

REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Cr. App. No. 23/2003

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL

BETWEEN

KENRICK LONDON

APPELLANT

AND

THE STATE

RESPONDENT

PANEL:

R. Hamel-Smith, J.A.

S. John, J.A.

P. Weekes, J.A.

APPEARENCES

Ms. M. Rose for the appellant

Ms. C. Jules for the State

DATE OF DELIVERY: 28th July 2006

Delivered by Weekes J.A.

J U D G M E N T

On the 4th of April 2003 at the Port of Spain

1 a r It was the defense case that Vidya had died

o ff o o r t p n e i d e
r e q u i s i t e f

tion in judgeThe

b t e h h a t t V i a d n y d a
t h e y n w o e t r e b e
t h a t

“ *i t w a s o*
w h e n t Ke en nt re

statements and so cast imputations on prosecution witnesses, the prejudicial effect of his antecedents outweighed any probative value they might have had.

She further argued that one of the convictions was “spent”, being more than ten years old at date of trial and therefore the judge ought to have exercised his discretion in favour of refusing to admit the evidence. Counsel did concede however that given the nature of the allegation against the appellant at trial, an old conviction for dishonesty was hardly likely to “turn the tables” put the appellant in the eyes of the jury.

For the ST

Now, please understand that the relev

