Douglas Wotherspoon

Junior Counsel - Under 15 Years
CALLED 2020

"Douglas is very conscientious and very hard-working. He has great skills as an advocate."
CHAMBERS AND PARTNERS, 2026

Douglas is an extradition defence barrister with an extensive understanding of domestic and foreign criminal law, procedure, and practice.

Extradition and International Expertise

Douglas frequently receives instructions to represent and individuals facing extradition under both Part 1 and Part 2 of the Extradition Act at first instance and on appeal.

Douglas has experience in representing and advising in relation to extradition requests from Albania, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Moldova, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the Republic of (South) Korea and the United States of America.

Douglas has experience in advising on complex international law issues and contributed to “Setting the Record Straight” for the Government of South Sudan and “Peace and Voice of the Tribes” for the tribes of Libya.

Domestic Expertise

Douglas has experience in public and private mechanisms for holding Government and non-state agencies to account. Douglas has advised a company in relation to their possible criminal liability arising from the Grenfell Tower Inquiry, advised His Majesty's Revenue and Customs in relation to legal professional privilege concerning possible offences arising from an employee benefit trust scheme, assisted a company in relation to the Horizon Post Office IT inquiry, and acted as junior counsel to the Undercover Policing Inquiry in both an advisory capacity and as an advocate in closed hearings.

Further, Douglas has experience as a junior alone in single defendant and multi handed trials involving offences of violence, blackmail, offensive weapons, and firearms and ammunition.

Notable Cases

Extradition

Republic of Korea v C, Ongoing

Ms C is sought by the Republic of Korea for her alleged involvement in a violation of the 'Act on the Aggravated Punishment of Specific Crimes'. This is understood to be the second ever request by the Republic of Korea to the UK.

Douglas is being led by Mark Summers KC.

The Republic of Turkey v UM, Ongoing

Mr M is sought by Turkey following a conviction for his membership of an armed terrorist organisation.

Douglas is being led by Joe Middleton KC.

Mohammed and Oprea v Romania [2025] EWHC 1671 (Admin)

Mr Mohammed was sought to serve a two year sentence of imprisonment which he received in his absence. The Divisional Court agreed that the evidence before the court did not show beyond reasonable doubt that Mr Mohammed had knowingly and intelligently waived his right to attend trial and he fell to be discharged from the warrant under s.20 of the Extradition Act 2003.

Douglas was led by Ben Watson KC.

Poland v P, 2025

Mr P was sought for opportunistic offending motivated to fund his substance dependency. Between the index offending and the final extradition hearing Mr P became street homeless, developed substantial mental health issues, had begun to rebuild his life following engagement with support services. District Judge King, on discharging Mr P, found that the treatment which Mr P received at present meant that he was stable, however, in contrast, a disruption to his treatment or a lack of support on release in Poland would be significant as Mr P is vulnerable and would have no immediate support network.

Poland v P, 2025

Ms P was discharged from previous proceedings owing to an invalid warrant. The warrant was re-issued correcting the absent particulars shortly after Ms P's discharge. Despite a finding of fugitivity the District Judge found that the re-imposition of the electronically monitored curfew and the effect which that had upon Ms P in parity with the restriction to her liberty amounted to a disproportionate interference with Ms P's rights. District Judge Matson Discharged Ms P and the CPS did not appeal the decision.

Austria v A, 2025

Mr A was sought for an allegation of an offence of aggravated fraud. The matter was actively managed and the warrant was withdrawn in advance of the final hearing.

Denmark v Y, 2025

Ms Y was sought pursuant to an accusation of unauthorised removal of a child from Denmark. The matter was actively managed and the warrant was withdrawn in advance of the final hearing.

France v B, 2024

Mr B was sought by France pursuant to a conviction warrant to serve a sentence of six months' imprisonment. The principal argument advanced on his behalf was that the time spent subject to an electronically monitored curfew as part of his bail conditions in the extradition proceedings meant that he had served his sentence according to French law, relying on the decisions in A v France [2022] EWHC 3214 (Admin) and Doha v France [2023] EWHC 2561 (Admin). It was argued that his extradition would amount to a disproportionate breach of his rights under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights and would be abusive.

Mr B's legal team obtained expert evidence demonstrating how the French law would be applied in his case. Given the strength of that evidence, District Judge Matson listed the matter and removed the curfew, electronic monitoring, and reporting requirements from Mr B's bail conditions.

The French authorities were directed to provide further information and declined to do so. One month later, the French authorities withdrew the warrant and Mr B was formally discharged by District Judge Pilling.

Jonathan Swain was initially instructed to represent Mr B, the matter was transferred to Douglas the day before the substantive hearing.

Poland v P, 2024

Ms P was sought by Poland to serve a one-year prison sentence having been convicted in her absence in 2007 of "misappropriation of movable property" occurring between 2000 and 2001. The property was valued at approximately £8,500.

District Judge Matson when discharging Ms P found that the warrant seeking her surrender was invalid in that it did not sufficiently particularise the location of the offending pursuant to s.2(6)(b) of the Extradition Act 2003 when read with s.2(4)(c) of the Extradition Act 2003 and King v the Public Prosecutor of Villefrance sur Saone [2015] EWHC 3760 (Admin).

Further, the District Judge found that the offence could not be said to have occurred within Poland nor could it be said to be an extradition offence pursuant to s.65 of the Extradition Act 2003 and discharged Ms P pursuant to s.10(3) of the Extradition Act 2003.

Ms P was discharged and the Crown Prosecution Service indicated that they would not appeal the decision.

The Netherlands v X, 2024

Mr X's surrender was sought by the Netherlands to face trial for his alleged participation in an organised criminal group and the export of nearly 1 tonne of cocaine from the Netherlands. The evidence against Mr X was collated from Encrochat. Following the service of an expert report which indicated the warrant was invalid the Netherlands withdrew the warrant, Mr X was discharged, and immediately released from custody.

New Zealand v NW, 2024

Mr W was sought in respect of his alleged involvement in numerous fraud offences between 2012 and 2015 to the value of nearly $2,000,000 NZD.

Douglas was led by Ben Joyes.

Belgium v C, 2023

Mr C was sought for 186 convictions for making false statements, the falsification and forgery of documents, and fraud. Mr C was convicted of doing so as part of a group over a period of one month in 2017. Douglas argued that the particulars contained in the warrant in regard to the requested person's role in the offending were insufficient in setting out his position in the hierarchy of the group and consequently the transposition exercise could not be satisfactorily completed,

Mr C was discharged by District Judge Minhas on 23 October 2023, finding that the warrant for Mr C's surrender was insufficiently particularised under s.2(6)(b) of the Extradition Act 2003.

Romania v C, 2023

Ms C was sought by Romania for violent offences committed in September 2016. During the extradition proceedings efforts were made to address the conviction in Romania by the defence team. Following the final hearing, before judgment, the warrant was withdrawn by the Requesting Judicial Authority.

Extradition

Achievements

Memberships

- Defence Extradition Lawyers Forum
- Extradition Lawyers Association
- International Bar Association
- The Criminal Bar Association
- The Honourable Society of the Inner Temple

Appointments

- CPS General Crime Panel (Grade 2)
- Attorney General Panel (Junior Junior)

Education

- LLB Honours Law Degree, The University of Manchester, 2019 (First Class)
- Bar Professional Training Course, BPP University Law School, 2020

Awards

- Sir Edward Marshall-Hall Scholarship, The Honourable Society of the Inner Temple
- Major Scholarship, The Honourable Society of the Inner Temple
- Duke of Edinburgh Scholarship, The Honourable Society of the Inner Temple
- Advocacy Scholarship, BPP University Law School
- Excellence Scholarship, BPP University Law School
- PASS Scholarship, The Honourable Society of the Inner Temple

Recognition

"Has a gravitas and maturity beyond his years' call. A barrister that really enjoys the intellectual rigour of extradition." **Legal 500, 2025**

"In court he has a calm, authoritative and informed style that judges and clients appreciate." **Legal 500, 2025**