# Sophie Stevens



Junior Counsel - Under 15 Years

**CALLED 2022**

*"Strives always for the best outcome and identifies issues and material supportive of a client's case."*

**LEGAL 500, 2026**

**Sophie practices in Crime and Extradition. She regularly appears in the Crown Court and has appeared in full extradition hearings and the High Court on Appeal. She has been described as 'forcefully persuasive' with submissions and 'first class' with her clients. She was ranked as a 'Rising Star' in the Legal 500 for Extradition (2026).**

Sophie is frequently instructed to prosecute and defend in serious and complex cases, including fraud, drugs, serious violence and sexual offences. In 2024, Sophie was a led junior defending in 'Operation Emperor' a fraudulent trading case which spanned the course of six months. As a Grade 2 CPS Panel Advocate, Sophie is often trusted to prosecute sensitive domestic matters and general crime.

Alongside Crime, Sophie has been instructed in a range of Part 1 Extradition cases and has experience of requests from Romania, Czech Republic, Portugal and Ireland.

Sophie welcomes instructions in criminal trials and extradition proceedings, both at first instance and on appeal.

Sophie always has the clients understanding at the forefront of her mind and is particularly passionate about working with clients with Neurodivergent conditions.

### Background and Expertise

Before turning to law, Sophie received a first-class History degree from The University of Southampton and studied Drama & Theatre at The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama.

In 2020, Sophie completed her Masters in Law with a research project focusing on the effectiveness of the disclosure process in RASSO Cases.

Since then, she has co-founded the charity 'Neurodiversity in Law' which focuses on destigmatising Neurodiversity in the legal profession and supporting those with Neurodivergent conditions. Her work in this area gives her a unique and personal understanding of Neurodivergent conditions which she often brings to her practice.

## Notable Cases

Extradition

### Germany v L, 2026

L was sought pursuant to an accusation warrant. Sophie advanced arguments under s.12(a) of the Extradition Act and Article 8. The case involved the use of Psychological reports relating to the welfare of the RP's step-children and the risk extradition posed to them, along with an analysis of whether there had been a decision to try or charge in the case.

### Romania v M, 2025

M was sought pursuant to a conviction warrant for an outstanding sentence of imprisonment for a breach of a restraining order. Sophie appeared at the substantive hearing to advance the remaining ground on appeal (Article 8) shortly after the court handed down the judgment in Adrysiewicz.

Full Judgment here

### Czech Republic v TH, 2024

TH was sought pursuant to a part 1 warrant. The context of the case became more complex due to TH having an extensive amount of bail applications and multiple appearances prior to his final hearing. Sophie represented TH throughout proceedings, advancing Article 8 and s.14, in reliance on a single expert report from a Czech lawyer and TH's own oral evidence at the final hearing, which

required skilled witness handling.

### Romania v AS, 2024

AS was sought for multiple driving offences, the most serious was death by dangerous driving. Whilst in the UK, AS had suffered a severe injury. Using medical notes and an expert report on Romanian prisons, Sophie argued that the prison conditions would be insufficient under Article 3 and that the assurance failed to set out specific support, placing him at risk.

**Extradition**

## Financial Crime

### Operation Emperor, 2024

Sophie, led by Dréa Becker, acted for a client charged with fraudulent trading. The trial was the culmination a five-year investigation by Tower Hamlets and Trading Standards into extensive allegations of fraud and malpractice at lettings agencies in East London. The trial spanned the course of six months, making it one of the longest trading standards trials.

On 09 October 2024, the jury returned unanimous not guilty verdicts on both counts faced by their client. Dréa and Sophie's client was one of only two individuals acquitted of all charges on the eight-count indictment.

Southwark Crown Court

**Financial Crime**

## Firearms

### R v C, 2023

C was charged with possession of an imitation firearm in a public place. D was of previous good character. After a comprehensive plea in mitigation, Sophie persuaded the bench to impose a Conditional Discharge.

Basildon Magistrates Court

**Firearms**

## General Crime

## R v L, 2026

Sophie was privately instructed as counsel for a 3-day trial for a single count of S.2 Harassment. The allegation was domestic in nature and involved extensive trial preparation over 12 months, including crossover with Family Court material.

During trial Sophie made multiple legal arguments including a s.78 PACE application to exclude hearsay evidence and a non-defendant bad character application which was granted. Sophie was able to discredit the accounts of multiple Crown witnesses during cross-examination and adduce L's account through effective and detailed Examination in Chief, supported by evidence.

After just under 1 hour of deliberations, the bench found L not guilty and granted a defence costs order. L has retained his good character as a result.

Weymouth Magistrates Court

## R v S, 2025

Sophie represented S for trial on multiple DV related charges, including controlling and coercive behaviour. Sophie argued in writing prior to trial that there were extensive issues with the evidence in the case, including those relating to disclosure. The Crown reviewed the case on the first day of trial and, having spoken with the complainant at court, offered no evidence.

Bournemouth Crown Court

## R v S, 2025

Sophie was privately instructed for trial. S faced two charges of assault by beating, one towards a baby. Due to issues with disclosure, Sophie drafted a Section 8 application, which was granted, and the Crown failed to comply.

At the second trial listing, Sophie made an Abuse of Process argument outlining the multiple failures. Before this was determined, the crown applied to adjourn; this application was refused, and the charges were dismissed.

As a result of the failures, Sophie represented S at a wasted costs hearing. Here, the court awarded a rare s.19 POA 1985 order for the CPS to pay a proportion of the private fees and a defence costs order for the remainder of the sum.

Oxford Magistrates Court

## RSPCA v K, 2023

Sophie represented a young and vulnerable client for sentence who was charged with causing unnecessary suffering to an animal. The RSPCA placed the case in the top sentencing categories and sought a disqualification & deprivation order preventing the defendant from having animals in the future. Sophie argued against a custodial sentence and heavily mitigated the offence using case law and expert reports. As a result, the judge took an 'exceptional' approach to the sentence imposing a 12-month community order. Sophie further persuaded the judge not to impose a disqualification & deprivation order which meant the client could keep an emotional support animal.

Willesden Magistrates Court

**Crime**

Rape and Sexual Offences

## R v D, 2026

Mr D was charged with sexually assaulting a woman in public and of ABH in the alternative. Mr D admitted presence and later attempted a S.24 citizen's arrest on the complainant. However, he maintained that he was not responsible for the conduct on the indictment.

In cross-examination, Sophie elicited the inconsistencies in the chronology of the accounts and the descriptions of the perpetrator. Further, the complainant agreed that she was intoxicated and could not be sure that the person who pushed her to the ground and touched her waistband was Mr D.

Sophie made a submission of no case to answer at the close of the prosecution case, arguing that when taking the prosecution case at its highest, there was not sufficient evidence to convict.

The Judge agreed, remarking that Sophie's submissions were 'short, pertinent and to the point' and that there was no case to answer, directing the Jury to find Mr D not guilty of both counts.

St Albans Crown Court

## R v S, 2025

S had pleaded guilty to three counts of Making Category A-C images and one count of possession of a prohibited image. The case concerned 'pseudo images' of children; as a result, Sophie correctly argued and identified key case law to assist in the judge's sentencing of S to avoid an immediate custodial sentence. This was despite the Crown arguing that the offences carried a starting point of 6 years in custody. Ultimately, S was sentenced to a total of 2 years' imprisonment, suspended for 18

months.

Croydon Crown Court sitting at The Central Criminal Court

### R v A, 2025

Sophie's client was sentenced to a 3 year community order, having pleaded guilty to one offence of causing or inciting a child to engage in sexual activity, one offence of causing or inciting a child to watch a sexual activity, two offences of meeting a child following grooming and three further related offences that took place between 2022-23.

At the sentencing hearing, the judge found that there had been an unjustifiable delay in the case and agreed with the categorisation of the offending put forward by Sophie. The judge took a starting point of 54 months, and after considering credit for guilty plea and mitigation, the sentence was reduced to 30 months imprisonment. The judge went on to find that there were significant factors of mitigation, and the risk of re-offending had significantly reduced. As a result, he was persuaded to impose a 3 year community order with unpaid work and rehabilitation requirements instead of a sentence of imprisonment.

Snaresbrook Crown Court

**Rape and Sexual Offences**

## Violence

### R v DA, 2026

Sophie was instructed to represent DA at trial. On the day of trial, the Crown amended the Indictment, adding three substantive Robbery charges alongside the other counts of Attempted Robbery and Handling Stolen Goods, the total indictment now spanning nine counts. DA had provided a no-comment interview and advanced no positive defence for trial. After cross-examination of the officer by Sophie and closing speeches, the jury returned Not Guilty verdicts on all three of the substantive Robbery charges, convicting DA of the other counts.

As a result, DA was only sentenced to a 12-month Community Order with unpaid work.

Wood Green Crown Court

### R v T, 2025

Sophie represented a former security guard who was charged with ABH in 2021 during his

employment and COVID-19. The four-day case turned heavily on issues with causation regarding the alleged injury sustained and the credibility of the individuals involved. Sophie was able to discredit the Crown's witnesses during cross-examination, build a positive picture of her client during his evidence and dissect and present the issues with the Crowns medical evidence.

As a result, the jury returned a unanimous not guilty verdict after just over one hour of deliberations and the client retains his good character.

Woolwich Crown Court

### R v C and another, 2024

Sophie represented the son at trial who was jointly charged alongside his father of ABH. The prosecution alleged that the two men launched a violent attack on their neighbour, wounding him with a brick. Through careful examination in chief, Sophie was able to present C as an individual who could not have acted in the way the complainant had alleged. Both were acquitted by unanimous not guilty verdicts.

Croydon Crown Court

### R v W, 2023

This was a DV assault by beating case. The crown applied to adduce W's Bad character, including convictions for violence and previous incidents involving the complainant. Sophie was served with the application on the morning of the trial and successfully resisted this through oral submissions. The complainant was elderly and vulnerable, despite this, Sophie was able to use her witness-handling skills to effectively cross-examine. W was acquitted by the lay bench.

Croydon Magistrates Court

**Violence**

## Youths

### R v M-M & Others, 2026

Sophie was instructed to represent M-M at trial for Kidnap and Possession of Class A and B drugs. A basis of plea had already been put forward for a charge of Aggravated Robbery. The Crown were seeking a Newton and a trial.

On the day of trial, Sophie put forward arguments before the DJ and the prosecution that the Kidnap

was incorrectly charged separately and that a Newton was not required. As a result of this, the Crown offered no evidence to the Kidnap and Possession charges and the DJ agreed that a Newton was not required.

After advocacy at Sentencing, M-M was given an 18-month YRO despite M-M previously being on a DTO shortly before the commission of this offence.

Luton Youth Court

### R v G, 2024

Sophie represented a youth defendant charged with an assault by beating. On the day of trial, Sophie made a lengthy s.78 PACE application to exclude all the crucial ID evidence in the case. The youth court granted the application and as a result, the crown offered no evidence to the charge.

Luton youth Court

### R v D (a child), 2023

Sophie represented a youth defendant charged with a robbery on a joint enterprise basis at trial. D was 12 years old at the time of the offence. Sophie challenged the adult complainant's live evidence during cross-examination and highlighted the weaknesses in the crown's case by discrediting the accounts given on ID evidence. After trial The District Judge found K not guilty.

Stratford youth Court

Youths

# Achievements

Associated Work

Sophie is the proud Co-founder and current Trustee of Neurodiversity in Law. In her capacity as Trustee she has co-chaired events, including for the CBA titled 'Neurodiversity in the Criminal Justice System.' More recently, she contributed to the training package offered by 'Briefed' called 'Neurodiversity and The Bar.'

Currently, Sophie volunteers for the 'Young Citizens' programme for students interested in Law.

## Memberships

- The Honourable Society of the Middle Temple
- Women in Criminal Law (WICL)
- Neurodiversity in Law (Co-founder)
- Delf Extradition Lawyers Forum (DELF)

## Appointments

- CPS Grade 2 - General Crime
- The Bar Council - Self-employed Junior under seven years in practice

## Publications

- The Barrister Magazine' article titled 'Neurodiversity: Why we need different brains at the bar.'

## Awards

- Diplock Scholarship – The Honourable Society of the Middle Temple
- Law First Scholarship – The University of Law

## Education

- CertHE - Royal Central School of Speech and Drama
- BA History, First Class Honours - The University of Southampton
- MA Law, Commendation - The University of Law
- BPC, Very Competent - The University of Law

## Recognition

"Popular with clients and solicitors alike. Strives always for the best outcome and identifies issues and material supportive of a client's case." **Legal 500, 2027**
"Strives always for the best outcome and identifies issues and material supportive of a client's case." **Legal 500, 2026**

## Activities and Interests

- Outside of law, Sophie is a 3rd Dan Black Belt in Taekwondo and has a keen interest in theatre.