

Matei Clej

(Member) OUTLINE Chambers

Called: 2017

Qualified to accept Public Access instructions

Licensed to conduct Litigation

Police Station Accreditation



## Introduction

Matei is an extradition practitioner with a thriving practice. He takes a pro-active approach to guiding both lay clients and instructing solicitors through this complex area of law. He is able to provide expert advice on all stages of the extradition process from surrender through to appeal, removal and beyond.

Matei also accepts instructions in domestic criminal matters both legally aided and private. He has experience of road traffic law and regularly defends professional drivers facing general criminal charges and the regulatory proceeding that follow.

## Recent work

### Extradition

#### Croatia v JE

Secured the discharge of the RP, a vulnerable individual sought for extradition to Croatia on an accusation warrant relating to a cash card scam, on section 21A grounds. The RP challenged his extradition grounds of passage of time, ill health, proportionality and Croatia prison conditions.

#### Romania v CM

Secured the discharge of the RP on Section 10 and Article 8 grounds. Matei successfully resisted judicial authority application to adjourn for further information about offence particulars and successfully argued that extradition

pursuant to a second warrant issued five years after the discharge of the first would amount to a disproportionate interference with the private life of the RP. Despite the RP being a fugitive and being a single man with no dependents, the DJ was persuaded to discharge the RP pursuant to Article 8.

#### Romania v AI

Secured the RP's discharge on Article 8 grounds by persuading the District Judge to assume that, if extradited, the RP would almost certainly benefit from early release. Ordinarily, early release is considered a matter for the requesting state. The District Judge discharged Matei's client at the point that she had served 8 months on remand, or two thirds of the outstanding sentence of 1 year's imprisonment, equivalent to a grant of early release under Romanian law having been 'factored in'.

#### Czech Republic v JK

Secured the discharge of a Requested Person sought for extradition to the Czech Republic to serve a sentence of 6 months for theft on proportionality grounds.

#### Romania v CS

Secured the discharge of a Requested Person sought for extradition to Romania to serve 27 months imprisonment for fraud and driving offences on grounds of incompatibility with Article 8 ECHR, calling expert evidence of a child psychologist on the potential impact of proceedings on the Requested Person's 8 year-old foster son.

## **Romania v GP**

Secured the discharge of a Requested Person sought for extradition to Romania to serve an outstanding sentence of 22 months' imprisonment for computer fraud and constituting an organised criminal group on the grounds of incompatibility with Article 8 ECHR.

## **Crime**

### **R v SM (Snaresbrook Crown Court)**

Secured a suspended sentence order for a defendant on a late plea of guilty to laundering the proceeds of a £44,000 fraud against a vulnerable victim.

### **R v TG (Luton Crown Court)**

Secured the acquittal of a defendant charged with witness intimidation in the Crown Court, having been instructed as defence advocate mid-trial.

### **R v KF (Portsmouth Crown Court)**

Secured a sentence of 36 months imprisonment on a plea of 'guilty' after the jury was sworn for a second strike offence of PWITS Class A. The Judge was persuaded to grant 10% credit for the very late plea.

### **R v AT (Winchester Crown Court)**

Secured a suspended sentence on a guilty plea to an indictment charging 4 counts of possession of over 20,000 indecent images of Cat A-C, including over 1,500 of Cat A.

### **R v SK (Cambridge Crown Court)**

Secured a suspended sentence order for a defendant on a plea of guilty to laundering the proceeds of a £25,000 fraud against an elderly victim.

### **R v MH (Luton Crown Court)**

Represented a defendant on an 8-count indictment in which the most serious charge was controlling and coercive behaviour. Following discussions on the first

day of trial, the prosecution accepted pleas of guilty to 4 offences on the indictment and the coercive and controlling behaviour count was left to lie on file.

### **R v MH (Luton Crown Court)**

Represented a defendant on an 8-count indictment in which the most serious charge was controlling and coercive behaviour. Following discussions on the first day of trial, the prosecution accepted pleas of guilty to 4 offences on the indictment and the coercive and controlling behaviour count was left to lie on file.

## **Education**

City Law School – BTPC

Birkbeck College – LLB

## **Memberships**

Defence Extradition Lawyers Forum

Young Fraud Lawyers Association

Criminal Bar Association

## **Languages**

Romanian (Fluent)

French (Basic)

Spanish (Basic)