

## Justice for Women response to the CPS consultation on Victims' Right to Review Interim Guidance.

Justice for Women was established in 1990 as a feminist campaigning organisation that supports and advocates on behalf of women who have fought back against or killed violent male partners. Over the past twenty years, Justice for Women has developed considerable legal expertise in this area, and has been involved in a number of significant cases at the Court of Appeal that have resulted in women's original murder convictions being overturned, including Kiranjit Ahluwalia, Emma Humphreys, Sara Thornton and Diana Butler. Most recently, in July 2010 we supported Kirsty Scamp to successfully appeal her murder conviction. We are currently supporting Stacey Hyde to appeal her murder conviction.

Justice for Women (JfW) contributes to the global effort to eradicate male violence against women, which includes sexual and domestic violence. Our focus is on the criminal justice system of England and Wales. Justice for Women works to identify and change those areas of law, policy and practice relating to male violence against women, where women are discriminated against on the basis of their gender.

### Answers to consultation questions

1. Do you agree that the guidance is clear as to which decisions would fall within the scope of the scheme?

A: Yes, we agree that the guidance on this issue is clear.

2. Do you agree that the guidance clearly sets out how victims can exercise their right to call for a review?

A: Yes, we agree that it does.

3. Do you agree that the guidance clearly sets out the basis of the victims' right to review, reflecting existing principles for reconsidering a decision?

A Yes, we agree.

4. Do you consider that the proposed time limits are appropriate?

A. Yes we do agree but would add that, with reference to paragraph 50, there should still be an overall time limit.

5. Are there any other issues you think should be considered and addressed in the guidance?

A: In so far as paragraph 23 is concerned, we submit that a proper and full explanation of the decision should always be given in the first place. This is consistent with the aim in 32(ii). Likewise and in so far as paragraph 55 is concerned, we are of the view that all victims should have the opportunity of discussing the outcome of the review with a CPS prosecutor.