

**COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS  
IN THE SUPREME COURT  
CRIMINAL LAW DIVISION  
2018/CRI/bail/00785**

**BETWEEN**

**AHMAD CLARKE**

**Applicant**

**AND**

**DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS**

**Respondent**

**Before:** The Hon. Justice Neil Brathwaite

**Appearances:** Cassie Bethel for the Applicant  
Mr. Timothy Bailey, Ms. Tameka Roberts, Mr. Brent McNeil for the Respondent

**Hearing Date:** 28<sup>th</sup> August A.D. 2024

**Ruling Date:** 2<sup>nd</sup> October A.D. 2024

**RULING ON BAIL**

1. The Applicant seek bail on charges of Murder and Breach of Bail, on which he has already been arraigned in the Supreme Court. He states that he is twenty-three years old, and claims to have other pending matters, but no previous convictions. He was unemployed prior to his incarceration. He pledges to abide by any conditions if granted bail, and claims that he will be disadvantaged in his ability to support his defence and assist his family if denied bail.
2. In response, the Respondent filed the affidavit of Calnan Kelly, Counsel in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, to which are exhibited a number of documents, including an affidavit which was relied upon in seeking to revoke the Applicant's bail on a previous occasion. The Respondent has placed before the court evidence that the Applicant does in fact have two previous convictions in 2020 for Possession of Dangerous Drugs with Intent to Supply, as well as Violation of Lockdown.

Applicant does in fact have two previous convictions in 2020 for Possession of Dangerous Drugs with Intent to Supply, as well as Violation of Lockdown.

[3.] The Respondent further alleges that the Applicant was charged in 2018 with the offence of Murder, and was released on bail on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2019. While on bail, the Applicant was in charged in November 2021 with the offences of Murder and Attempted Murder, and was again granted bail on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2021. He was subsequently charged with another offence of Murder which allegedly occurred in October 2022. Following those charges, a successful application was made to revoke the Applicant's bail on the initial two indictments filed in 2018 and 2021. It follows that, while the Applicant claims to seek bail on the current charges, in respect of which VBI No 8/1/2023 has been filed, he has no bail at present on VBI 290/12/2018 and 1/1/2021. It is also stated that the Applicant has actually already been convicted for Breach of Bail, and has served a sentence for that offence.

[4.] The affidavit in response indicates that, on the most recent indictment, which is scheduled for trial commencing 5<sup>th</sup> August 2025, the Applicant has been identified as one of three men who emerged from a vehicle with firearms and fired shots which resulted in the death of a male. It is further alleged that there is an Electronic Monitoring Device report which places the Applicant in the vicinity of the offence at the time the offence was committed.

[5.] Counsel for the Applicant submits that there is no evidence that the Applicant will abscond or interfere with witnesses if granted bail, and that he has strong ties to the community. The previous convictions are noted, but it is submitted that they are not of a similar nature, and therefore do not show a propensity to commit offences of violence. Counsel therefore urges the court to grant bail to the Applicant.

[6.] In response, counsel for the Respondent notes that these are serious charges for which the penalty is severe, with cogent evidence, raising the likelihood of absconding. Counsel further submits that the Applicant, having been released on bail on prior occasions, and having been again charged with serious offences while on bail, and also having been convicted of breaches of bail, has demonstrated that he will not comply with any conditions of bail, and is likely to reoffend if granted bail. Counsel therefore submits that the Applicant should be refused bail in order to preserve public order and safety.

## LAW AND ANALYSIS

[7.] The tensions surrounding an application for bail have been considered in many cases. In **Richard Hepburn and The Attorney General SCCr. App. No 276 of 2014**, Justice of Appeal Allen opined that:

“5. Bail is increasingly becoming the most vexing, controversial and complex issue confronting free societies in every part of the world. It highlights the tension between two important but competing interests: the need of the society to be protected from persons alleged to have committed crime; and the fundamental constitutional canons, which secure freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention and serve as the bulwark against punishment before conviction.

6. Indeed, the recognition of the tension between these competing interests is reflected in the following passage from the Privy Council’s decision in *Hurnam The State* [2006] LRC 370. At page 374 of the judgment Lord Bingham said inter alia:

“...the courts are routinely called upon to consider whether an unconvicted suspect or defendant shall be released on bail, subject to conditions, pending his trial. Such decisions very often raise questions of importance both to the individual suspect or defendant and to the community as whole. The interests of the individual is, of course, to remain at liberty unless or until he is convicted of crime sufficiently serious to deprive him of his liberty”. Any loss of liberty before that time, particularly if he is acquitted or never tried, will prejudice him and, in many cases, his livelihood and his family. But the community has countervailing interests, in seeking to ensure that the course of justice is not thwarted by the flight of the suspect or defendant or perverted by his interference with witnesses or evidence and that he does not take advantage of the inevitable delay before trial to commit further offences...”

[8.] At paragraph 11 she further noted that

“The general right to bail clearly requires judges on such an application, to conduct realistic assessment of the right of the accused to remain at liberty and the public’s interests as indicated by the grounds prescribed in Part A for denying bail. Ineluctably, in some circumstances, the presumption of innocence and the right of an accused to remain at liberty, must give way to accommodate that interest.”

[9.] The presumption of innocence is enshrined in Article 20(2)(a) of the Constitution of The Bahamas which states:

***“Every person who is charged with a criminal offence – (a) shall be Presumed to be innocent until he is proved or has pleaded guilty”.***

[10.] Furthermore, Article 19(1) provides as follows:

**“19. (1) No person shall be deprived of his personal liberty save as may be authorized by law in any of the following cases-  
(a) in execution of the sentence or order of a court, whether**



established for The Bahamas or some other country, in respect of a criminal offence of which he has been convicted or in consequence of his unfitness to plead to a criminal charge or in execution of the order of a court on the grounds of his contempt of that court or of another court or tribunal;

(b) in execution of the order of a court made in order to secure the fulfilment of any obligation imposed upon him by law;

(c) for the purpose of bringing him before a court in execution of the order of a court;

(d) upon reasonable suspicion of his having committed, or of being about to commit, a criminal offence;

(e) in the case of a person who has not attained the age of eighteen years, for the purpose of his education or welfare;

(f) for the purpose of preventing the spread of an infectious or contagious disease or in the case of a person who is, or is reasonably suspected to be, of unsound mind, addicted to drugs or alcohol, or a vagrant, for the purpose of his care or treatment or the protection of the community;

(g) for the purpose of preventing the unlawful entry of that person into The Bahamas or for the purpose of effecting the expulsion, extradition or other lawful removal from The Bahamas of that person or the taking of proceedings relating thereto; and, without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, a law may, for the purposes of this subparagraph, provide that a person who is not a citizen of The Bahamas may be deprived of his liberty to such extent as may be necessary in the execution of a lawful order requiring that person to remain within a specified area within The Bahamas or prohibiting him from being within such an area.

(2)...

(3) Any person who is arrested or detained in such a case as is mentioned in subparagraph (1)(c) or (d) of this Article and who is not released shall be brought without undue delay before a court; and if any person arrested or detained in such a case as is mentioned in the said subparagraph (1)(d) is not tried within a reasonable time he shall (without prejudice to any further proceedings that may be brought against him) be released either unconditionally or upon reasonable conditions, including in particular such conditions as are reasonably necessary to ensure that he appears at a later date for trial or for proceedings preliminary to trial”.

[11.] The relevant provisions of the Bail Act Chapter 103 read as follows:

**“4. (2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other law, any person charged with an offence mentioned in Part C of the First Schedule, shall not be granted bail unless the Supreme Court or the Court of Appeal is satisfied that the person charged**

**(a) has not been tried within a reasonable time;**

**(b)...**

**(c) should be granted bail having regard to all the relevant factors including those specified in Part A of the First Schedule and subsection (2B), and where the court makes an order for the release, on bail, of that person it shall include in the record a written statement giving the reasons for the order of the release on bail.**

**(2A) For the purposes of subsection (2) (a) ...**

**(a) without limiting the extent of a reasonable time, a period of three years from the date of the arrest or detention of the person charged shall be deemed to be a reasonable time;**

**(b) delay which is occasioned by the act or conduct of the accused is to be excluded from any calculation of what is considered to be a reasonable time.**

**(2B) For the purposes of subsection (2)(c), in deciding whether or not to grant bail to a person charged with an offence mentioned in Part C of the First Schedule, the character and antecedents of the person charged, the need to protect the safety of the public order and where appropriate, the need to protect the safety of the victim or victims of the alleged offence, are to be primary considerations.”**

**9. The factors referred to in Part A are:**

**“PART A**

**In considering whether to grant bail to a defendant, the court shall have regard to the following factors—**

**(a) whether there are substantial grounds for believing that the defendant, if released on bail, would-**

**(i) fail to surrender to custody or appear at his trial;**

**(ii) commit an offence while on bail; or**

**(iii) interfere with witnesses or otherwise obstruct the course of justice, whether in relation to himself or any other person;**

**(b) Whether the defendant should be kept in custody for his own protection or, where he is a child or young person, for his own welfare;**

**(c) whether he is in custody in pursuance of the sentence of a Court or any authority acting under the Defence Act;**

**(d) whether there is sufficient information for the purpose of taking the decisions required by this Part or otherwise by this Act;**

**(e) whether having been released on bail in or in connection with the proceedings for the offence, he is arrested pursuant to section 12;**

**(f) whether having been released on bail previously, he is charged subsequently either with an offence similar to that in respect of which he was so released or with an offence which is punishable by a term of imprisonment exceeding**

**one year;**

**(g) the nature and seriousness of the offence and the nature and strength of the evidence against the defendant.”;**

[12.] In an application for bail pursuant to section 4(2)(c), the court is therefore required to consider the relevant factors set out in Part A of the First Schedule, as well as the provisions of section 2B.

[13.] In considering those factors, I note that the Applicant is charged with serious offences, involving the use of firearms, and resulting in the death of a person. With respect to the seriousness of the offence, I am mindful that this is not a free-standing ground for the refusal of a bail application, yet it is an important factor that I must consider in determining whether the accused is likely to appear for trial.

[14.] In the Court of Appeal decision of *Jonathan Armbrister v The Attorney General SCCrApp. No 45 of 2011*, it was stated that:

*“The seriousness of the offence, with which the accused is charged and the penalty which it is likely to entail upon conviction, has always been, and continues to be an important consideration in determining whether bail should be granted or not. Naturally, in cases of murder and other serious offences, the seriousness of the offence should invariably weigh heavily in the scale against the grant of bail”.*

[15.] I note also **paragraph 30** of *Jeremiah Andrews vs. The Director of Public Prosecutions SCCrApp No. 163 of 2019* where it states:

*“30. These authorities all confirm therefore that the seriousness of the offence, coupled with the strength of the evidence and the likely penalty which is likely to be imposed upon conviction, have always been, and continue to be important considerations in determining whether bail should be granted or not. However, these factors may give rise to an inference that the defendant may abscond. That inference can be weakened by the consideration of other relevant factors disclosed in the evidence. eg the applicant’s resources, family connections..*

[16.] While no direct evidence has been provided that the Applicant will not appear for his trial, the Applicant is charged with murder on three separate indictments which, in considering the possible penalty which could follow a single conviction, raises the issue of the likelihood of not appearing for trial.



[17.] That likelihood must be contrasted with the nature of the evidence against the Applicant. In *Cordero McDonald v. The Attorney General SCCrApp. No. 195 of 2016*, Allen P., at *paragraph 34* stated,

*“It is not the duty of a judge considering a bail application to decide disputed facts or law. Indeed, it is not expected that on such an application a judge will conduct a forensic examination of the evidence. The judge must simply decide whether the evidence raises a reasonable suspicion of the commission of the offences by the appellant, such as to justify the deprivation of his liberty by arrest, charge and detention. Having done that he must then consider the relevant factors and determine whether he ought to grant him bail.”*

[18.] In considering the cogency of the evidence, I note the following statement from the Court of Appeal in *Stephon Davis v DPP SCCrApp. No. 20 of 2023*:

“In our view "strong and cogent evidence" is not the critical factor on a bail application. The judge is only required to evaluate whether the witness statements show a case that is plausible on its face. To put it another way, there must be some evidence before the court capable of establishing the guilt of the appellant. In essence, the test is prima facie evidence, comparable to what is required at the end of the prosecution's case in a criminal trial. We can find a useful summary of the strength of the evidence required at the end of the prosecution's case in the headnote to the Privy Council's decision in *Ellis Taibo* [11996] 48 WIR 74:

"On a submission of no case to answer, the criterion to be applied by the trial judge is whether there is material on which a jury could, without irrationality, be satisfied of guilt; if there is, the judge is required to allow the trial to proceed.”

[19.] In considering what has been placed before me, while I bear in mind that the court is not to embark on a trial of the matter on the papers, I am satisfied that the evidence rises to the level of a prima facie case, as the Applicant has been identified by an eyewitness, and that evidence appears to be corroborated by the Electronic Monitoring Device report. In my view, the cogency of the evidence, coupled with the seriousness of the offences, raise a concern that the Applicant will not appear for his trial.

[20.] With respect to the issue of public order, I note that the Applicant has prior convictions for Possession of Dangerous Drugs with Intent to Supply. These are not crimes of violence, but it is axiomatic that drug trafficking, and the evils attendant thereto, offend public order. Of more concern in this case is that the Applicant, having been released on bail in 2019, was again charged with murder in 2020, and having been

again released on bail in 2021, he was again charged with murder in 2022. In my view the issue of public safety is paramount in this case. While the Applicant is presumed to be innocent, the court must have regard to the fact that there is cogent prima facie evidence of his involvement in the instant matter. Having regard to these facts, I am satisfied that the Applicant should be kept in custody to preserve public order and safety.

## **CONCLUSION**

[21.] In considering whether conditions could be imposed to ensure the attendance of the Applicant at trial, I am mindful of the usual conditions which include reporting, electronic monitoring device (“EMD”), and curfew. In my view, those conditions would not serve to prevent any re-offending, or to protect the public order. I must also bear in mind the fact the Applicant has been convicted of Breach of Bail. When that conviction is viewed in light of the fact that it was not actually disclosed in the affidavit of the Applicant, and that the Applicant further did not disclose that his bail had been revoked by the Supreme Court, and that the Applicant claimed to have no previous convictions, which is not true, the court can have no confidence that the Applicant would abide by any conditions if granted bail.

[22.] In the circumstances and having regard to the foregoing reasons I find that the Applicant is not a fit and proper candidate to be admitted to bail. Bail is therefore denied.

**Dated this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of October A.D., 2024**



**Neil Brathwaite**  
**Justice**