John Richard Jones KC

Call 1981 | Silk 2002

Clerks

Nick Buckley
0161 817 2757

Kate Masher
0151 242 8841

Appointments

- Recorder
- Associate Lecturer at Northumbria Law School

Memberships

- Criminal Bar Association
- Northern Circuit

Education

- LL.B (University of Liverpool)
- Middle Temple

Criminal

Ranked Band 1 and Leading Silk for Financial Crime and Crime in Chambers and Partners.

Ranked Tier and Leading Silk for Crime and Business and Regulatory Crime in The Legal 500

John is the head of the Crime team in Exchange Chambers and is an experienced specialist in all forms of fraud and ancillary issues such as confiscation proceeds of crime and money laundering. His serious fraud practice includes work prosecuted by the SFO, CPS and HMRC and he is currently retained in several multi-million pound city insider dealings and aggressive tax avoidance/evasion cases. He has a detailed knowledge of the issues of restraint and confiscation, as well as specialist experience F.C.I.B and U.M.B.S related issues.

He has successfully defended in cases brought forward by the SFO which have required specialist expertise of insider dealer and computer fraud, aggressive tax avoidance schemes and duty evasions. These include recent successes in aggressive tax avoidance schemes and D.O.T.A.S. issues prosecuted as conspiracies to cheat and fraudulent evasion.

He has extensive experience of prosecuting and defending matters of serious crime including manslaughter, sexual offences, drugs and terrorism related offences. John also deals with cases involving mental health issues and has been involved in a number of notorious, innovative cases, such as the Gonzalez case, which raised a significant number of issues concerning the distinction between motivation and illness, true mental illness and self-induced mental illness caused by illicit drugs. He has been briefed in ‘shaken baby’ cases and other cases involving non-accidental injuries to children.

Notable high profile cases include:-

R v Ryan Wellings, an allegation of manslaughter of a former partner and girlfriend allegedly driven to suicide following an alleged abusive and violent relationship. R v Daniel Hardcastle, the alleged murder of a 22 month old baby involving complex medical evidence as to the alleged causes of the child's injuries. R v Ben Doyle, an allegation of Murder arising out of a drive by shooting. R v Azzizi, a terrorist case involving the dissemination of terrorist material and the recruitment of others to the cause of the so called Islamic State Group. R v Flynn, a conspiracy to murder and attempted murder of an alleged drugs supply rival. Case successfully concluded due to Prosecution disclosure issues and no evidence ultimately offered resulting in the release of the defendant.

John is instructed in ongoing high profile cases involving alleged corruption and misfeasance in public office, Revenue Fraud by the importation of material from China in alleged breach of EU sanctions and the leading EncroChat case known as Embossed 2.

John has conducted many historic sex abuse cases on behalf of both the prosecution and defence. Due to the complexities facing a defendant in such circumstances, the foundation of sound preparation akin to the presentation in fraud work is beneficial for these types of cases.

He is an incisive advocate known for his formidable ability in the courtroom. He is equally at home with detailed cross examination as he is in ensuring the jury fully understands, with complete clarity, the issue he is raising. He is a calm, yet persuasive presence who, through years of heavyweight, hard-hitting advocacy is widely respected by opponents, juries and judges alike.

John is consistently recognised as a Leading Silk in both Chambers and Partners UK & The Legal 500 Guide for his expertise in Crime.

Criminal Cases

PENDING CASES

R v McLean, Kavanagh, Anderson, Hatton and Others. – Allegations centred upon alleged corrupt payments to officials employed by the Liverpool Council.

R v Rothwell and others. – Case centred upon alleged fraud concerning the application for and acquisition of COVID bouceback loans.

R v Syme and others – Case centred upon the fraudulent use of PERN's in the exportation of non-recyclable plastic waste for the UK to Turkey.

SERIOUS FRAUD

R v Zhang – A case heard in January 2026 concerning the alleged fraudulent evasion of anti-dumping duty and VAT on the importation of solar panels allegedly from China in alleged contravention of EU regulations designed to protect the domestic EU and UK markets from the importations of Chinese products. The allegation was to the effect that the UK Government have already paid the duty (ADD and VAT) (which in any event was denied to be due and owing) to the EU as part of alleged treaty obligations. The Defence of the defendant was that the solar panels in any event did not originate from China but from other Countries such as Taiwan, Vietnam and India and consequently the duty was not due and therefore the alleged payments (by HMRC on behalf of HM Government) have been erroneously made. Value of the alleged fraud said to be in excess of £140 million. Case concluded with the Prosecution offering no evidence in consequence of disclosure issues and the conclusion that the defendants were unable to have a fair trial.

R v Hughes, Bold and Others – Retained by the defence in a case brought by HMRC concerning an alleged fraud involving a film investment and tax avoidance scheme.The scheme involved the investment in films with a tax hedge should the films prove financially unsuccessful. HMRC alleged this was fraudulent. The defence made an application to dismiss before arraignment in consequence of a deficiency in the charges. The application was successful and the case dismissed.

R v Shirley (and others) – Prosecution for money laundering and other offences of dishonesty including mortgage fraud and the acquisition of very high value presitge motor vehicles free of VAT by reason of the exploitation of the abuse of the system to provide vehicles for Wheel chair users. Majority of counts dismissed at the close of the prosecution case.Widespread abuse of the Wheel chair use regulations exposed by nationally reknowned motor dealers who had been supplying vehicles on the same terms

R v Smith (and others) – Conspiracy to import tobacco and cigarettes. Majority of evidence was obtained in consequence of the use of a covert listening device.Challenges to the use of the device and the disclosure proceedures surrounding the same.

R v Batliwala and Others – Retained by the defence in a conspiracy to defraud the revenue by the alleged smuggling of class A and B drugs, as well as tobacco. The case concerned the smuggling of the drugs and tobacco in loads of fresh fruit and vegetables imported via Heathrow and Gatwick airports as well as via various coastal ports. The allegations of class A were dismissed with the defendant being acquitted of the remainder after a re-trial.

R v Ahmed and Others – Retained by the defence in a conspiracy to defraud and launder money. The case concerned the alleged abuse of the Hawala banking system and the laundering of money via a series of money changing bureaux. The case involved the analysis of many thousands of transactions and the tracing of both money and assets. The case was ultimately resolved by the Prosecution offering no evidence upon receipt of arguments for the application for a stay.

R v Emery and Others – Retained by the defence in a conspiracy to defraud. The allegation was essentially a "boiler room" type fraud concerning a share dealing entity in Madrid. There were many victims including elderly and vulnerable victims. The case was complex as it was apparent that some investors had made very considerable profits although they were small in number when compared with the victims.

R v Donnelly and Others – The first trial in the Operation Vex trilogy. Retained for the director and accountant for the group of companies allegedly responsible for the fraud which included a variety of alleged devices including money laundering and MTIC.

R v Knights and Others – Retained by the defence in "the largest mortgage fraud ever prosecuted in the UK" (as opened to the jury by Prosecuting Counsel). Known by the S.F.O. case reference as BMF 01, the case concerned the fraudulent acquisition of approximately £63m from various commercial lenders. The case required detailed cross-examination of experts as to the duties and responsibilities of a solicitor involved in transactions of this type. Case was complex involving both criminal and regulatory breaches. Defendant unanimously acquitted after a five month trial.

R v Cahill and Others – Retained by the defence in a prosecution by the SFO of Defendant's charged with conspiracies and fraudulent trading. A case of the utmost complexity and difficulty. Successful plea bargain resulted in a non-custodial sentence.

R v Gosling and Others – Retained by the defence in a prosecution by the SFO into the notorious "buy to let" fraud concerning the activities of P.P.P. Limited. Described by the S.F.O. as the most significant "buy to let" type fraud involving over £80 million of investor monies of which £65 million provided no prospect of any return. There were ultimately £16 million in investor claims following the collapse.

R v Mawdsley –A serious fraud concerning both criminal and regulatory offences/matters. Case concerned the abuse of trust by a tied agent in the financial services field and the fraudulent trading of an IFA through a series of off-shore companies after the changes brought about by the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 had restricted his UK based activities.

R v Brown (and others) –Otherwise known as the "IKEA fraud." Retained by the defence in a prosecution by the SFO of various defendants allegedly supplying goods to IKEA at a time when these goods were not in fact required by IKEA.Despite their assertions to the contrary the SFO were compelled to accept greatly reduced figures concerning the quantum alleged in respect of various charges including corruption and to abandon the principle allegation of Conspiracy to defraud resulting in the verdicts of Not Guilty.

R v Cox & Others – (also Known as "Operation Divert"). M.T.I.C. fraud of EU exporters. At the time of conviction this was the largest and most complex fraud of its type.

R v Issitt – (also Known as "Operation Divert 2") – M.T.I.C. fraud of EU exporters. (Linked to Cox & Others).

R v Duff – Prosecution of a solicitor accused of money laundering.

SERIOUS CRIME

R v Wellings – The first ever defendant to be tried before a jury accused of the unlawful killing of his partner following a sustained period of alleged domestic abuse, including violence, in consequence of which she took her own life.
Ryan Wellings was accused of driving Kiena Dawes to her death after two years of alleged domestic abuse and violence. After a six week trial at Preston Crown Court, the jury found the defendant not guilty of manslaughter, accepting the defence's argument that there was no significant causative link between Mr Wellings' conduct and Ms Dawes' tragic death.

R v Flynn – Case of conspiracy to murder and attempted murder. The defendant was alleged to be one of a group of men behind the targeting and attempted murder of an alleged drug rival. Defendants DNA was said to be on the weapon used to attempt the murder. Prosecution ultimately offered no evidence and defendant was discharged.

R v Sladek – case of alleged murder (tried Spring 2023) of one of a group of men who stormed the house were the defendant was staying in order to execute a revenge attack. The "householder defence" was used and the defendant acquitted of murder but convicted of manslaughter due to his part in the alleged attack. Others were convicted of murder. A complex case both factually and legally in consequence of the interaction of self-defence and the householder defence which were to be assessed by the jury.

R v Williams – Allegation of murder in a gang/drugs turf war. Deceased was an 18 year old youth beaten and stamped to death in a city centre internet café. The allegation of a turf war was denied with the motive for the attack being the deceased's alleged threat to a child with a knife. Two knives found on the deceased. His family members had attempted to conceal these before the arrival of the police. Cell siting and CCTV used to place some of the defendants at the scene. Issues of participation, self-defence and joint enterprise.

R v Hardcastle – Allegation of murder by a defendant against his 22 month old baby. Complex evidence concerning the causation of the injuries as to whether accidentally caused or deliberately inflicted.

R v Byrne – Allegation of murder of man alleged to have accosted young girls. Defendants action was to "teach a lesson" concerning this alleged behaviour. Defendant struck the deceased twice but upon falling the deceased struck his head on the pavement. After the defendant left the scene 2 others came and kicked the unconscious man. The cause of death and sequencing of the blows was critical. Defendant pleaded guilty to manslaughter. Prosecution refused to accept the plea. Defendant found not guilty of murder.

R v Taylor – Killing by a defendant of both parents in consequence of a series of psychotic illnesses and a failure in the medication required to stabilise his pre existing paranoid schizophrenia and psychosis. Manslaughter by way of diminished responsibility was ultimately accepted once the defendant was fit to plead. Thereafter complex medical evidence was heard from competing psychiatrists as to the ultimate disposal. The issue being the alternative of a hospital order or Section 45A hybrid order.

R v Doyle – April 2022: Drive by shooting of a rival gang member. Case concerned the recognition of a distinctive electric bike and the defendants involvement with this bike and its alleged camouflage on the day of the shooting. Defendant was a supplier and repairer of bicycles who was allegedly unaware of the purpose for which the electric bike he supplied would be used. His relationship with the alleged gunman was denied.

R v Cookson – January 2022: Murder of vulnerable drug user who had allowed his home to be used for drugs supply. Dispute between two gangs who claimed the house as theirs. Defendant was attacked by a rival gang when he visited the house. Deceased allegedly killed in retribution for this attack. The defendants presence at the scene was proven by the use of a fitness App on his mobile phone which measured the distance to the house in question and allegedly established his presence there at the time of the killing.

R v Robert Child – Murder for gain by a son upon his mother. The defendant had lead a fantasy life during which he had represented himself as being variously a University professor and a coaching scout for a premier league football team. He allegedly killed his mother to gain access to her considerable funds and thereafter had purchased an expensive car before being arrested.

R v Alan Edwards – Alleged murder of Susan Waring who went missing in January 2019 and who has never been seen since. Case of missing body murder. Extremely complex issues as to the extent and scope of the search operation and the potential for the missing person to create and sustain a new identity in what were styled "proof of life enquiries". Complex forensic evidence linking a potential attack upon the alleged victim to her subsequent disappearance.

R v John O'Brien (and others) – Allegation of murder and arson with intent to endanger life. Case arose out of a county lines drugs supply case where the deceased was suspected of supplying for a rival line. An attack took place where his home was set alight with petrol and the same was sprayed over the deceased who was then ignited causing injuries from which he died. Defendant was present at the scene but denied knowledge of the intention to ignite. Defendant acquitted of murder but convicted of manslaughter and reckless arson.

R v Darren Taylor – Murder of an elderly and vulnerable man for whom the defendant acted/posed as a carer. Complex factual scenario in consequence of the care package in place for the patient and the inter-action between the care provided and the alleged activities of the defendant. Extremely complex expert evidence concerning the dating of fractures some of which were dated some five months or more prior to the alleged fatal attack. The deceased sustained some 78 fractures in total but the dating of the fractures and the correlation between these dates and the defendant's access to the patient was a significant issue.

R v Daniel Taylor – Murder involving a father and son as defendants in the alleged attack upon their friend in consequence of an attack following a dispute between the Father and a former partner. The deceased became involved in the defence of his father. Prosecution contended it was a joint attack. Complex issues of joint principals or primary and secondary parties. Inter related issues of joint enterprise ans defence of another.

R v Christopher Wallace – Case said to involve the head of a significant organised crime syndicate involving the supply of Class A drugs, possession of firearms, ammunition and explosives on a massive scale. Complex expert evidence regarding the explosives and the ability to trace the defendant of various alleged supply journeys.

R v Fazal Ilahi (and others) – Allegations of murder and attempted murder arising out of a feud between two families. The feud had been on going for many months and culminated in an attack in which the father of one family was killed and his son was subject to an attempt to murder. Issues of joint enterprise and participation were at the forefront of the trial. Defendants presence was admitted but his knowledge and participation remained contentious.

R v Bernard Pinkney – Allegation of murder. Defendant was pursued by the deceased following altercation concerning the presence of the defendant as an uninvited guest at a party at the home of the deceased. The Defendant was pursued by the deceased who was carrying 1 possibly 2 knives. Defendant was initially unarmed. After a successful pursuit of the defendant a struggle ensued in consequence of which the deceased was stabbed twice. The Defendants self defence went beyond what was reasonable and defendant pleaded guilty to manslaughter.

R v Dylan Slater – Allegation of murder of a professional cage fighter during an altercation following a wrestling fight when the defendant defeated the deceased who took exception to being defeated by "an amateur". Cage fighter attacked the defendant with a knife who thereafter defended himself. Self defence went beyond what was initially reasonable and the defendant pleaded guilty to manslaughter.

R v Deborah Andrews (and one other) – Charge of murder of old and vulnerable victim with a subsequent dismembering (by burning) of the body. Complex case due to covert surveillance of the defendants whilst in custody.

R v Booth (and others) – Allegation of murder subsequently reduced to manslaughter following a series of fights and disturbances in various bars and public houses. Allegation of manslaughter on basis of joint enterprise.

R v McNally (and one other) – Allegation for attempted murder and wounding with intent to cause grievous bodily harm. Victim was vulnerable individual who was regarded by the defendants as a source of money. Attack allegedly took place upon their requests being refused.

R v Lauren Coyle (and others). – Charge of manslaughter of a 19 month old child by her mother. The child had allegedly been restrained in a cot with makeshift sides made to resemble a cage. Allegations that the child had been further restrained by ligatures. Complex medical issues concerning the cause of death and the underlying mechanism causing the death. Defendant acquitted of the manslaughter charge but convicted of offences of child cruelty.

R v Leighton Holt – Charge of murder following an incident in the St Helens town Centre when altercation developed between the defendant and several bouncers/door staff. CCTV evidence showed defendant was pursued by the door staff and thereafter surrounded. Defendant produced a knife and used the same in self defence. Verdict of not guilty after two juries failed to agree.

R v Bulhan – Multiple counts of murder and attempted murder following an attack in Russell Square in Central London when the defendant indiscriminately attacked members of the public with a large knife. The defendant was suffering from a significant mental illness. Complex medical issues resulted in hospital orders being made.

R v Johnson – Allegation of murder by two brothers of a man who was allegedly a troublesome neighbour to their mother. Case involved issues of joint enterprise as the defendant was said to be present and to have been involved in the attack. Submission of no case upheld due to close analysis of CCTV in conjunction with telephone evidence which demonstrated that the defendant was not in the close vicinity of the attack at the material time.

R v Alom – Allegation of murder following an incident in the defendants home when he was alleged to be the victim of bullying. Complex issues following the defendants use of a knife in self defence.

R v Richardson – Unprovoked and indiscriminate attack on New Years day of a Chinese national visiting his family in the UK.

R v Mutekedza – Allegation of Murder by a soldier and member of the Territorial Army of a girlfriend in consequence of her alleged infidelity. The killing was admitted but the defence of loss of control was advanced due to the fear of violence at the hands of the deceased and her new lover/boyfriend. Complex issues as the new boyfriend and "other man" was a Zimbabwean national who refused to return to the U.K. to testify. Cross examination was via video link to Harare. Defendant had served with the Army and had volunteered for duty in Afghanistan.

R v Ewing and Dewhurst – Abduction and Murder of young girl, Paige Chivers. Paige went missing in 2007 and has never been seen since nor has her body been recovered. Allegation was that Paige was murdered by Ewing and the body disposed of by Dewhurst who thereafter perverted the course of Justice. Proof of life evidence and probe material of covert recordings of the defendants comprised the majority of the prosecution case.

R v Ullah – Murder of a cannabis grower by men posing as purchasers of the drugs. Defendant was the person who allegedly put the "deal" together with the co-accused being the man with possession of the weapon. Significant "cut throat" defence between the defendants concerning the acquisition, possession and disposal of the weapon. Complex issues of bad character material revealed in the unused material to be deployed against the co-defendant.

R v Gonzales – Central Criminal Court. The Defence of a serial killer who engaged in 4 random killings and two attempted murders over a two day period. Whole life terms were imposed upon conviction. The Defendant was described by staff at Broadmoor Hospital as the most difficult and dangerous of those in their care. The case involved a significant mental health issues induced by a prolonged period of illicit substance abuse.

R v Kabir –Case involved the ritual killing of a 10-month-old baby in a bakery and
again involved issues of cultural differences set against a long history of mental health problems.

R v Oladapo – Central Criminal Court. Allegation of murder following an alleged vigilante attack following the activities of a notorious gang member. Case involved intrusive covert Surveillance methods and alleged covert confessions. Defendant acquitted of murder.

R v Duffeal – Central Criminal Court. Allegation of murder in a gang attack on a group including a 14 year old boy. Defendant and the co-accused were members of the notorious "London Fields Boys" gang. The case involved complex areas of joint enterprise and related issues. The case was extremely sensitive due to the age of the deceased and the issues of knife crime amongst inner city teenage gangs.

R v Anthony Greenwood – Defence of a teenager involved in the events surrounding the murder of the Liverpool teenager and cadet soldier Joseph Lappin. A case where the principle issue was joint enterprise where the Prosecution ultimately accepted guilty pleas to lesser offences.

R v – Stephen Brighouse – Defence of a man accused of manslaughter of a supermarket employee following her attempted apprehension of him as he attempted to leave the store. In consequence of a rapid rise in blood pressure during the chase an undiagnosed and unknown aneurysm ruptured causing her death. Complex medical and causational issues were raised. The case was ultimately withdrawn from the Jury upon a submission of no case being upheld.

HISTORIC SEX ABUSE

R v Khubaib – Retained by the defence in the Peterborough grooming case. Allegations of grooming of young and vulnerable girls aged between 12 and 15 years. Allegations over a significant period and for a large number of complainants Defendant was alleged to be the principal and in charge of others. All witnesses were vulnerable and required cross examination within the new regime and tool kits". Complex legal issues concerning cross admissibility.

R v Anthony Briggs – Retained by the defence in an historic sex abuse case. Allegations concerned the alleged abuse by a variety of complainants over a significant period spanning many years. Complaints were made up to 20 years after the alleged incidents had taken place and were from both family and non-family members. Abuse covered all aspects of sexual behaviour. Defendant acquitted on all 25 counts in two indictments.

R v Andrews – Defence of the Senior Director of Social Services involved in serious allegations of rape and indecent assault (male and female) on children within local authority care. Complex interdepartmental disclosure issues were raised in the case along with the Local Authority's reluctance to co-operate. Case was of a historic nature as the complainants were all now adults complaining of alleged conduct that had occurred many years before when they were children in the care of the local authority. Defendant was in a position of control and trust, both in regard to the victims and the local authority he served, neither of whom can be named in this profile for legal reasons. Defendant was acquitted of all save one charge out of 34 counts.

TERRORISM

R v Azzizi – Distribution and dissemination of very disturbing terrorist material by a man alleged to be a senior recruitment officer for the so called Islamic State group. Material had been distributed to others by a defendant who was trafficked into the UK for this purpose and to recruit others. Defendant was politically active and had attended demonstrations in London against the Iranian regime.

R v Girma & Others – Defence of alleged terrorist charged with rendering assistance to those in the attempted bombings of the London Tube system on the 21st July 2005.

R v Shaykh Asif Hussain Forooqui – An eminent Muslim cleric released without charge following his arrest and investigation for involvement in alleged terrorist offences. Pre-charge advice on disclosure, seizure and related matters given.

Recommendations

"John's attention to detail in the preparation of cases is second to none; no stone is left unturned."

"John Richard Jones is beyond great. Easy to approach for queries and wonderful with clients. It is clear for everyone to see that the bench respects him, too."
Chambers and Partners 2026

"John can put a case across in a way that keeps the jury engaged. His eye for detail shines through. He is a go-to silk."

"John's meticulous attention to detail is second to none. His calmness and client care puts clients at ease under very stressful situations."
The Legal 500, 2026

"I have known Mr Jones KC for a number of years now. By definition of Mr Jones KC status, we have worked on the most serious of offences in the criminal calendar. He quickly elevated to become my "first go-to" silk of choice. His dedication, preparation and eye for detail, no matter how paper volumous a case is, is phenomenal and it quickly becomes apparent. He has a down to earth approach to cases and my clients have always been very impressed by his dedication and skill. At what arguably is the lowest point of their lives Mr Jones KC has the knack of immediately putting them at ease from their very first meeting. On a selfish note this is always great for me because it lifts a lot of the pressure.

Mr Jones KC readily engages everyone involved in a case, client, instructing Solicitor and Junior Counsel and welcomes people's views and comments. He is the first to say all cases are a team effort. He makes himself available any time of day or night if advice or a view is required on something.

In Court he has a very big presence and it is clear the respect Judges and peers alike have for him. He is a great Jury Advocate.

I only have one negative comment to make, I wish I had met the Gentlemen professional much sooner than I did!"
Garry Leaver, Farley's Solicitors

"John Jones KC is regularly instructed by the Firm because he is an effective and powerful advocate representing our clients in the most serious of cases to be heard throughout England and Wales.

John's approach to preparation is meticulous, thorough and methodical, identifying evidential weaknesses in our opponent's case to be pressed home by him to win the trial.

John's client care is second to none, with regular and meaningful conferences with our clients, proceeding to navigate them through the complexity of the evidence and law in an easy to understand manner but moreover so the client is best prepared when giving evidence at trial.

It is not surprising that John's caseload in recent years has included representing client's faced with Murder, Terrorism and high value Money Laundering allegations.

John excels as Queen's Counsel for all the above reasons but also because his character and personality always shine through. He is naturally committed and hardworking with a genuine interest in working for our client as well as being incredibly easy to work with, being approachable and accessible by phone or in person.

You want Queen's Counsel and you want the best – choose John Jones KC."
Nasir Hafezi LLB MA, Solicitor at Robert Lizar Solicitors

"John Jones Q.C. is a tenacious, highly intelligent, accomplished silk who has many years of experience of defending complex and challenging cases. He has particular expertise in defending complex fraud cases and does so with the upmost skill and client care.

Having regularly instructed him over the years (and having recently been involved with him in a multi million pound money laundering case in Manchester, where he and I represented the main Defendant) I am consistently impressed by his exceptionally high levels of preparation, his attention to detail, his overall tactical awareness and his advocacy skills.

He is also a pleasure to work with and a real team player. He also makes the most complex of cases easy to understand for his clients, from whom he regularly receives praise. He involves the client at every stage of their case and always keeps them abreast of developments and legal issues. He seems to thrive on attention to detail."
David Ryan, Partner, M&A Solicitors, York

"John Jones KC specialises in defending very serious criminal allegations. In addition to his intelligent and thoughtful manner, Mr Jones is a highly motivated and extremely hard working lawyer. He cares deeply to ensure that those he represents obtain the best possible outcome. He is a fearless advocate for his clients. His tenacity, work ethic, incisive tactical thinking and dedication to ensuring the best possible results for his clients have resulted in a thoroughly well-deserved reputation for excellence."
Correna Platt, Senior Partner, Stephensons

"John scores on every front. His paperwork is absolutely first class; logical, lucid, well presented, well ordered and above all totally to the point. His thorough preparation is evidenced by a relaxed but highly effective courtroom presentation. Be it in forensic cross examination of experts, or chatting things through with the jury, his sheer command of the English language is a joy to witness. All in all a sound choice, but with an added advantage, which any solicitor will understand he is a natural team leader who takes the time to listen."
Mike Mackey, Senior Partner, Burton Copeland

"John is a superb advocate and his case and trial preparations are exceptional and very thorough. His interest and commitment to the client's cause always shines through. John is never afraid of giving difficult advice to a client and he doesn't shy away from issues which need addressing. John thinks strategically from the outset and always ensures that my clients understand any difficulties they may face and they are thus able to make decisions based on the very best advice available."
Jason Cropper, Partner, Regulatory Investigations and Prosecutions, TLT LLP

"John Richard Jones KC is excellent."
Chambers and Partners 2025

Tier 1 – Business and Regulatory Crime (Including Health and Safety)

Tier 1 – Crime (General and Fraud)
The Legal 500, 2025

Consistently ranked in the legal directories, Chambers UK and the Legal 500, John is described as a "heavy hitting silk" and is praised for his "formidable reputation as an advocate". Sample references from the directories include:

"John is a superb jury advocate and lawyer. My go-to silk."

"He's very thorough and gets good results."
Chambers and Partners 2024

"He is calm and assured." **Chambers and Partners 2023**

"He is hard-working, thorough and excellent with clients and juries alike."
Chambers and Partners 2022

"He is brilliant – extremely thorough and so clever."

"John has an excellent manner and builds up a rapport with the client. He is proactive and delivers outstanding closing speeches."
"He is hard-working and gets good results."
Chambers and Partners 2021

"Has an excellent manner and builds up a rapport with clients. He is proactive and delivers outstanding closing speeches." "A pugnacious advocate, the proverbial iron fist in a velvet glove."

"A top-drawer silk with a very strong work ethic." "He lives and breathes financial crime." "A meticulous barrister and an excellent jury advocate. He's very personable and is someone who can bring himself to the jury's level and explain things in a non-technical way, while getting across some very pertinent and technical points."
Chambers and Partners 2020

"He's very thorough, hard-working and gets good results." "He works tirelessly to achieve the best results for his clients; he's a very clever advocate."
Chambers and Partners 2019

"He's an excellent advocate who has an outstanding command of the courtroom. He's diligent in his preparation for complex and lengthy trials."
Chambers and Partners 2018

"Specialises in serious crime and fraud work, with particular expertise in money laundering, drugs and sexual offences. Regularly involved in cases arising out of domestic terrorism."
Chambers and Partners 2017

"A really powerful trial advocate. His attention to detail is remarkable and he has a very caring approach to the lay clients."
Chambers and Partners 2016

"Handles serious fraud and money laundering defence work. Solicitors appreciate his meticulous approach" "He is very good on his feet and commands a lot of respect from Barristers and Judges" "He is extremely hardworking and good with clients."
Chambers and Partners 2014

John is cited as a "leading Silk" in both crime and regulatory work in The Legal 500 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018/19, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023.

Crime:

"John has the ability to put the client at ease from their very first meeting, which is no mean feat bearing in mind the seriousness of the allegations they may face. He has a down-to-earth approach and readily engages everyone present, he is never fearful of asking people their thoughts and views, his preparation of a case does not go without notice, and his eye for detail is phenomenal."
The Legal 500, 2024

"His preparation in cases is meticulous, his client care is impeccable and his advocacy is always forceful and formidable. The go-to KC."

"John has a stylish, smooth and unflappable demeanour in Court. His advocacy is precise, comprehensive and cogent. As a result of his thorough knowledge of the law and preparation of his cases, John is trusted by the Court and is, as a result, a very persuasive advocate. He is very agile in cross examination and reacting to the unexpected events that occur in a criminal trial. John has a great eye for detail in paper heavy cases."
The Legal 500, 2023

"Attention to detail. Superb with the clients and juries alike. Overall a fantastic lawyer and advocate. My go-to silk."
The Legal 500, 2022

"A formidable advocate whose attention to detail is second-to-none."
The Legal 500, 2021

"Very hard-working and always gives good turnaround of instructions."
The Legal 500, 2020

"A specialist in criminal law."
The Legal 500, 2018/19

"An iron fist in a velvet glove."
The Legal 500, 2017

"Experienced in fraud and all other white collar crime."
The Legal 500, 2016

"His advocacy is calm and precise, and his gravitas with the judge makes him
very persuasive."
The Legal 500, 2015

Regulatory/Health and Safety/Environment work:

"*John is a tenacious, highly intelligent, accomplished silk who has many years of experience in defending complex and challenging cases. His exceptionally high levels of preparation, his attention to detail, his overall tactical awareness, and his advocacy skills are impressive."*
The Legal 500, 2024

"John Jones KC has a strong background in handling fraud cases concerning issues including money laundering, corporate fraud and insider dealing."
The Legal 500, 2022

"Has the ability to lead a team whilst listening to instructions given. Excellent with clients. Extremely hard working, an effective advocate who is also lucid in his written submissions."
The Legal 500, 2021

"Very hard-working and always turns around work in good time."
The Legal 500, 2020

"Very experienced across a range of health and safety cases."
The Legal 500, 2018/19

"A formidable lawyer."
The Legal 500, 2017

"Defends actions brought by regulators, including the H.S.E and the environment Agency".
The Legal 500, 2016

"He adopts an utterly fearless and robust approach."
The Legal 500, 2015