



R (Andrew Tate and Tristan Tate) v Director of Public Prosecutions

Press Summary: For release at 12.10pm, 26 June 2026

This summary is provided by the court for the assistance of those reporting the judgment (neutral citation [2026] EWHC 1600 (Admin)). It does not form part of that judgment.

Headline

- 1 The Crown Prosecution Service seeks the extradition of Andrew and Tristan Tate for trial on charges including rape, assault and human trafficking. The Tate brothers brought judicial review proceedings to challenge the decision not to reveal to them until they return to the UK the identities of the women who have made allegations against them. Mr Justice Chamberlain has today refused them permission to apply for judicial review.

Background

- 2 Andrew and Tristan Tate are well-known on social media, where they have accounts with many millions of followers. The UK has sought their extradition from Romania, where they are habitually resident, to stand trial in England for offences including rape, assault and human trafficking.
- 3 Extradition warrants were issued at Westminster Magistrates' Court in January 2024. In March 2024, the Bucharest Court of Appeal ordered their extradition, but only after the conclusion of separate criminal proceedings in Romania.
- 4 The Crown Prosecution Service has refused, at this stage, to disclose to the claimants the names of the complainants who are said to be the victims of these alleged offences. The claimants have brought judicial review proceedings, contending that this refusal is irrational (ground 1) and in breach of their right to a fair trial under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ground 2).

Decision

- 5 After a hearing on 23 June, Mr Justice Chamberlain concluded that neither of these grounds is arguable, for reasons set out in a judgment handed down today. Permission to apply for judicial review was therefore refused.

Summary of reasons for rejecting ground 1

- 6 At this stage, the claimants have no rights under any relevant statutory regime to be told of the identities of the complainants. The common law imposes, at most, a duty on the prosecutor to undertake a multi-factorial judgment, weighing the reasons for and against disclosure in the specific factual circumstances of the case.
- 7 The decision taken in this case was coherent and rational, bearing in mind the latitude which the court is required to accord to prosecutorial decisions.

- 8 In the first place, it was taken by an experienced Specialist Prosecutor who had met the complainants and formed her own view about their vulnerability and the likely effect on them if their identities were publicly disclosed.
- 9 Secondly, the high profile of the claimants was relevant to the extent of the damage that would be done if they chose to name the complainants publicly. Although they are “of good character” in the technical sense used by criminal lawyers, the prosecutor’s description of them as “notorious” was not unfair. It was consistent with the fact that they are currently banned from all Google-owned social media platforms.
- 10 Thirdly, the Specialist Prosecutor did not have to find that it was more likely than not that the claimants would disclose the complainants’ identities. She was entitled to take a precautionary approach, given the high public interest in ensuring that witnesses alleging serious offences (including sexual offences) are not discouraged from giving evidence.
- 11 Fourthly, the claimants’ security-backed undertakings were rejected both because there was no obvious legal mechanism to administer and secure payment of the sums offered as security and because the arrangements being offered “do not mitigate the risk of harm to the victims”. These were relevant reasons.
- 12 Fifthly, the risk of unfairness to the claimants flowing from the late disclosure of the complainants’ identities was attenuated by factoring in that delay when considering what lines of inquiry should be pursued in relation to the collection of evidence from the complainants (including from their devices).

Summary of reasons for rejecting ground 2

- 13 Article 6(3) ECHR arguably applied from the point when the extradition warrants were issued, after a charging decision applying the full test in the Code for Crown Prosecutors.
- 14 However, any analysis of compliance with Article 6(3) involves a holistic examination of the criminal proceedings. What matters is the effect, if any, of any failure or delay in providing particulars of the offence on the fairness of the trial overall. Applying these principles to the facts, there are three features of particular significance.
- 15 First, the claimants have been given some particulars of the case against them. They know the offences and the date ranges. There has been no challenge to the validity of the extradition warrants in England and no successful challenge in Romania.
- 16 Secondly, the claimants will be provided with the identities of the complainants if and when they are prosecuted in this jurisdiction. In general, that is the point when an accused person is expected to answer the case against him.
- 17 Thirdly, it is not clear that the late provision of the identities of the complainants will hamper the ability of the claimants to gather and present evidence. If it does, and this prevents a fair trial, the Crown Court would be obliged to stop the trial.
- 18 Accordingly, this is not a case at which it can be said—even arguably—that there has been a breach of Article 6(3) at this very early stage.

Ends