

Proposed Post-Mortem Examinations (Defence Time-Limit) (Scotland) Bill

Page 1: Introduction

A proposal for a Bill to make the right of defence counsel for a person accused of homicide to instruct a post-mortem examination of the alleged victim subject to an extendable time-limit in order to minimise delays and uncertainty for victims' families. The consultation runs from 9 January 2018 to 4 April 2019. All those wishing to respond to the consultation are strongly encouraged to enter their responses electronically through this survey. This makes collation of responses much simpler and quicker. However, the option also exists of sending in a separate response (in hard copy or by other electronic means such as e-mail), and details of how to do so are included in the member's consultation document. Questions marked with an asterisk (*) require an answer. All responses must include a name and contact details. Names will only be published if you give us permission, and contact details are never published – but we may use them to contact you if there is a query about your response. If you do not include a name and/or contact details, we may have to disregard your response. Please note that you must complete the survey in order for your response to be accepted. If you don't wish to complete the survey in a single session, you can choose "Save and Continue later" at any point. Whilst you have the option to skip particular questions, you must continue to the end of the survey and press "Submit" to have your response fully recorded. Please ensure you have read the consultation document before responding to any of the questions that follow. In particular, you should read the information contained in the document about how your response will be handled. The consultation document is available here: [Consultation document](#) [Privacy Notice](#)

I confirm that I have read and understood the Privacy Notice attached to this consultation which explains how my personal data will be used

Page 2: About you

Are you responding as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation? Note: If you choose "individual" and consent to have the response published, it will appear under your own name. If you choose "on behalf of an organisation" and consent to have the response published, it will be published under the organisation's name.

an individual

Which of the following best describes you? (If you are a professional or academic, but not in a subject relevant to the consultation, please choose "Member of the public".)

Member of the public

Please select the category which best describes your organisation

No Response

Please choose one of the following:

I am content for this response to be published and attributed to me or my organisation

Please provide your name or the name of your organisation. (Note: the name will not be published if you have asked for the response to be anonymous or "not for publication". Otherwise this is the name that will be published with your response).

Louise Tricker

Please provide details of a way in which we can contact you if there are queries regarding your response. Email is preferred but you can also provide a postal address or phone number. We will not publish these details.

Page 8: Aim and Approach

Q1. The proposed Bill would set a time-limit for the instruction of a second post-mortem examination (PME), by the defence, in relation to a suspicious death. Which of the following best expresses your view of the proposal?

Fully supportive

Please explain the reasons for your response.

To give victims of crime some dignity after suffering such a horrendous crime and so that grieving families can make arrangements for a dignified send off of their choosing not to be dictated by a law which is in my opinion totally unnecessary and serves no purpose and only prolongs the suffering of the victims families , why should murderers be allowed the right to a defence which causes more pain on top of the devastation they have already caused its , its time the scales of justice were tipped in the innocent victims favour.

Q2. Which of the following best expresses your view of when any time-limit should begin?

Other (please specify)

Please explain the reasons for your response.

ideally there should not be a second post mortem as im certain the professionals have carried out the first one to a satisfactory conclusion and their findings should only be challenged if there is sufficient evidence that emerges that wasnt available at the time of death and as all departments involved have the sharing of information act they work together to find the truth of the crime , how many second post mortems uncover vital facts that were missed during the first one ?

Q3. How long a time-period do you think should be available to the defence in which to instruct a second PME?

7 days (1 week)

Q3. How long a time-period do you think should be available to the defence in which to instruct a second PME?

Please explain the reasons for your response.

if this second post mortem must be in force then as soon as possible must be the appropriate time limit

Q4. The proposed Bill would allow the defence to apply to the courts for the time limit to be extended by up to the same amount as originally allowed, and on more than one occasion. Which of the following best expresses your view of this element of the proposal?

there should be no time-limit (and no need for any extension)

Please explain the reasons for your response.

its stalling tactics which only cause more pain to families of those who have been murdered

Page 12: Financial Implications

Q5. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have on:

	Significant increase in cost	Some increase in cost	Broadly cost-neutral	Some reduction in cost	Significant reduction in cost	Unsure
(a) prosecuting authorities (COPFS)					X	
(b) the courts (SCTS)					X	
(c) victims' families						X
(d) the accused/defence					X	

Please explain the reasons for your response.

less court applications and paperwork and defence teams time and fees for doing paperwork in relation to this issue

Q6. Are there ways in which the Bill could achieve its aim more cost-effectively (e.g. by reducing costs or increasing savings)?

the money recovered from criminal activity and the proceeds of crime act could give money to victims of crime to put their cases through parliament and have the law changed to protect the victims of crime and their families in the future

Page 14: Equalities

Q7. What overall impact is the proposed Bill likely to have on equality, taking account of the following protected characteristics (under the Equality Act 2010): age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion and belief, sex, sexual orientation?

Positive

Please explain the reasons for your response.

the law doesnt discriminate against age ,gender or any other differences we all have it governs and protects us all in the same way so it can only be a good thing that will help people of every denomination , gender, age etc

Q8. In what ways could any negative impact of the Bill on equality be minimised or avoided?

there should be no need to minimise equality the law should always be the same for everybody regardless of who they are

Page 16: Sustainability

Q9. Do you consider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future disproportionate economic, social and/or environmental impacts?

Yes

Please explain the reasons for your response.

there is no reason why it shouldnt be able to

Q10. Do you have any other comments or suggestions on the proposal?

i only hope the bill can be passed and some comfort and dignity can be restored to the victims and their families its horrendous enough to lose someone under those circumstances without being bound by ridiculous rights given to the offender that severely impact the final arrangements that can be made for the victims , its the last thing grieving families can do for their loved one it shouldnt be allowed that specific funeral arrangements cant be granted due to an inane formality that probably isnt neccessary anyway