was forced to offer no evidence on the first day of trial after a successful application to exclude the defendant's interview under s.78 of PACE.

B v H [2016] – successfully argued autrefois acquit in a private prosecution alleging statutory nuisance at Westminster Magistrates Court.

R v RS [2016] – Possession with Intent to Supply Class A Drugs at Wood Green Crown Court – YRO with ISS given to youth with a previous conviction for drugs supply.

R v N [2016] – Possession with Intent to Supply Class A Drugs at Derby Crown Court. Starting point of 4 years and 6 months mitigated down to one of 1 year and 8 months.

R v F [2016] – Dangerous Driving- 24-month suspended sentence given in a case where the defendant had been chased by police for two miles at 120mph on the wrong side of a dual carriage way.

R v S – [2016] Fraud (DVLA) – Successfully argued the magistrates should have suspended a 6-month custodial sentence for a driving test fraud.

R v T- [2016] Possession of Identity Documents with Intent- Successfully opposed an application for a Serious Crime Prevention Order.

Criminal Prosecution

Grade 2 Prosecutor – CPS

Liam has experience of prosecuting allegations of burglary, robbery, fraud, assault (ABH/s.20), public order matters, weapons offences and sexual assault

R v L [2020] – Luton Crown Court – Prosecuted an allegation of inflicting grievous bodily harm.

R v S [2021] – Luton Crown Court – Prosecuted an allegation of dwelling burglary. Defendant found guilty after a 3-day trial which featured cell-site and footwear impression evidence.



R v M [2021] – St Albans Crown Court – Prosecuted an allegation of arson with intent to endanger life and possession of an imitation firearm whilst committing a specified offence. Court ordered an extended sentence of 9-years imprisonment.

Professional Memberships

- Inner Temple
- Criminal Bar Association
- South-Eastern Circuit

Awards/Qualifications/Other

- Psychology and Criminology- BSc- First Class Honours
- GDL- Commendation
- BPTC- Very Competent