

Danielle Barden

YEAR OF CALL: 2014



Danielle Barden is a specialist in business crime, general crime and extradition law. Danielle is known for her skilled and eloquent advocacy and her determination to go the extra mile for her clients.

"She is a tenacious and skilled advocate, and her highly intelligent approach to cases inspires confidence in clients."

The Legal 500 2023.

"An up-and-coming and very capable Barrister. She has an impressive grip on issues at hand and is very thorough in her preparation, regularly achieving fantastic outcomes for her clients."

The Legal 500 2021.

"Danielle delivers amazing advocacy in court as well as in writing, with her submissions. She obtains fantastic results for her clients. She will fight the client's case very thoroughly and never gives up."

The Legal 500, 2025 | International Crime and Extradition

"Danielle is sharp, intelligent and personable and clients instantly warm to her."

Chambers & Partners, 2025 - Crime

Overview

Danielle Barden is a specialist barrister instructed in business crime, general crime and extradition.

She is ranked in the Legal 500 in International Crime & Extradition and in Fraud: Crime. Danielle is also recognised in Chambers & Partners for her work in Extradition, Crime, and Financial Crime.

"A fearless advocate who is willing to work on any case, however daunting."

Chambers & Partners 2023.

"A fine advocate who is always thorough in her preparation and inventive with her arguments."

Chambers & Partners 2022.

"She quickly identifies the issues in a case and proactively pursues lines of enquiry."

Chambers & Partners, 2025 - Crime

Danielle has significant experience of acting in business crime cases and enforcement proceedings under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 concerning cash forfeiture, detention,

confiscation and enforcement proceedings. She has appeared at the Court of Appeal in relation to such matters.

Danielle is an experienced advocate in extradition. She exclusively appears on behalf of individuals who are requested for extradition before both the High Court on appeal and the Magistrates' Court at first instance. Danielle has broad experience of arguing complex legal issues before the High Court and has successfully argued against the extradition of requested persons, both at the Magistrates' Court and on appeal, to a range of states.

Danielle appears regularly in complex criminal matters including fraud, money laundering, robbery, sexual offences and drugs offences, both as a led junior and a junior alone. She appears for both the defence and prosecution in the Crown, Magistrates' and Youth Courts and has achieved success in all these forums, as well as before the Court of Appeal.

She is a skilled prosecutor and has acted in a plethora of private prosecution cases. She has successfully acted on behalf of private bodies, such as the Royal Mail and local authorities.

Danielle has significant experience in representing vulnerable defendants, such as youths, victims of exploitation and individuals with mental health difficulties. Her skill at putting clients at ease, building a rapport and ensuring their comfort and understanding of the process throughout is second to none. As a result, Danielle has significant expertise in representing defendants running defences under section 45 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015.

Danielle is a dedicated advocate, who argues passionately on behalf of her clients and is able to clearly and persuasively put across complex legal arguments, both in her written and oral advocacy.

“A fearless advocate who is willing to work on any case, however daunting.”

Chambers & Partners 2023.

"A fine advocate who is always thorough in her preparation and inventive with her arguments."

Chambers & Partners 2022.

'Danielle is extremely hard working, very clever and has great attention to detail in all aspects of her work. She has the ability to absorb vast quantities of evidence and to understand it and to explain it to lay clients in a way that makes it simple and makes sense.'

The Legal 500 2024.

"Danielle Barden approaches cases with compassion and sensitivity and is always cognisant of the difficulties in a case."

Chambers & Partners 2024.

"Provides strong advocacy and good client service."

Chambers & Partners 2024.

"She has in-depth knowledge and vision and advocates at the highest standard."

Chambers & Partners, 2025 - Extradition

"Her arguments are persuasive and very well presented, effortlessly guiding judges through proceedings and simplifying complex matters for clients."

Chambers & Partners, 2025 - Extradition

Professional panel appointments

Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) specialist advocates' panel: Fraud: Level 3

Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) specialist advocates' panel: Serious Crime: Level 3.

Serious Fraud Office (SFO) panel of external counsel: C Panel.

Additional information

Before coming to the bar, Danielle worked at a specialist criminal defence firm in Northwest London. She specialised in confiscation law.

Danielle is a member of the Education Sub-Committee for the Female Fraud Forum, as well as several committees within chambers, and is committed to promoting equality at the Bar.

Education

City Law School, BPTC.

Cardiff University, LLB Law.

Professional Memberships

Female Fraud Forum.

Young Fraud Lawyers Association.

Women in Criminal Law.

Defence Extradition Lawyers' Forum.

Middle Temple Young Barristers' Association.

Middle Temple.

South Eastern Circuit.

Extradition & International

Danielle is a specialist extradition practitioner and is ranked in the Legal 500 as a rising star in International Crime and Extradition and Up and Coming in Chambers and Partners in Extradition.

She exclusively represents requested persons in extradition proceedings.

Danielle regularly appears before the Magistrates' Court and the High Court in complex

extradition cases, representing requested persons whose extradition has been requested to countries both throughout Europe and further afield, both as a led junior and alone.

Danielle has successfully opposed the extradition of requested persons at the Magistrates' Court and the High Court in relation to a range of legal bars to extradition. She represents requested persons on the basis of the full range of issues that fall under the Extradition Act 2003 and the European Convention on Human Rights.

"[Her arguments] were beautifully presented and eloquent".

Feedback from Mr Justice Kerr presiding over an extradition appeal in the High Court in which Danielle represented the Appellant.

She has acted in complex cases before the Magistrates' Court and the High Court, including raising arguments on prison conditions that amount to the inhuman and degrading treatment of prisoners (Article 3), the lack of decisions to charge and try requested persons (section 12A), forum (section 19B), procedural failings in the body of the Arrest Warrant (section 2) and lack of information to support that alleged offences were in fact extradition offences (section 10).

"It might not be possible to envisage anyone being better represented on this particular matter".

Feedback from Mr Justice Lane presiding over an extradition permission hearing in which Danielle represented the Applicant.

Danielle also assists clients with the drafting of letters to INTERPOL concerning the request for the removal of, and information concerning, INTERPOL Red Notices.

Interpol

Business Crime & Financial Regulation

Danielle specialises in business crime.

She has significant experience of acting in business crime cases, acting for both the prosecution and defence in large-scale, multi-handed, high value cases of fraud and money laundering.

This year, she has been instructed for the Serious Fraud Division of the Crown Prosecution Service, as a led junior, in a multi-handed fraud and money laundering case. She has also defended in lengthy multi-handed money laundering trials that have involved tens of millions of pounds of money laundering.

She is regularly instructed in lengthy and complex trials involving very high values of financial loss, with substantial volumes of evidence, including evidence of a cross-border nature and requiring the presentation of multifaceted legal arguments.

Danielle's experience in extradition law and resultant knowledge of international criminal law means that she is uniquely placed to accept business crime instructions with an international element.

Asset Forfeiture, Confiscation & Civil Fraud

Danielle specialises in representing both the defence and prosecution in confiscation proceedings at the Crown Court and Court of Appeal.

She represents defendants in high value confiscation proceedings, both as a led junior and a junior alone and has successfully argued for the significant reduction of confiscation orders.

Danielle appears at enforcement proceedings at the Magistrates' Court concerning the activation of default sentences for the non-payment of confiscation orders.

She has successfully opposed the activation of default sentences for clients whose outstanding confiscation orders have ranged in value from thousands to hundreds of thousands of pounds.

Criminal Defence

Danielle is a skilled advocate within the field of criminal proceedings.

Danielle has broad and extensive experience at the Crown Court, Magistrates' Court, Youth Court and the Court of Appeal, appearing in cases for both the prosecution and defence.

She has successfully secured the acquittal of defendants in a range of cases, such as those involving allegations of kidnapping, blackmail, serious assault, robbery, burglary, sexual offences and drugs offences.

Danielle regularly acts in large scale criminal cases, involving multiple defendants and allegations of joint enterprise and conspiracy. Danielle has recently acted in cases involving serious organised crime, involving human trafficking, kidnapping and blackmail.

As a result, of the unique rapport Danielle can build with her clients, one of her specialisms is representing vulnerable defendants. She has successfully obtained acquittals in cases running the defence under section 45 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015.

"The undoubted brilliance of Miss Danielle Barden, was I believe the difference between the not guilty judgement the jury delivered and the very real prospect of being found guilty and therefore losing my clean record, a thing I didn't really value until it was hanging on a razors edge..."

I can't sing the praises of Miss Barden enough, her pure professionalism, her determination to get the result required, her willingness to go that extra mile in a worthwhile cause, her sheer mastery of the court room setting. I can only imagine the hours that Danielle spent preparing the final summing up of all the details of the case to the jury just before they went out to deliberate and in doing so making mincemeat of all the prosecutor's arguments."

Feedback from lay client in a crown court trial for theft and burglary where his acquittal was secured.

Criminal Prosecutions - Private & Public

Danielle regularly prosecutes on behalf of both private prosecutors and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and is a Grade 3 advocate for the CPS.

She is a skilled prosecutor and has successfully acted on behalf of private bodies, such as the Royal Mail and local authorities.

Inquests & Inquiries

Danielle accepts instructions in relation to Public Inquiries and Inquests.

Cases of Note

CRIME

R v MB and others (2022-2023)

Danielle represented a young defendant in this multi-handed trial, which involved an incredibly serious allegation of kidnapping, unlawful imprisonment and blackmail. It was alleged that her client formed part of a group who had conspired to kidnap a boy who had failed to pay a drug debt, held him in different properties in North London and demanded ransom payments from his family for his return. Extensive telephone data, video footage and recorded interviews were

served and Danielle was required to make complex legal arguments to exclude evidence and stay the matter as an abuse of process.

R v BT (2023)

Danielle's client was accused of possession of firearms, ammunition and Class A drugs. As a result of the decision to instruct firearms, forensics and psychological experts, and extensive mitigation prepared and presented to the court, Danielle and her Instructing Solicitor were able to secure the acquittal of the client without trial in respect of all of the firearms and ammunition offences and a favourable sentence for their client that would allow him to move forward with his life.

R v HB and others (2022)

Represented a defendant in a 3-handed people trafficking trial in which it was alleged that he was a knowingly involved taxi driver who moved individuals who had been recently trafficked into the UK, from their unloading point in Kent to Birmingham, from where they would then be moved to other parts of the UK. The trial involved extensive cell site data telephone data, in order to show the movement of, and contact between, individuals allegedly involved in the conspiracy. The defendant was ultimately convicted after a lengthy and difficult trial, but Danielle was able to secure a suspended sentence for him.

R v RG and another (2021-22)

As a led junior, represented a defendant in a lengthy, two-handed people trafficking, drugs, rape, controlling prostitution and money laundering case. Complex and detailed legal arguments were raised in respect of foreign intercept evidence and the case was further complicated by the majority of the evidence being given from a court in Romania by video. Following conviction, Danielle and her leader were able to secure a suspended sentence for their client, who was incredibly pleased with the outcome.

R v MO (2022)

Danielle represented a defendant who was accused of taking illicit items into a prison. It was accepted that the items were taken into the prison. However, the case was run utilising the defence under section 45 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015, namely that this young man was

compelled to take the items into prison by reason of the exploitation that he faced, which involved threats that were made to himself and his family in order to ensure that he carried out this 'service' for the known offender who was making these demands of him. The jury unanimously acquitted him of the offence in under two hours and the young man was incredibly pleased to finally be able to move on from the terrible ordeal that he had gone through.

R v NR (2020)

Danielle represented a client in an incredibly difficult attempted rape, threats to kill, possession of an offensive weapon and bladed article trial. It was alleged that the client had forced the complainant to allow him into his property, threatened him, held a knife to him and attempted to penetrate him before the complainant was able to run from the building for help. Danielle was able to successfully secure the acquittal of the client in respect of one of the offences at the end of the prosecution case. The case involved extensive legal arguments on bad character and admissibility of hearsay evidence, as well as cross-examination in advance of the trial under section 28 YJCEA.

R v R (2018)

Danielle appealed against a sentence imposed by the Crown Court for two offences of assault occasioning actual bodily harm. The sentence imposed was one of 5 years, made up of a 4 year sentence of imprisonment with a 1 year extended licence period. She successfully argued that the sentence was 'manifestly excessive' and thus the custodial element of the defendant's sentence was reduced.

R v O and others (2019)

Represented a young defendant in a five handed knife-point robbery. Successful arguments were run to oppose the Crown adducing bad character, hearsay evidence and a significant proportion of the forensic evidence against the defendants.

R v C (2019)

Following successful legal arguments leading to the Crown Prosecution Service dropping numerous allegations of burglary against the defendant, Danielle represented the defendant

for a single offence of burglary where DNA matching the defendant's was found on items of clothing that were located alongside items stolen from a nearby burglary. Danielle was able to draw out the significant difficulties with the Crown's case and secure the client's acquittal.

R v F and A (2019)

Danielle successfully prosecuted a case of robbery committed against an individual from abroad, who was targeted when alone and drunk in North London. The defendant was found guilty of robbing the victim of his mobile telephone.

R v A (2019)

The defendant had been found unfit to plead and thus a trial of fact was held to establish whether he chased gas workers who had attended his property with a machete. Danielle presented the case clearly and fairly on behalf of the Crown Prosecution Service and it was found that the defendant did the acts of affray and possession of a bladed article.

R v S (2018)

Successfully represented a defendant in a multi-handed drugs, sexual offences and human trafficking trial, as a led junior. The case was large and complex and required a keen eye for detail and careful analysis of the evidence that related to Danielle's client, given the significant volume of both used and unused material that was served by the Crown. The defendant was acquitted of the human trafficking offence of which she was accused.

R v T (2018)

A Youth Court case in which Danielle successfully argued that the police were not acting in the course of their duty when arresting the defendant and thus he was found not guilty of the offence of assault occasioning actual bodily harm with intent to resist arrest.

R v B (2018)

The defendant was a youth, who was the victim of modern slavery, having been pressured to move illicit drugs. Danielle relied upon the expert report of a clinical psychologist and the account of the defendant to argue successfully that the defence under section 45 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015 had been raised and the defendant was acquitted.

R v O (2018)

The defendant was accused alongside two others of affray and GBH, committed in the context of a tussle breaking out at a shopping centre. Danielle was able to successfully argue that the GBH offence of which the defendant was accused should not be left to the jury and the defendant was acquitted of affray following trial.

R v S (2018)

Danielle represented the Crown in a trial where the defendant was accused of smuggling a young boy into the United Kingdom under the back seats of his motor vehicle. The defendant was unanimously convicted of people trafficking.

R v A (2017)

Danielle secured the acquittal of a defendant who was accused of possession of an offensive weapon, namely a piece of wood.

R v F (2017)

Represented a defendant accused of the commission of burglary and theft against his own sibling. The case required a delicate hand in cross-examination, given the nature of the relationship between the parties involved. The defendant was acquitted on all counts.

R v W (2017)

Danielle defended a case of stalking where an allegation had been made by a drugs key worker against one of her clients. The case turned on what the defendant 'ought to have known' and thus required gentle, precise cross-examination of the key worker to establish exactly what her reaction to his behaviour was and whether he was present to witness this. The defendant was acquitted.

R v P (2016)

Successfully represented a defendant accused of the commission of a burglary. The issue in the case was identification. A facial mapping expert was relied on to secure the acquittal of the defendant based on a successful dispute over the quality of the identification evidence.

BUSINESS CRIME/ASSET RECOVERY AND CONFISCATION:

R v S and others (2023)

Danielle was a led junior in this 9-handed money laundering trial in which the defendants were accused of laundering over £40 million of cash in suitcases that were transported to Dubai in the holds of commercial aircraft over a period of 3 years. Danielle's client was additionally accused of committing further, similar offences, over and above those involved in the £40 million money laundering conspiracy, and other defendants were accused of human trafficking offences, which were alleged to be the source of part of the criminal monies that were transported to Dubai. The trial was incredibly complex and lasted 3 months, involving numerous legal arguments and very substantial amounts of evidence.

R v L and others (2023)

Represented a defendant, as a led junior, in a 6-handed money laundering trial that lasted 2 months. The trial related to the movement of money from the bank accounts of victims who had been defrauded of substantial sums of money by way of intercepted or false email contact that resulted in payments being made into bank accounts that were ultimately alleged to have been set up and managed by the defendants. Due to the voluminous evidence presented, the trial was lengthy and was carried out utilising iPads.

R v A and others (2022-23)

Danielle prosecuted this case, as a led junior. It involved the commission by an organised crime group of an extensive money laundering and fraud conspiracy involving a carding website operated by one of the defendants, and the use of stolen card credentials to move money from victims' bank accounts, either electronically or by physically obtaining bank cards from unwitting victims. All defendants ultimately entered guilty pleas.

R v R and another (2020)

Danielle acted as disclosure counsel for the Crown in this two-hand fraud and money laundering trial. The defendants were accused of being concerned in fraud and money laundering through their involvement in carbon credit trading. The defendants operated companies that acted as clearing houses and brokerage firms, receiving millions of pounds from individuals who believed they were investing in a product that would increase in value, but which in reality would only ever decrease. Both defendants were convicted following trial and received substantial sentences of imprisonment.

R v R and another (2021-22)

Danielle represented, along with her leader, a defendant who was accused of trafficking young women into the UK, controlling their prostitution in the UK, and thereafter laundering the money obtained from the brothel which it was alleged she ran with her husband. Given the international nature of the people trafficking, the trial was complicated by the wealth of evidence served in the case that was obtained in Romania by way of the interception of mobile telephone conversations, which is prevented in the UK under RIPA. Therefore, Danielle and her leader were required to run complex legal arguments in respect of the admissibility of the evidence.

R v D and others (2020)

Danielle and her leader were instructed to represent a company secretary who was accused with his employer and his employer's accountant of cheating the revenue of substantial sums of money. It was alleged that he had altered company documents, on the direction of the companies' accountant and director, to show a group relationship that substantially reduced the tax liability of a number of the companies that were operating private nursing home. The trial lasted 5 weeks, involved 3 defendants, 8 counsel, voluminous case papers and complex legal argument, including a hard-fought submission of no case to answer. The client was convicted, but through substantial argument in mitigation received a suspended sentence.

R v I (2016-2020)

Danielle argued a novel point of law in the Court of Appeal in respect of whether the statutory assumptions could apply when a defendant was involuntarily absent from confiscation proceedings as a result of her mental health. The Court of Appeal found that there was not

sufficient evidence that Danielle's client was involuntarily absent at the time of the confiscation proceedings, as a result of a lack of medical evidence during that period. However, the legal point in respect of whether the assumptions can apply in a case where sufficient evidence could be provided is an interesting one that has yet to be revisited by the Court of Appeal.

R v P and others (2018)

Danielle acted as a led junior in a complex, multi-handed fraud and money laundering trial, involving the employees of a company based in the United Kingdom. The defendants were accused of illicit activity, such as the fraudulent increase of their salaries, the making of unauthorised bonus payments and the misuse of company money to purchase expensive items including jewellery and watches.

London Borough of Harrow v N (2018)

Following the successful private prosecution of a company that had illegally altered and let out a large property as a House of Multiple Occupation, Danielle also acted in the confiscation proceedings, securing a substantial confiscation order against the company.

R v A (2017)

Danielle successfully negotiated a favourable confiscation order on behalf of the defendant. The Crown had asserted high values for both the benefit from the defendant's criminal and available figure from which this benefit could be recouped. Danielle was able to negotiate a figure that was significantly lesser than that originally applied for.

R v J (2017)

Acted for the Crown in the sentencing of a high value fraud involving the defendant abusing the trust of his employer, a large multi-national corporation, by using his position to purchase and sell on goods for his own benefit.

EXTRADITION AND INTERNATIONAL

CR v Armenia (2022)

Danielle acted as a led junior in this extradition request made by Armenia in respect of fraud and money laundering allegations that involved using false credit cards to withdraw money

from banks in Armenia and then remove the money from the country. Danielle and her leader were able to win the case and prevent the extradition of their client on the basis of both Article 6 and Article 3, given that the client would not have received a fair trial or have been safe in prison in Armenia as a result of his sexuality.

GW v Portugal (2022)

Danielle successfully opposed the extradition of her client under section 2 of the Extradition Act 2003, having raised the point that there were two warrants, it was impossible to know which had been translated and served and thus whether the warrant being considered was in fact the warrant that the client was requested upon. The prosecution applied to adjourn, but having raised this point well in advance of the hearing without resolution, that application was refused and the client was discharged.

RT v Hungary (2021-23)

In this two-handed extradition case, both Danielle's client and his wife were requested to be extradited to Hungary to face trial for forgery and offences against the person. It was argued that; there were insufficient particulars in respect of the forgery offences; the judicial authorities requesting the client were not independent, and thus could not properly request extradition; no decision to try had been made in respect of one EAW; and that it would be disproportionate to extradite him, given the impact on his four young children. The client's wife was discharged and his case was appealed to the High Court.

RG v Lithuania (2021)

On appeal to the High Court, Danielle successfully argued that her client should not be extradited to be tried for three offences of fraud by an organised criminal group. It was submitted that the client's health and the life she had built in the UK made it oppressive/disproportionate to extradite her. After a 20 year addiction to heroin, she had finally obtained a stable home, employment, relationship and was on the verge of overcoming her addiction, with the assistance of opioid replacement therapy. This is treatment that a Lithuanian prison expert confirmed is not available in Lithuanian prisons. Therefore, her appeal was granted under Article 8 and section 25.

AG v Poland (2021)

It was argued at a complex appeal hearing before the High Court that the client's extradition was barred under sections 2, 10/65 and 20 of the Extradition Act 2003, and disproportionate under Article 8 of the ECHR. Detailed written and oral submissions were required. It was submitted that it was unclear which offences the client was wanted to serve a sentence for, the sentence he would be required to serve upon his return, that one offence was not an extradition offence and that the client had been afforded no right to a re-trial, despite his involuntary absence at the relevant hearing.

KL v Poland (2020)

Danielle successfully argued against the extradition of her client in circumstances where he had turned his life around, was doing incredibly well with work and had an autistic son who was highly reliant upon the client and who would have been seriously affected by the removal of his father. Danielle was able to successfully argue on appeal that, in light of the relative lack of seriousness of the offences, the client's lack of fugitive status and the severe impact on his and his family's life of his removal, his extradition was not proportionate. Therefore, the extradition order was quashed and the client discharged.

MS v Poland (2020)

Danielle represented a client who had served the totality of the sentence that he was requested to serve in Poland on an initial arrest warrant in custody. When that warrant was withdrawn and a slightly different warrant issued in respect of the same offences, it was successfully argued before the High Court that it would be disproportionate to require the client to serve the sentence again in Poland upon extradition.

AO v Poland (2020)

Represented a client who was requested to serve a sentence for a theft offence. Evidence was provided to show that Danielle's client was a victim of Modern Slavery, having been trafficked from Poland when he was homeless and desperate, suffered immensely at the hands of his traffickers and, as a result, had been diagnosed with PTSD. By the time of his arrest in the proceedings he was finally receiving help in terms of his accommodation, employment, finances and mental health and it was argued that it would be disproportionate to

extradite him in those circumstances. The District Judge refused to extradite him under Article 8 and Danielle's client was discharged. Danielle successfully represented the client again in 2022, when he was arrested for alleged human trafficking. Evidence was obtained in respect of the continued progress that the client had made, as well as the risk of becoming a trafficker if a person has been the victim of that behaviour. Danielle's client was discharged at the magistrates' court once again.

DA v Portugal (2020-22)

Danielle was led in this complex prison conditions case in respect of Portugal. It was raised, both at the magistrates' court and the High Court, that the material conditions of detention were so poor, and the experience of being held in prisons there so dangerous, that the client's extradition was in breach of Article 3 of the ECHR. Two experts on Portuguese prisons gave evidence on the conditions and treatment of prisoners. Voluminous evidence from international bodies, domestic monitoring groups and domestic and international authorities were relied upon to argue against the client's extradition that was requested for drug trafficking.

B v Poland (2019)

Danielle represented an Appellant before the High Court who had developed significant ties in the United Kingdom. He had obtained prosperous employment, established a settled home for his wife and two young children and provided additional support to his physically and mentally unwell brother. Danielle argued that, taking into account the prolonged period that the Appellant had served in custody in the UK awaiting his appeal, the very short sentence that remained to be served, that the offences were committed a long time before and amounted to behaviour that was now entirely out of character, it was not proportionate to return him to Poland. The appeal was allowed, the extradition order quashed and the Applicant allowed to return to his family life in the UK.

Belgium v T (2019)

The requested person was accused of a very serious, multi-handed offence of involvement in a human trafficking ring, where asylum seekers were transported from Belgium to the United Kingdom in refrigerated vans. Numerous arguments were raised to oppose the requested person's extradition, including prison conditions that were inhuman and degrading (Article 3),

lack of decisions to charge and try the requested persons (section 12A), procedural failings in the body of the European Arrest Warrant (section 2) and lack of information to support that alleged offences were extradition offences (section 10). The Judicial Authority were forced to concede the case in the face of the overwhelming evidence that the decisions to charge and try all of the requested persons had not been made and thus they were discharged.

S v Poland (2019)

Danielle raised a complex legal point concerning the lack of independence of the Polish judiciary as a result of the numerous statutory changes that had been made by the newly appointed political party in Poland. This case involved in-depth legal research and the drafting of complex grounds of appeal in order to properly explore the issue before the High Court.

Romania v S (2019)

Serious concerns had been raised over the prison conditions in Romania and thus the client's extradition was opposed, relying on detailed, comprehensive written and oral submissions, on the basis of the inhuman and degrading treatment that he would face if he was returned. Danielle also raised issues over the client's right to a re-trial if he were returned and the potential breach of the right to private life for him and his family under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

G v Czech Republic (2019)

The Applicant was requested for extradition to the Czech Republic for offences of theft and breach of a deportation order. He was an Algerian citizen and was the sole breadwinner for his wife and four young children. It was argued before the High Court that, given the significant financial and emotional hardship that his family had experienced as a result of his remand in custody in the UK, his extradition was in breach of their rights to private and family life and his extradition order should be quashed and he should be allowed to return to his family.

C v Poland (2017)

Danielle represented a client at the magistrates' court who had been convicted in Poland of four offences of burglary. She made representations on the lack of proportionality of returning him to Poland when his life had changed so significantly in the time that he had been living in

the UK, namely gaining impressive employment and having started a family, and his extradition was discharged.

Poland v Z (2017)

Successfully represented a requested person in an appeal to the High Court. The issue was whether the extradition of the Appellant was proportionate under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights given the short time that remained to be served. Danielle was able to persuade the High Court that to extradite the Appellant would be a disproportionate interference with his right to a private and family life in the UK and his appeal was allowed.

Germany v R (2017)

Represented a requested person in an appeal to the High Court made on the basis of section 12A of the Extradition Act 2003. A complex legal argument was raised on the basis of expert evidence that had been obtained concerning the stage that the proceedings in Germany had reached.


Poland v K (2017)

Danielle successfully represented a requested person at the Magistrates' Court in opposing extradition to Poland on the grounds of proportionality under Article 8. In the prolonged period that he had lived in the UK he had set up his own building company and had a number of employees who relied on his company for their livelihoods. He had a young family who were reliant on him and had changed his life significantly since the old offences that had been committed in Poland.

E v Latvia (2016)

Danielle represented the Appellant, who had serious medical concerns, and raised issues under section 21A, section 25 and Article 8, all of which focused upon the treatment that he was able to receive in the UK and the serious that there would not be immediate continuation of treatment if he was extradited. Danielle persuaded the High Court that the Appellant could be removed only if sufficient supporting documents were provided, both in advance of his removal and to be carried with him, to ensure that his treatment was continued immediately upon arrival in the requesting state.

Accreditation



"Danielle is a supremely conscientious and diligent advocate with a fine eye for detail."

Chambers & Partners, 2025 - Financial Crime