

## Henry F. Charles

Call: 1987  
charles@12kbw.co.uk



### AREAS OF EXPERTISE

Personal Injury, Clinical Negligence, Professional Negligence, Insurance, Costs, Health & Safety, Inquests

Henry is recognised as a leading personal injury and clinical negligence practitioner. He acts for Claimants and Defendants typically in complex and high value claims. He has negotiated settlements as high as nearly £7,000,000.

He was awarded Personal Injury and Clinical Negligence Junior Barrister of the Year award in 2014 by Chambers & Partners. He has appeared in their guide for many years, recommended in both personal injury and clinical negligence. Observers have said, for example, "I am impressed by his attention to detail and his commitment to ensure that no stone gets left unturned. He has a very agile and adaptable approach to things" and that he is "A tower of strength; he is calm in the midst of battle, knows how to read judges and is an excellent strategist" He has also been described as "unflappable and laser-like in terms of his focus.", an "extremely safe pair of hands," and as "delightful" with both "panache and a beautiful manner". "He knows when to fight," declare observers.

Henry encourages a team approach, he is happy to travel to see claimants and insurers alike.

### Personal Injury

---

Typically higher value claims, with a particular interest in psychiatric injury, pain related, amputation and brain damage claims.

Henry lectures/delivers seminars widely

### Clinical Negligence

---

Henry leads the 12KBW clinical negligence team.

Cases have included management of hypertension, psychiatric unit breach of duty, spinal surgery, failure to diagnose/refer cancers, obstetrics and failed dental treatment. He has successfully undertaken a number of claims whereby insurers have obtained very significant contribution on the basis of clinical negligence in treatment following accidents.

### Professional Negligence

---

Henry acts in cases involving professional negligence of lawyers in respect of personal injury and clinical negligence

claims. His cases have included B v P – see below

## Insurance

---

Construction of policies, issues as to motor vehicle use.

## Costs

---

Henry has lectured on costs and is noted as being an effective advocate in CCMCs.

## Health & Safety

---

For a number of years Henry has defended HSE prosecutions.

## Inquests

---

Related to his clinical negligence and personal injury work Henry acts for interested parties at Inquests.

## Qualifications & Awards

---

University College London LLB, LLM

Chambers & Partners Personal injury and Clinical Negligence Junior barrister of the Year 2014

## Directories

---

Henry is meticulous with detail whilst having a firm grasp on the big picture of a case. He has a great breadth of knowledge and can often offer solutions which are out of the box. – Legal 500, 2024

Henry is outstanding, especially when he combines his remarkable knowledge with his attention to detail. Henry is a compelling advocate with a calm convincing style. – Legal 500, 2024

Henry has superb medical knowledge and experience, and is suitable for the most difficult cases. – Chambers & Partners, 2024

His tactical advice is really good. He's very thorough and good with the clients. – Chambers & Partners, 2024

He shows a real passion for the cases on which he works. His advice and assistance has been invaluable. – Chambers & Partners, 2024

Henry Charles is the junior of choice in complex cases. He never ceases to impress. – Chambers & Partners, 2024

Henry is methodical and detailed in his analysis of complex cases. He adapts very well to clients. – Chambers & Partners, 2024

He is always willing to go above and beyond with technical detail. – Chambers & Partners, 2024

*Henry has a great analytical brain which quickly gets to the heart of the issue.* – Legal 500, 2023

*Henry is an extremely intelligent and experienced barrister. Experts are routinely impressed with his understanding and grasp of very difficult medical concepts, practices and procedures.* – Legal 500, 2023

*He is so technically minded and really forensic on complex causation matters and medical evidence.* – Chambers & Partners, 2022

*Henry has an impressive breadth of knowledge about legal and practical subjects which he uses to focus potentially complicated issues to provide practical and workable solutions. – Legal 500, 2022*

*He offers excellent legal analysis, but with a pragmatic approach. – Chambers and Partners, 2021*

*His attention to detail is outstanding and he has a very reassuring authority. – Chambers and Partners, 2021*

*Excellent at picking apart complex medical issues. – Chambers and Partners, 2021*

*Trusted and valued advice with careful and meticulous attention to detail. Advises with a reassuring authority. – Legal 500, 2021*

*Able to comfortably converse with a variety of medical experts on their specialist topics, as well as grasping and articulating complex personal injuries matters clearly. – Legal 500, 2021*

*His ability to get to the crux of the case is superb. He is a pleasure to work with, has a good rapport with clients and leaves no stone unturned. – Chambers and Partners, 2020*

*An astute mind whose mastery of the law is first-class. – Legal 500, 2019*

*He is able to navigate the most unusual of medical mistakes and takes a practical approach to his cases – The Legal 500, 2019*

*He is a meticulous barrister, and excellent when it comes to the consideration of complex personal injury claims. He gives very good solid advice and he's someone you can very much put your trust in. He is an excellent cross-examiner. – Chambers and Partners, 2020*

*A reliable and experienced barrister who is able to assist with a wide variety of claims. He is technically astute and particularly good with figures. – Chambers & Partners, 2019*

*Extremely bright, knowledgeable, effective and hard-working. – Chambers & Partners, 2019*

*He has very good judgement. His ability to get to the crux of the case is superb. He is a pleasure to work with and has a good rapport with clients. – Chambers & Partners, 2019*

*Very intelligent and extremely experienced. He has exceptionally good medical knowledge. – Chambers & Partners, 2019*

*He is a strong and attractive advocate who has a first-class work ethic, takes a thorough, careful and diligent approach to cases and is a top notch in the field. – Legal 500, 2018*

*He is an extremely bright, knowledgeable and approachable lawyer with an outstanding ability to turn round work. – Legal 500, 2018*

*Very personable and knowledgeable. – Chambers & Partners, 2018*

*A very capable and experienced barrister who provides invaluable advice. A strong weapon to have on your side. – Chambers & Partners, 2018*

*He combines incredible tenacity with a huge grasp of details of cases and the law. – Legal 500, 2017*

*He's excellent, really good with the clients, great on his feet and provides meticulous attention to detail. He's also very supportive, helpful and flexible in terms of contact hours. – Chambers & Partners, 2017*

*An experienced all-rounder.* – Chambers & Partners, 2017

*Very thorough and prepared to put in the work on difficult cases.* – Chambers & Partners, 2017

*Extremely astute tactically and highly intelligent.* – Legal 500, 2016

*I am impressed by his attention to detail and his commitment to ensure that no stone gets left unturned. He has a very agile and adaptable approach to things.* – Chambers & Partners, 2016

*A tower of strength; he is calm in the midst of battle, knows how to read judges and is an excellent strategist.* – Legal 500, 2015

## Publications

---

Published JPIL article

## Cases

---

*Osborne v Loke:*

*Failure to diagnose acute severe colitis and admit the Claimant to hospital, leading to life threatening post operative deterioration including septicaemia. The Claimant was in intensive care 53 days, for much of this time she on a ventilator. Critical illness myopathy led to paralysis of the entire body and required protracted rehabilitation. There is a permanent ileostomy, severe scarring and disfigurement of the abdomen.*

*Cole Smith v East Kent Hospitals:*

*Failure on part of hospital to appreciate the effects of repeated vomiting and thus loss of fluids on foetus, who has grown up with subtle, but debilitating neuro-developmental issues.*

*Marie-Willows v (1) HCA (2) Strover:*

*Nursing negligence of hospital, negligence of orthopaedic surgeon, resulting in amputation. Settled for overall sum of £2,000,000. Issues included liability of private hospital for independent consultant, contributory negligence*

*Millward v Brighton & Sussex University Hospitals NHS Trust:*

*Claimant suffered catastrophic brain injury from anoxia in course of operation leaving her in persistent vegetative state/minimally conscious. Liability initially disputed, settled on basis of lump sum plus periodical payments plus indemnities*

*Kimmins v North Bristol:*

*Failure to diagnose breast cancer leading to more advanced stage/grade*

*Mansi v King's College University Trust:*

*Failure to pick up brain tumour, the delay rendering successful treatment impossible, claimant having a stroke, losing his business. Settled for approximately £750,000.*

*Holroyd v United Lincolnshire Hospitals NHS Trust:*

*Failure to heed scans, leading to a significant period of non-treatment of liver cancer and the claimant's resulting death, issues of extent of causation*

*Eslah v Dr Robb:*

*Alleged (i) failure to provide adequate diagnostic input (ii) failure to heed declining condition, resulting in avoidable death. Led by Frank Burton QC*

*Langley:*

RTA, severe brain injury – minimally conscious minus state. A particular issue of interest was the impact of a likely divorce given (a) contributory negligence (b) periodical payments being secured for future care without deduction for contributory negligence but capital payments being reduced accordingly. Settled for a capitalised value equivalent to £5,250,000. Led by Richard Methuen QC, input obtained (joint conference) as to family law from Michael Glaser (specialist family barrister)

*Robertson Inquest, Lattitude Global Volunteering*

Two young women were on a placement in South Africa with Lattitude. They went swimming, were caught in a rip tide with others and died. The inquest considered the nature and risk of rip tides, and also involved intricate regulation 28 issues.

*Stewart v Harding:*

RTA, multiple orthopaedic injuries, complex issues relating to long-term deterioration/job prospects

*Watkins v Howell:*

Road traffic accident, acting for Defendant, claimed at over £1,000,000

*Spraggs v Burrell:*

RTA, Severe upper and lower limb injuries. Elective above-knee amputation, issues included whether that was reasonable and the suitability/benefits of new high-end technology prosthetic equipment

*Laney v Frimley Park Hospital:*

Claimant injured by another patient who should have been restrained, set off complex sequence of orthopaedic and psychiatric injury

*Montrose-Brown v Wentworth Care Homes:*

Acting for defendant Wentworth Homes re fall of member of staff, claimant claimed primarily orthopaedic injuries, at trial the claimant discontinued after her evidence

*Carrington v South Essex Health Authority:*

Acting for Defendant. Claimant alleged work related upper limb disorder arising out of her work as a hairdresser. All elements of claim in dispute, claimant's claim dismissed following a trial.

*Johnson v SCB, Norfolk Arena:*

Acting for claimant motorcycle race competitor who alleged he suffered much more serious injuries than would have been the case if appropriate barriers had been in place. International motorsports experts. Settled

*B v P:*

B fell off ladders. He claimed against his employers, and was represented by a leading personal injury firm. His claim was settled for £15,000, a negative view being taken of liability, and a significant brain injury being missed notwithstanding medical evidence that should have triggered further investigation. P's solicitors never met B, they liaised with his wife. B continued at work, but struggled and ultimately gave up work. At a hearing to repossess his home the District Judge realised that something was wrong with B. B, now a protected party, pursued P for undersettling his case. The professional negligence claim was concluded in his favour for a substantial sum.