**Tribunal Procedure Committee**

**Consultation on possible changes to Tribunal Procedure (Upper Tribunal) Rules 2008 in respect to rule 24**

**Questionnaire**

We would welcome responses to the following questions set out in the consultation paper. Please return the completed questionnaire by **13 July 2021** to:

Vijay Parkash-Secretary to the Tribunal Procedure Committee

Post point 10.18

102 Petty France

London SW1H 9AJ

Email: tpcsecretariat@justice.gsi.gov.uk

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Respondent name** |   |
| **Organisation** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 1:** Do you consider that the Devani interpretation should be ‘overruled’ by rule change to UT rule 24 (Option 1)? If so, why; and if not, why not? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 2:** If so, do you have any comments on the indicative drafting? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 3:** Should the Devani interpretation be made express in the Rules (Option 2)? If so, why; and if not, why not? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 4:** If so, do you have any comments on the indicative drafting? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 5:** Should the terms of UT rule 24 be adjusted so as to conform more closely with CPR. 13.2 (Option 3)? If so, why; and if not, why not? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 6:** If so, do you have any comments on the indicative drafting? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 7:** Should the terms of UT rule 24 be widened so as to conform more closely with CPR. 13.2 and to accommodate applications for permission to appeal (Option 4)? If so, why; and if not, why not? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 8:** If so, do you have any comments on the indicative drafting? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 9**: Should a UT rule 24 response be mandatory in all cases (Option 5)? If so, why; and if not, why not? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 10:** If so, do you have any comments on the indicative drafting? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 11**: Do you have any further comments? |
| Comments: |