

**COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS
IN THE SUPREME COURT
Criminal Division
CRI/bal/00068/2023**

B E T W E E N

**CHRISTOPHER CARTWRIGHT
Applicant**

AND

**DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS
Respondent**

Before: The Honourable Madam Justice Renae McKay

Appearances: Applicant appeared Pro Se
Mr. Basil Cumberbatch along with Mrs. Tamika Roberts for the
Respondent

Hearing Date: 29th February, 2024

Ruling Date: 25th April, 2024

RULING ON BAIL VARIATION

[1.] On 4th December 2023, the Applicant, Christopher Cartwright (the “Applicant”) was granted bail on the sum of \$30,000.00 with two sureties and subject to the following conditions:

- i. He shall be fitted with an Electronic Monitoring Device;
- ii. He shall report to Carmichael Road Police Station daily before 6:00pm;
- iii. He shall be subject to curfew conditions from 9:00pm to 7:00am daily;
- iv. He shall surrender his travel documents;
- v. He is prohibited from interfering, either directly or indirectly with any of the Prosecution witnesses;
- vi. He shall surrender himself to custody at the Central Police Station at 1:00pm on the Friday before his trial is set to begin herein.

[2.]The Applicant herein sought to vary the aforementioned conditions by way of his Summons and Affidavit in Support both filed on 14th February, 2024. By the said Affidavit in Support, the Applicant averred that he remained remanded as he was not able to secure a sureties who possessed a Conveyance for property valued over \$10,000.00 which was a requirement of the Supreme Court Criminal Registry.

[3.]The Applicant added that his family is of limited financial means and that they were not land holders but hold stable jobs. On this basis he sought the variation to allow at least three sureties to sign the bail bond, and to remove the condition that he shall surrender travel documents because he has never owned a passport.

[4.]The Respondent indicated that to the Court that it opposed the bail variation but they did not submit an Affidavit in Response to the application. At the initial bail hearing, the Respondent by is Affidavit in Response filed on 22nd November, 2023 opposed the bail application being granted as they verily believe that the evidence against the Applicant is strong and cogent. The Respondent failed to provide any evidence or reasons in support for its objection to this present application.

[5.]The Applicant has been charged with murder, two counts of armed robbery and attempted armed robbery, which are serious offences. The relevant factors as set out in the Bail Act were considered and despite the cogency of the evidence against him, the Applicant herein was granted bail. With charges of this nature, it is not an unusual requirement for two sureties be permitted to facilitate bail.

[6.]On 25th April, 2024, I have heard and considered the application on behalf of the Applicant. Having regard to the limited means of his family members, I accede to the application and varied the bail granted herein on 4th December, 2023 to permit two to three persons as sureties.

Dated this **25th** day of **April** A.D. 2024

The Hon Madam Justice Renae McKay