Jordan Santos-Sindes



Junior Counsel - Under 15 Years

CALLED 2014

Jordan has a rapidly growing criminal practice. His experience encompasses both prosecuting and defending cases in the Crown Court, covering a wide range of criminal matters, including including serious violence, sexual and drug offences.

Jordan strives to provide exceptional legal representation and support to individuals facing criminal charges ensuring that their needs and interests are protected.

Jordan prioritises the needs and interests of his clients, providing personalised attention, clear communication, and strategic legal guidance throughout the legal process. Further he is committed to protecting the rights and interests of young people facing criminal charges. With a compassionate approach and a focus on fair treatment and positive outcomes for juvenile clients navigating the legal system.

Jordan is renown for his tenacious approach and hard work, which accompanies his broad legal knowledge and advocacy skills.

Notable Cases

Appellate

R v K, 2026

R v Khan [2026] EWCA Crim 200

Jordan Santos-Sindes represented a teaching assistant who had a sustained sexual relationship with a 15-year-old pupil involving multiple offences. Jordan represented her at Inner London Crown Court where she received a suspended sentence order, with no conditions attached to it.

The Solicitor General referred the sentence as unduly lenient on three grounds. Having heard written and oral submissions, the Full Court granted leave to appeal but refused the Solicitor General's application. The Court thus decided not to interfere with the original sentence imposed in any way.

R v A, 2023

R v Ali [2023] EWCA Crim 232

The Appellant had received a 6-month immediate custodial sentence for an offence of assault on an emergency worker, which had occurred over 3 years previously. Jordan appealed on the grounds that the sentence ought to have been suspended. Having heard oral submissions the Court of Appeal allowed the appeal, but also held that due to the current high prison population, and the Government's announcement of Operation Safeguard, there was a real strain on the prison service. This gives rise to a "further exceptional factor" for sentencers to consider whether to suspend a term of imprisonment, until the situation with the prison population is resolved.

Jordan was instructed by Leila Abdul-Rasool of Lewis Nedas Law.

R v Thomas [2023] EWCA Crim 1157

The Appellant had received a sentence of 5years 4months' imprisonment for a series of three dwelling burglaries. The Appellant had significant previous convictions for like offences and was subject to the mandatory minimum provisions. Jordan successfully argued on appeal that this was manifestly excessive because the judge at first instance had failed to properly account for totality in ordering one of the sentences to run consecutively. Further, the Judge had erred in awarding too little credit for early guilty plea. The appeal was allowed and a sentence of 4 years 3months' imprisonment was substituted.

Jordan was appointed to represent the Appellant by the Registrar.

Drugs

R v M, 2026

Jordan appeared for the prosecution in this NCA-led investigation. ZM was the driver of a horse truck that was stopped by UK Border Force at the Port of Dover. The vehicle contained 12 feed bags that were concealing 70 kilogram blocks of high purity cocaine (worth over £5.25 million at street level). In interview ZM gave a full account explaining his route to the UK, his horse transport business and that he had no knowledge the cocaine was in the truck. The trial centred around the accounts given by ZM. Following a four day trial the jury convicted ZM of importation of cocaine into the United Kingdom.

R v A & Others, 2024

Jordan, led by Paul Crampin (Mountford Chambers), was junior counsel to the first defendant in this NCA prosecution. This concerned a large-scale drugs conspiracy in the Essex area. The defendant had previously served 14 years for drug trafficking offences and was under surveillance immediately following release. During the case, Jordan undertook cross-examination of the telephone analyst as well as drafting various legal arguments. Following a 7-week trial the jury were hung in respect of A.

Jordan was instructed by Sonia Weaver of Shaw Graham Kersh.

R v K & Others, 2022

Represented the third defendant in a large scale national Encrochat drug conspiracy at a 4 day sentence hearing. K was deemed to be part of the leadership group of an organised crime network, which supplied industrial quantities of drugs which were in excess of 1 tonne and had links to the biggest importer of cocaine in the country. The gang also laundered over £24million.

Jordan was instructed by Miles Herman of Lewis Nedas Law

R v V & Others, 2022

Jordan, led by Tessa Shroff of chambers, represented one of four defendants charged with a large-scale drugs conspiracy in South London during a 4-week trial. The defendant was suspected to be a key player in the operation. The case involved analysis of several mobile telephones, cell site and co-location between various individuals.

Inner London Crown Court

R v R, 2021

R had been arrested by the police having been in possession of 41 wraps of crack cocaine. R was initially charged with simple possession of class A. R pleaded guilty to this, amongst other offences, and was committed for sentence. Following this, the Crown sought to recharge R with possession with intent to supply class A, for the same drugs. Jordan represented the client at Isleworth Crown Court and argued that the bringing of supply charge was an abuse of process, under the wider principle of autresfois convict. Having heard legal submissions, the Court stayed the indictment as an abuse of process.

Drugs

Financial Crime

R v M & V, 2024

Jordan was instructed to prosecute a matter involving in a widespread conspiracy to handle stolen goods. This involved the theft and handling of over £7million worth of luxury supercars. The conspiracy was made up of over 50 substantive offences, with vehicles belonging to the rich and famous. Given the in-depth analysis and presentation of the case by Jordan, the defendants pleaded guilty to the conspiracy on a basis making up a significant proportion of the substantive offences.

Jordan was instructed by CPS Hertfordshire.

Financial Crime

General Crime

R v M, 2025

Instructed to represent M who was charged with a single count of doing an act intending to pervert the course of public justice. The facts of the case were that A & B were in a relationship residing at one of M's properties. A & B had an argument which culminated in A stabbing B. In the aftermath, SM was driving both A & B home, during which he threw the knife used out of the car into a stream. This was later recovered by the police. A was subsequently convicted of section 20GBH. Following Jordan's written application to dismiss, the prosecution offered no evidence. This has allowed M to keep his good character.

R v M, 2025

Prosecution counsel for an actus reus trial. M had kidnapped an 8-year-old boy. Jordan attended the fitness to plead hearing, cross-examined the defence psychiatrist and made submissions about the findings of the same. Following the jury finding that M had done the act, Jordan cross-examined the psychiatrist about appropriate disposal given his condition and prognosis. M was detained under s.41 of the Mental Health Act 1983 with restriction.

R v N, 2025

Defence counsel in domestic violence case with multiple accusations of assault, supported by images from the complainant. Jordan's client was acquitted of all charges after trial.

R v L & 6 others, 2023

Jordan, led by Jessica Clarke of Chambers, appeared for the Crown in this case which concerned a conspiracy to commit burglary and steal motor vehicles. The Defendants were involved in the commission of over 70 offences, totalling a loss of more than £500,000. The case involved the scheduling of large amounts of telephone, cell site and ANPR material.

Jordan was instructed by CPS London.

R v C & W, 2023

Jordan, led by Jessica Clarke of chambers, appeared for the Crown in this matter of conspiracy to commit burglary. The Defendants were alleged to have committed 11 burglaries in the West London area, in which over £200,000 worth of items were stolen over a sustained period of time. The nature of the Crown's case was circumstantial and relied upon Flying Squad surveillance, the pattern of behaviour of the defendants prior to and after the burglaries, and cell site. Following a three-week trial the leader of the conspiracy was convicted.

See full article here

Jordan was instructed by CPS London

R v L, H, S & Anor, 2023

Jordan was instructed to represent 3 out of 4 defendants jointly charged with burglary, ABH and criminal damage. Following detailed written and oral submissions at PTPH, all of the charges were dismissed against all 3 of Jordan's clients.

Jordan was instructed by Andy Hobdell of Lawtons Solicitors.

R v K, 2021

Instructed defence counsel. The defendant was accused of a street robbery in which an expensive watch was stolen. The defence involved identification evidence, alibi, as well as disputing cell site evidence produced by the Crown. Following trial the defendant was acquitted. Southwark CC.

Crime

Murder and Manslaughter

R v K & Ors, 2025

Jordan, led by Ruth Jones, at the Central Criminal Court, appeared for the first defendant charged with conspiracy to commit murder. This involved a carefully planned attempted firearms assassination whilst the victim was sat at home with his young child. The prosecution case revolved around circumstantial evidence which asserted that K was the gunman. The case required careful analysis of call data records, car telematics and ANPR. Further, there was cross-examination of forensic officers, cell site expert, ballistics expert and a tracker expert. Jordan undertook the cross-examination of the tracker expert during the trial, as well as drafted legal arguments concerning bad character.

Read more on BBC News

R v AOC & Others, 2024

Jordan, led by Ignatius Hughes KC, was instructed to represent a 16 year old in a murder and attempted murder trial. The case for AOC centred around the principles of secondary accessory liability, per the case of *R v Gnango* [2011] UKSC 59. Following written and oral submissions the Crown Court found there was no case to answer for AOC on murder, attempted murder and their respective alternatives. This was appealed to the Court of Appeal by the Crown, on a terminatory ruling. The Court of Appeal upheld the decision of the Crown Court and affirmed there was no case to answer for AOC.

Jordan was instructed by Nick Seeley of Lawtons Solicitors.

Read more here

Read judgment here

Murder and Manslaughter

R v A, 2026

Jordan represented AA, who was accused of two oral rapes and threats to kill, on two separate complainants. The complainants were cousins. They alleged they were forced to give AA oral sex under repeated threat of being stabbed.

AA asserted that any sexual activity was consensual and that the cousins had demanded money from him following the act.

During the trial Jordan adduced evidence that, in the course of the investigation, the complainants had disclosed that they had blackmailed AA, supporting his account.

AA was acquitted following a 9-day trial at Inner London Crown Court.

Read more here

R v K, 2025

Defence counsel to female teaching assistant who had been having a sexual relationship with one of the students in her school. K had pleaded guilty at the earliest opportunity to the offences; however, the starting point of the most serious offence was in excess of 5 years. Following a full day sentencing hearing the Court imposed a suspended sentence order with no conditions based on Jordan's submissions.

R v J, 2025

Prosecution counsel in a trial concerning multiple allegations of sexual assault by an employee against her former employer over a sustained period of time.

R v O, 2024

Prosecution counsel in a matter where the defendant was charged with trespassing with intent to commit a sexual offence and robbery. The circumstances were very close to an allegation of attempt rape and was witnessed by the complainant's son. The case involved a heavily intoxicated complainant and difficult issues around consent, which developed during trial.

Jordan was instructed by CPS London.

Spain v Q, 2021

Instructed for the requested person who was wanted on an accusation warrant for rape. The link to Q related to forensic evidence held by the IJA. The issue for the extradition hearing centred around the statutory bar of section 12A of the Extradition Act 2003. Jordan instructed an expert on the Spanish Penal Code and Criminal Justice System, who was able to consult the domestic file. This demonstrated the case was in its infancy and following the serving of the report and submissions the IJA withdrew the Arrest Warrant and Q was discharged.

Westminster Magistrate Court

Rape and Sexual Offences

Violence

R v F, 2023

The Defendant was charged with a domestic violence assault. During the course of the complainant's evidence it was discovered that two of her witness statements had never been disclosed to the defence that went to the heart of the Crown's case, as well as other disclosure failings. The trial was halted. Following this, Jordan successfully argued that for the Crown to continue would offend the Courts sense of propriety and integrity as an abuse of process.

Jordan was instructed by Leah Connolly of Sonn Macmillan Walker

R v F, 2022

The defendant was charged with Section 18 GBH. The complainant alleged he had been viciously attacked by the defendant unprovoked. The complainant was vulnerable due to mental health issues and therefore required section 28 cross-examination. Jordan was instructed trial counsel from the Ground Rules Hearing. The defendant's relevant previous convictions were excluded following legal argument. The defendant was acquitted following trial.

Wood Green Crown Court

R v B, 2022

Prosecution counsel for an ABH against an emergency worker, police officer. This involved legal argument about the legitimacy of police powers when executing a stop of a suspect. The defendant was convicted following trial.

Basildon Crown Court

R v G & S, 2021

Prosecution trial counsel in which two on duty police officers were accused of assaulting a teenage girl. The officers had used PAVA spray (in the confined quarters of the back of a police car) and a knee strike to the head of the handcuffed complainant, but maintained their actions were reasonable and proportionate. The case involved cross-examination of two "use of force" experts, who were ex-police officers. Following trial both officers were convicted and have been subsequently dismissed. Folkestone MC.

Read News Article here

R v E, 2021

The defendant was charged on indictment with affray and possession of a bladed article. The case centred around footage of a group of males chasing one another, and at least one of them wielding two machetes. The Crown's evidence was based on a police officer's identification from CCTV footage. The defendant was acquitted after trial.

Isleworth Crown Court

R v M, 2021

Prosecution counsel in a trial of issues. This was a domestic armed robbery in which the complainant was threatened with a knife by her son. The defendant had been declared unfit to plead as he suffered from paranoid schizophrenia. This trial required careful witness handling of a vulnerable complainant.

Lewes Crown Court

R v AS R, 2021

Defence counsel for an able seaman who was accused of a one-punch ABH against another sailor in a public house. The defendant sought to run a defence of pre-emptive self-defence. Bulford Court Martial.

Violence

Youths

R v X & Anor, 2025

Defence counsel to a youth defendant charged with aggravated burglary with intent to cause GBH,

knife offences, assault and other charges. X suffered with learning difficulties and required an intermediary throughout the trial. Jordan had to ensure that his client fully understood the trial process and follow the evidence, whilst also conducting cross-examination of a youth complainant. Following trial, X was acquitted of the aggravated burglary with intent to cause GBH.

R v X (youth), 2023

Jordan represented a 16-year old charged with over 30 offences to do with snatch thefts. At trial, the Defendant sought to rely upon section 45 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015; that he was the victim of modern slavery. This required the instruction of a psychologist for the Defendant. Jordan also made various disclosure requests which culminated in the disclosure of a voluminous Cris report concerning the known exploitation of the Defendant in the area. This was used in the course of the trial.

Jordan was instructed by Leah Connolly of SWM Solicitors

R v X (youth), 2023

Jordan's 16-year old defendant was accused of two matters of robbery and attempted robbery. The Defendant suffered with significant learning difficulties, ADHD, PTSD and autism, an intermediary was required for trial. This required adept vulnerable witness handling in the course of both trials.

Jordan was instructed by Leah Connolly of SMW Solicitors

R v X (youth), 2022

The defendant was charged with possession with intent to supply class A drugs. The defendant had admitted that he was intending to supply the drugs. Having taken further instruction from the defendant, the defence sought to rely upon section 45 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015. Following extensive investigation, the defence were provided with a positive conclusive grounds decision. Jordan drafted a letter of representation to the prosecution. The prosecution offered no evidence, even though this was a case which post-dated the Court of Appeal decision in Brecani [2021] EWCA Crim 731.

Bromley Youth Court

Youths

Achievements

Memberships

- Gray's Inn
- Criminal Bar Association
- South Eastern Circuit

Appointments

- CPS Panel (Grade 3)
- CPS Serious Crime (Grade 3)

Education

- 2013 University of Bournemouth, LLB (Law) 1st class
- 2014 BPP University, London, BPTC (Very Competent)
- 2020 Anne Goddard Scholarship