




Allan C. Hutchinson  
December 2013

# CRIMINAL LAWYERS – PUTTING UP A DEFENCE?

- 
- Traditional Model
  - Critique
  - Criminal Law?
  - Twist, not Transformation
- 




# Three Questions

- “How *can* you defend someone whom you know to be guilty?”
  - “How can *you* defend someone whom you know to be guilty?”
  - “How can you *defend* someone whom you know to be guilty?”
- 




“How *can* you defend someone whom you know to be guilty?”

- “lend [their] exertions to all, [themselves] to none. The result of the cause is to [them] a matter of indifference
  - Guilt, not truth
  - Not about escaping conviction
  - Vindicating rights
- 



“How can you *defend* someone whom you know to be guilty?”

- Can = should ?
  - Knowledge and belief
  - Defences run – false and/or affirmative?
  - ‘Guilty’ clients –anti-Crown
  - Perjured testimony – no, but ....
- 



“How can *you* defend someone whom you know to be guilty?”

- Rule of Law -- all entitled to lawyer
  - Why ‘you’?
  - Already selective
  - More socially beneficial than not
  - Personal responsibility – last lawyer in town
- 