

## PETER EGUAE

Year of call  
2011



Peter Eguae is an impressive trial advocate, whose exceptional IT and analysis experience has been regularly deployed in a wide variety of cases, whether leading, led or alone.

His ability to distill large amounts of complex information into a persuasive and meticulous case strategy sets him apart. His versatility is matched by his enthusiasm to deliver high-quality advocacy and client care. He is well-regarded, innovative and tactically astute.

Peter's practice is centered on the defence of serious crime, fraud and cybercrime. Peter specializes in complex, paper/data heavy cases, and regularly acts in matters of the utmost legal and factual complexity.

Peter has an undeniable passion for solving problems at the intersection of technology and law. He recognises that the vast majority of 'cybercrime' matters never result in a criminal charge. Consequently, he continues to develop his practice to advise on the ever-growing number of 'cybercrime' disputes within the civil/regulatory/offshore arenas.

## LEGAL EXPERTISE

---

### Crime & Regulatory

Peter Eguae's criminal practice is centered on the defence of serious crime, fraud and cybercrime. Peter specializes in complex, paper/data heavy cases, and regularly acts in matters of the utmost legal and factual complexity. Whether leading, led, or alone, his strategic focus and determination to meet his client's objectives contributes to the outcomes he achieves. His record in the appellate courts demonstrates his skill and desire to fight fearlessly for whomever he represents.

Peter also regularly advises on cybercrime, AML and data matters.

## Selected Cases

### [R v W \[Oxford\] \(2022\)](#)

Cybercrime. Representing defendant accused of a \$ multi-million international cryptocurrency fraud.

### [R v D \[Winchester\] \(2022\)](#)

Terrorism. Led by Ben Newton (Doughty Street) representing the founder of a terrorist organization who was alleged to have continued membership after the organization was proscribed.

### [R v M & Ors \[Newcastle\] \(2022\)](#)

Represented D2 in a nine-handed OCG drugs conspiracy trial (leading Shina Animashaun, Garden Court). The case involved covert surveillance, financial records and complex digital evidence including 'spoofer SIMs', Encrochat and customised encrypted phones.

### [R v P \[Croydon\] \(2022\)](#)

Defendant – who hosted Freenet, TOR and cryptocurrency nodes – acquitted of being in possession of indecent and prohibited images. Legal argument led to the prosecution offering no evidence.

### [R v B \[Southwark\] \[2022\]](#)

Represented a solicitor accused of contempt of court in relation to an ongoing murder trial. Following submissions, the allegations were withdrawn.

### [R v C \[Isleworth\] \[2022\]](#)

Represented defendant pleaded guilty to a large-scale Encrochat drug dealing conspiracy. Careful analysis reduced the alleged weight from ~170kgs to ~25kgs which resulted in a significantly lower sentence.

### [R v I \[Maidstone\] \(2021\)](#)

Money laundering. Defendant's bank account used to launder the proceeds of an international cybercrime 'spoofing' fraud. Acquitted.

### [R v W & Ors \[Croydon\] \(2021\)](#)

Firearms. Defendant acquitted of converting blank pistols to fully-functional guns.

### [R v F \[Newcastle\] \(2021\)](#)

Offensive weapons. Defended a TikTok influencer accused of being armed with police-issue weaponry. Acquitted.

## R v M [Newcastle] (2021)

Dangerous driving. 'Paedophile hunter' captured driving erratically at high-speed on the dashcam of pursuing police cars. Acquitted.

## R v M & M [Snaresbrook] (2021)

Two brothers had pleaded guilty to assaulting police officers after being captured on police bodyworn footage fighting and struggling with several officers. Following my instruction, legal argument led to the vacation of their guilty pleas the dismissal of all charges.

## R v T & Ors [Southwark] [2021]

Robbery. Defendant was the leader of a group accused of robbery. The incident was caught on CCTV. Acquitted.

## R v A [Inner London] [2021]

Professional footballer accused of theft of a laptop. The incident was caught on railway CCTV. Acquitted.

## R v C [Peterborough] (2020)

Defendant imprisoned following his guilty plea to a sexual offence. Following my instruction, legal argument led to the vacation of his guilty pleas and the prosecution dropping the case. Acquitted.

## R v J & Ors [Birmingham] (2020)

Terrorism. Led by Ben Newton (Doughty Street) in a lengthy trial for the first of four defendants alleged to have continued in their membership of a proscribed organisation, contrary to s11 Terrorism Act 2000. Peter's detailed cross-examination of the prosecution tech expert about various messaging systems was described by the judge as "a model of clarity".

## R v D [Newcastle] (2020)

19-year-old defendant with 170 previous offences accused of burglary supported by DNA and footprint evidence. Successful application to dismiss.

## R v L & Ors [Wood Green] (2020)

Defendant – with damaging bad character evidence – threw a punch which started a bar brawl, leading to the victim's broken jaw. Incident captured on various CCTV cameras. Section 20 GBH count negotiated down to a plea to affray. Defendant was sentenced to a conditional discharge.

## R v PS, Dahir & CF [2019] EWCA Crim 2286 [Court of Appeal] (2019)

Appeal against sentence for a serious section 18 GBH, following a sustained attack to the victim's face and neck with a broken glass bottle. Successfully argued that previously undiagnosed mental health issues reduced the appellant's culpability. 14-years reduced to 10-years.

The judgement by the Lord Chief Justice, LJ Fulford and LJ Holroyde contains primary guidance about sentencing offenders with mental health conditions or disorders.

## R v M [St. Albans] (2019)

Defendant captured on mobile footage assaulting two neighbours. Restraining order had previously been imposed and breached (leading to 6-month sentence). Skillful cross-examination of both complainants, and detailed review of the footage led to a unanimous acquittal in under 1 hour.

## R v Amin [2019] EWCA Crim 1583 [Court of Appeal] (2019)

Successful appeal against sentence in a violent disorder in which a youth was stabbed several times. It is the leading case when sentencing an adult who committed an offence as a youth.

## R v J & Ors [Wood Green] (2019)

Coordinated £16k robbery of a businessman supported by ANPR, cell site, CCTV and the defendant's previous admissions. Exclusion of adverse statements under PACE s.78, and skilful cross-examination of the cell site expert led to acquittal.

## R v Murden [2019] EWCA Crim 1154 [Court of Appeal] (2019)

Defendant convicted of beating a female stranger with a dog-lead. Following a pro-bono review of the defendant's case, an appeal against sentence was successful – 3yrs to 2yrs – resulting in immediate release.

## R v S & Ors [Isleworth] (2018)

Led junior acting for D1 in a multi-handed conspiracy to repeatedly circumvent immigration controls via Ireland and the common travel area. Peter's analysis of phone data was crucial to successful a submission of no case.

## R v K [Croydon] (2018)

Represented a trainee doctor accused of racially-aggravated assault on a fellow student. Acquitted.

## R v L & Ors [Central Criminal Court] (2017)

Excellent research, analysis skills and case strategy led to the successful submission of no case in a multiple-count class-A PWITS trial at the Old Bailey.

## R v MS & SS [Southwark] (2016)

Supported Sarah Forshaw QC in the successful five-month SFO prosecution of a complex £78m Ponzi fraud. Used IT skills in various ways, including finding the “smoking gun” message leading to conviction (the infamous ‘Zipon’ message).

## Offshore disputes, Civil Fraud & Asset recovery

Peter has an undeniable passion for solving problems at the intersection of technology and law. He recognises that the vast majority of ‘cybercrime’ matters never result in a criminal charge. Consequently, he continues to develop his practice to represent the ever-growing number of ‘cybercrime’ claimants and defendants within the civil/regulatory/offshore arena (including AML and advisory work).

His experience and ability in complex disputes leaves him well-placed to tackle and advise on a wide range of related ‘cybercrime’, civil fraud and regulatory matters. Peter holds the Legal Education Certificate from Norman Manley Law School, Jamaica, so is eligible to practice across multiple jurisdictions in the Commonwealth Caribbean.

### Practice Area Cases

- Presently instructed to advise an offshore jurisdiction on cryptocurrency and cybercrime typologies.
- Presently instructed to advise on very high net worth family trust dispute across numerous jurisdictions.
- Presently instructed in relation to \$ multi-billion insolvency litigation.
- Successfully represented a claimant in an intellectual property dispute, recovering full damages and the return of the intellectual property.
- Advised a tech company whose systems were accessed on numerous occasions by a disgruntled former employee who subsequently stole data.

## Employment & Professional discipline

Peter Eguae has represented employees and employers, particularly in matters involving cyber/tech or digital evidence issues. His ability to identify the crucial issues makes him a skilled settlement negotiator.

### Selected Cases

#### AR v Boots Opticians (2022)

Represented the employer in claim involving disability discrimination, harassment and constructive dismissal.

#### British Airways v BK (2021)

Represented the employee in an unfair dismissal claim following his termination due to the unauthorised access of BA employee benefit systems.

## Social Work England v ES (2021)

Acted for ES who was charged with misconduct relating to an accusation that she dishonestly worked in multiple jobs at once.

## K v C (2020)

Acted for the claimant in an 'out-of-time' ET claim for unfair dismissal and disability discrimination, arising from a dismissal one-month into the claimant's first job. Negotiated significant settlement.

## Aguebor v PCL Whitehall Security Group & Anor UKEAT/0078/14/JOJ

Appeal in the EAT against the dismissal of the claimant's claim of constructive dismissal following a TUPE transfer. The case clarified the difference between a business transfer under regulation 3(1)(a) of the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE) and a service provision change TUPE transfer under regulation 3(1)(b) of TUPE. Claimant received substantial award at the subsequent trial.

## Memberships

---

- Criminal Bar Association
- Cybercrime Practitioners Association
- The Society for Computers and Law
- Fraud Lawyers Association
- Commonwealth Lawyers Association