

Approved

Minutes of the Civil Procedure Rule Committee

Friday 1st April 2022, conducted in a hybrid format, namely, at The Rolls Building (Royal Courts of Justice), Fetter Lane, London and via Video Conference.

Members attending

Lord Justice Birss, Deputy Head of Civil Justice (Chair)
Mr Justice Kerr
Mr Justice Trower
Master Cook
His Honour Judge Jarman QC
District Judge Clarke
Lizzie Iron
Dr Anja Lansbergen-Mills
John McQuater
Isabel Hitching QC
David Marshall

Apologies

Members: District Judge Cohen; His Honour Judge Bird, Tom Montagu-Smith QC; Others: District Judge Byass, Katie Fowkes (MoJ Legal).

Item 1 Welcome, Minutes, Action Log & Matters Arising

1. The Chair welcomed everyone, both those in person and those attending remotely via video conference, to the meeting. The minutes of the meeting on 4th March 2022 were **AGREED**.
2. The Action Log was duly **NOTED** and the following matters arising were **NOTED** from the Chair:

- **AL(22)15/16 - Vulnerable Parties: Form revisions and proposed amendment to PD1A:** this is considered under Item 4 below.
- **AL(22)17 - 142nd PD Update: Damages Claims Pilot PD 51ZB:** this is taken under Item 5 below.
- **AL(22)18 - PDs under Part 52 and Forms EX105, 62 & 202 concerning transcripts at public expense:** District Judge Clarke is to work with Master Cook on the related points arising from the judgment in *Mohammed Anwer -v- Central Bridging Loans Ltd* (Neutral Citation Number: [2022] EWCA Civ 201).

Action: Master Cook and DJ Clarke to advise the Secretariat when the matter is ready to return.

- **AL(21)105 - 143rd PD Update: Small Claims Paper Determination Pilot PD 51ZC:** The Chair advised that, (i) following a request by District Judge Nightingale (co-opted member of the Small Claims Sub-Committee) it was agreed, out-of-committee, to add the County Court at Staines to the list of pilot court centres because of the back to back listing practice between that court and the County Court at Guilford (which was already included in the Pilot PD). (ii) The Chair had received correspondence concerning paper determinations of small claims and was pleased to be able to reply with news that the pilot PD 51ZC was due to

commence on 1st June 2022. (iii) Upon publication of the new PD 51ZC, a drafting point was raised by Dr John Sorabji concerning paragraph 1.3 (which lists the pilot courts) as to whether it sufficiently reflected the creation of the single County Court. Drafting Lawyers had been consulted and took the view that whilst it was likely to be capable of correction under the slip rule due to the meaning being clear, because it cannot mean anything else, the Chair's view was that this was not an urgent amendment and can await formal inclusion in the next suitable PD Update and this was **AGREED**.

Action: Drafting lawyers and Secretariat to include in PD Update.

- **AL(21)07 - Judicial Review Appeals from the High Court (CPR 52.8)** this will now be considered as part of the Sub-Committee's work related to committals and the Divisional Court, being undertaken by His Honour Judge Bird.

Item 2 Section 2(7) Sub-Committee

3. Mr Justice Kerr explained there were two elements to this report, first the consultation responses to the proposals concerning Parts 7 & 8, which was presented by Isabel Hitching QC and secondly, the proposed amendments in relation to Part 49. Each was discussed in turn, a summary as below.

CPR Part 7 (How to Start Proceedings – The Claim Form) & Part 8 (Alternative Procedure for Claims) CPR(22)14(a) & CPR(22)14(b)

4. The rolling consultation exercise on proposed changes to Parts 7 and 8 closed on 24th March 2022. A total of five responses were received, respectively, from the Council of HM Circuit Judges, the Forum of Insurance Lawyers (FOIL), the Association of Consumer Support Organisations (ACSO) and two separate legal professionals. Only very modest revisions were proposed (by some, not all respondents) and which were explained and duly **NOTED**, but not adopted. However, the Committee greatly appreciates the time and care respondents gave to submitting responses and was particularly pleased to acknowledge the positive reception observed by respondents generally and the support expressed for the simplification project.
5. Another important observation concerned the interface between the CPR and the Insolvency rules. To ensure no mismatch for anyone in Insolvency proceedings, it was **RESOLVED** that Mr Justice Trower liaise with the Insolvency Rule Committee Chair.

Action: Isabel Hitching QC to refer any specific points from the consultees to Trower J.

6. The discussion also identified some drafting points to be addressed, thus: paragraph 4.2 of PD 7A should not express claimants/defendants as "1", "2" etc, but rather as "[name of] **first** [claimant/defendant]" and "**second** [claimant/defendant]"; r.8.1 (2A) as to whether the penultimate word is to read, "provides" or "states"; numbering to be reviewed by drafting lawyers.
7. It was **RESOLVED to APPROVE, subject to the above points and to final drafting, the reformed CPR Parts 7 & 8 and the PDs supplementing those Parts.**

CPR Part 49 (Specialist Proceedings) CPR(22)09

8. Kerr J explained the purpose of the amendments is to remove from the early generic parts of the CPR, non-generic materials considered worthy of preservation, and to place them in Part 49 on specialist proceedings. As such, the proposed changes to Part 49 (and other related Parts) was focused on moving existing CPR material; it was not intended to

change its content significantly. Most of the proposed changes have been mentioned in previous consultations (on Parts 3, 7 and 8).

9. The discussion highlighted the following drafting points, and it was **AGREED** that they be reflected in the final proposed reforms:

- The proposed new rule 49 should read, "The practice directions made under the Rule apply to proceedings of the types described in them" (the insertion of "made under" being a preferred proposal to "following" and provides drafting consistency within the CPR);
- Part 49 should be renamed "Specialist Specific Proceedings";
- Para 3.3 of Section A of PD 8A (as amended following the Part 8 consultation) and which is now proposed to become the introduction and Section A of PD 49E, should read, "Where it appears to a court officer that a claimant is using the Part 8 procedure inappropriately, he the court officer may refer the claim to a judge for the judge to consider the point.";
- PD 49B may not already have been revoked, but appears to be defunct, since its provisions are now included within the *Practice Direction on Insolvency Proceedings* and which is freestanding and not linked to Part 49. This should be highlighted as part of the consultation, with a proposal that it should be revoked.

10. It was **NOTED** that PDs which remain supplementing Parts 3, 7 and 8 should likely be re-numbered and re-lettered to restore sequential numbering and lettering and that this may generate a need for changes to cross-referencing elsewhere in the rules and PDs.

Action: Drafting lawyers to review before the final (post consultation) drafting is settled.

11. Isabel Hitching QC raised a question as to the timing of the consultation and interaction with the work of the Costs Sub-Committee. Following discussion it was **RESOLVED** to continue with the two strands of work as individual topics, because the overlap was likely limited to consequential cross references only and if any should arise from the ultimate reforms, they can be addressed in due course, if needed.

12. It was further **RESOLVED to APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE**, subject to the above points and to final drafting, the proposed reformed CPR Part 49, **AND FIT FOR CONSULTATION**, using the (online) rolling consultation facility.

13. **Actions:** (i) Kerr J to provide final consultation material to the Secretariat (ii) Secretariat to facilitate publication as part of the rolling consultation facility, at the earliest opportunity.

Post Meeting Note: Part 49 material published as part of the rolling consultation on 11th April 2022; closing date for comments is 23rd May 2022.

Item 3 Traffic Enforcement (PD75) CPR(22)10

14. Richard Creese (Department for Transport) and Samantha Toyn (Ministry of Justice) were welcomed to the meeting.

15. The Department for Transport (DfT) has been working with MoJ on the necessary amendments to PD 75 (Traffic Enforcement) in anticipation of the coming into force of the Civil Enforcement of Road Traffic Contraventions (Approved Devices, Charging Guidelines and General Provisions) (England) Regulations 2022 and the Civil Enforcement of Road Traffic Contraventions (Representations and Appeals) (England) Regulations 2022. The regulations will replace, respectively, the Civil Enforcement of

Parking Contraventions (England) General Regulations 2007 and the Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) Representations and Appeals Regulations 2007.

16. Accordingly, the proposed amendments to PD 75 take the form of substituting references to both the new regulations and the shortened titles by which they are referred.
17. The anticipated coming into force date is 31st May 2022. However, the consequential PD amendments were not considered urgent and any passage of time between the regulations coming into force and PD 75 being formally updated, was not considered to present problems in practice.
18. It was confirmed that the changes were specific to England, with no issues arising in relation to Wales.
19. The need to update court forms (TE7 and TE9) were also anticipated and this was duly **NOTED**.
20. It was **RESOLVED**:
 - to approve the amendments to PD 75 as drafted;
 - proposed form revisions to be referred (en bloc) to the Forms Sub-Committee for consideration and approval, out of committee, under delegated powers.
21. **Actions:** (i) Drafting Lawyers/Secretariat to incorporate into a suitable Update instrument, before the mainstream summer Update cycle, if practicable (ii) MoJ/DfT to provide the Secretariat with the proposed form amendments for referral to the sub-committee.

Item 4 Vulnerable Parties or Witnesses

22. This item comprised the following topics:

Timetable

23. It was **NOTED** from the Chair that the coming into force date for the various regulations being made under the Domestic Abuse Act is now 7th June 2022 and as such, implementation has been put back slightly to align.

Form revisions AL(22)15

24. As a matter arising from the last meeting (4th March 2022) when the additional questions to be added to certain civil forms were resolved upon, concerns as to possible unintended consequences from the inclusion of question three have been raised, which have been considered, out-of-committee. It is, therefore, proposed to remove question three altogether and this was **AGREED**.

PD1A (inclusion of signpost as to Address Confidentiality) AL(22)16.

25. The proposed drafting solution, to add an additional sentence to the end of paragraph 7 of PD 1A (Participation of Vulnerable Parties or Witnesses) was discussed in detail. Kerr J noted the proposed text provided a signpost for users to PD 16 (Statements of Case) and, accordingly, suggested an alternative to bring the proposed amendment into line with the draft revisions (currently part of the rolling consultation exercise) concerning PD 16. However, Master Cook, raised whether the reference to PD 16 paragraph 2.5 addressed the issue, because it is a reference to the requirements for a Particulars of Claim only. This was discussed, whereupon further proposed amendments aiming to make the position clearer and better reflect court practice, including a related point concerning

possible revision to CPR 6.23 (regarding the location of the text “unless the court orders otherwise” in sub-rule (1); insertion of, “or order” to sub-rule (2) and insertion of, “unless the court orders otherwise” to sub-rule (3) were discussed in detail.

26. The Chair observed that the practical challenge with introducing a signpost was that there were various related cross-references within the rules, which highlighted the core issue for users, that they needed to have clear information on the mechanics of how to apply for an address to be kept confidential. It was concluded that this is best served through (HMCTS) guidance, rather than in the CPR and this was **AGREED**.

27. **Action:** MoJ Policy and HMCTS to review/produce the guidance on how to apply for address confidentiality.

28. It was **RESOLVED** to:

- amend PD 1A, paragraph 7 to read as follows and for in force on/by 7th June 2022, if possible:

“If the court decides that a party’s or witness’s ability to participate fully and/or give best evidence is likely to be diminished by reason of vulnerability, the court may identify the nature of the vulnerability in an order and may order appropriate provisions to be made to further the overriding objective. This may include concealing the address and/or contact details of either party or witness for appropriate reasons.”

- amend CPR 6.23 (Methods of Service) for clarificatory purposes, as proposed by Master Cook.
- Sub-Committee to consider revision to PD 16.

29. **Actions:** (i) HMCTS and Secretariat to settle in-force date (ii) For the amendment to PD 1A and in consultation with the Sub-Committee, Drafting Lawyers to produce the final drafting for incorporation into a PD Update at the earliest opportunity (iii) For the amendment to CPR 6.23 and in consultation with the Sub-Committee and Master Cook, Drafting Lawyers to produce the final drafting for incorporation into the next available mainstream rule amending SI (iv) Any proposed revision to PD 16 to return when ready; Sub-Committee to advise the Secretariat for agenda programming purposes.

Domestic Abuse Protection Notice (DAPN) and Domestic Abuse Protection Order (DAPO) Pilot CPR(22)11

30. Oliver Lendrum (Ministry of Justice) was welcomed to the meeting and presented the matter.

31. It was **NOTED** from the Chair, that District Judge Byass (co-opted Chair of the Vulnerable Parties Sub-Committee) was unable to join the meeting; but was aware of and had made some preliminary comments on this item.

32. The Domestic Abuse Act 2021, introduces Domestic Abuse Protection Notices (DAPN) and Domestic Abuse Protection Orders (DAPO), which are cross-jurisdictional measures and as such, the MoJ Policy team implementing this is liaising with the rule committees for Civil, Family and Crime respectively; Mr Lendrum is due to present to the Family Procedure Rule Committee (FPRC) on Monday 4th April.

33. The proposed approach for implementation was to commence pilot schemes (in specific police areas), intended to commence in early 2023. For the civil jurisdiction, DAPOs will

be available only in ongoing county court proceedings specified in regulations, on application by a party to the proceedings or of the court's own initiative.

34. DAPOs are intended to bring together features of existing protective orders; there is no minimum or maximum duration for the order and anyone subject to a DAPO will also be required to notify the police of their name and address within 3 days of the DAPO being made, (and within 3 days of any changes). Beyond existing protective orders for domestic abuse, which typically impose restrictions, courts will also be able to impose electronic monitoring requirements and positive requirements (requirements to actively do something, such as attend a behaviour change programme) as part of the DAPO. A breach of a DAPO is a criminal offence. In response to a question, it was clarified that DAPNs are not intended for civil proceedings governed by the CPR.
35. MoJ Policy have been considering whether an enabling rule is required to facilitate a new pilot PD, but the Drafting Lawyer's emerging view is that an enabling rule is not required for civil, because the CPR already provides for pilot provisions in Part 51. An alternative suggestion of seeking to incorporate any pilot within the current CPR provisions under Part 1/PD 1A were not deemed appropriate, because they concerned the participation of vulnerable parties or witnesses; Part 65 (Proceedings relating to Anti-Social Behaviour or Harassment) was raised as a possible alternative option, if required. It was also observed that, given that the application of DAPOs is more limited in civil, it may not be necessary to have a pilot PD in the CPR at all, but rather introduce a substantive PD in the first instance. However, the discussion ventilated some key elements of the legislative reforms, such as the use of electronic monitoring, which are likely to benefit from being piloted, because they are not currently mainstream measures within the civil courts.
36. Consultation with, in particular, the Association of HM's District Judges and Council of HM's Circuit Judges was seen as essential. Given the legislative and multi-jurisdictional nature of the reforms, a joint civil and family consultation, with a focused audience, was seen as an appropriate approach; subject to the views of the FPRC and this was **AGREED**.
37. The Chair observed, with thanks, that DJ Byass was already working with the FPRC's Vulnerable Parties Working Group and thus is best placed to be the point of contact for this wider cross-jurisdictional work; Lizzie Iron volunteered to serve as deputy and this was **AGREED**.
38. It was **RESOLVED** that officials work with members to frame the necessary drafting and settled approach to consultation and return to the CPRC in May/June, if required for inclusion in the summer CPR update.
39. **Actions:** (i) Oliver Lendrum to update the Secretariat on progress following presentation at the FPRC's meeting and as to timing for agenda planning and CPR Update programming purposes.

Item 5 Damages and Money Claims Committee: OCMC CPR(22)12 and DCP CPR(22)15

40. Mr Justice Johnson was welcomed to the meeting.
41. The Chair opened the item by advising that following the last meeting, there had been two developments that required urgent, out-of-committee, action. First, the need to promulgate a further urgent PD Update (144th PD Update) to clarify that PD 51ZB only applies to legal professionals, not litigants in person and to rectify a drafting oversight which inadvertently widened the intended scope of claimant *mandation* to include the more complex multi-party claims, which can not be litigated through the Damages Claims Portal. Secondly, the decision to decouple the claimant and defendant *mandation* provisions and progress the defendant element in slower time; accordingly, it is an item

for further consideration today. Thanks were expressed to officials and drafting lawyers for their characteristic dispatch and for the helpful additional, ad-hoc sub-committee input, from Andrew Parker (co-opened member of the Costs (FRC) Sub-Committee) and Nicola Critchley. This was duly **NOTED**.

42. Johnson J explained that the Damages and Money Claims Committee sought two further sets of amendments, respectively, for PD 51R (Online Civil Money Claims (OCMC) Pilot) and PD 51ZB (Damages Claims Pilot). Each was discussed in turn.
43. PD 51R concerned amendments to expand the OCMC pilot service to allow the option (but not mandatory) for claims to be brought by a represented litigant against a represented litigant (with up to two claimants and one defendant (“2v1”), or one claimant and up to two defendants (“1v2”) and with a value of up to £25,000. In addition, the unrepresented (litigant in person) service is to be expanded to allow 2v1 and 1v2.
44. Further, it was recognised that there is an argument that the current drafting of the rules suggests that all parties have to be individuals, whereas it has always been the reform project’s intention to allow claims by and against corporations. It was, therefore, considered desirable to clarify that.
45. Taken as a whole, the OCMC service should largely follow the processes within the Damages Claims Portal pilot.
46. HMCTS are keen to introduce the expanded service as soon as possible. The Chair reiterated the practical steps from CPRC resolution to final drafting and ultimate promulgation, explaining that precise in-force dates needed to be finalised with the Secretary out-of-committee and were subject to the MR’s and Ministerial availability.
47. It was **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE** the proposed amendments to PD 51R, subject to final drafting.
48. **Actions:** (i) HMCTS and Secretariat to settle in-force date (ii) In consultation with Johnson J, Drafting Lawyers to produce the final drafting for incorporation into a PD Update at the earliest opportunity.
49. PD 51ZB provides a pilot scheme for the Damages Claims Portal (DCP). The proposed amendments concern the Defendant *mandation* provisions and follows the decision in principle at the last CPRC meeting (4th March 2022) to require legally represented defendants to use the DCP. The drafting was reviewed and discussed, wherein it was explained that the system has now successfully handled several test cases (and at least one real case). The aim was to implement the reforms in June 2022. Although HMCTS had carried out a variety of communication methods, the need for ongoing and targeted communication prior to go-live was urged.
50. It was **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE** the proposed amendments to PD 51ZB, subject to final drafting.
51. **Actions:** (i) HMCTS and Secretariat to settle in-force date (ii) In consultation with Johnson J, Drafting Lawyers to produce the final drafting for incorporation into a PD Update at the earliest opportunity.

Item 6 Lacuna Sub-Committee (LSC) CPR(22)13

52. Master Dagnall advised that although the LSC's work has been hampered by the consequences of the pandemic and other commitments, it has been progressing existing referrals, receiving notifications of new queries and been keeping its usual review over case-law developments. He was pleased to report that the volume of matters before it

had been reduced in recent weeks and is now in the region of around 50 matters, some of which are awaiting initial filter. A significant number only relate to minor points of wording, updating or cross-referencing. This report was duly **NOTED** with thanks to all LSC members.

53. The following five items of lacuna were presented by Master Dagnall and discussed:
54. **LSC2020/24 (Whether Pre-Action Applications are Proceedings for the purposes of QOCS)**. This concerns pre-action applications “proceedings” for the purposes of Qualified One-way Costs (QOCS) Shifting. Thanks were conveyed to Tom Montagu-Smith QC for preparing the matter. The LSC observed that in *Waterfield and ors v Dentality Ltd* [2020] 11 WLUK 223 (13 November 2020), it was decided that pre-action applications for a Group Litigation Order are not “proceedings” within the meaning of CPR 44.13 and so the QOCS regime in CPR Part 44, Section II, did not apply. The QOCS regime would apply to a post-issue application of the same sort. The decision is unreported, and no reported decision addresses the issue. Accordingly, the LSC raised whether the CPRC may wish to clarify the position. It was **RESOLVED** to refer the matter to the Costs Sub-Committee, contingent upon the wider costs related work recently instigated by the Civil Justice Council, which Birss LJ was chairing.
55. **LSC2021/05 (Second Claims and Applications to Part 8 Claims)**. This concerns CPR 38.7 and whether it is the intention not to cover the situation when permission is required to make a second related claim, in circumstances where the claimant has brought and discontinued a first claim, but where the first claim was brought under the Part 8 procedure. It flows from the judgment in *Advantage v Stoodley* 2018 EWHC 2135. The potential for unintended consequences, should an amendment be made in response to obiter, in this instance, was observed.
56. It was **RESOLVED**, on balance, not to take any further action and thus, not to make any amendments to the CPR.
57. **LSC2022/06 (Second Claims and Timing of Application)**. This also concerns CPR 38.7, the LSC referral flows from *Captain Saulawa v Captain Abeyratne* 2018 EWHC 2463 in which it was held that an application for permission to make a second related claim, where the claimant has brought and discontinued a first claim, must be made before the second claim is issued. The LSC raise whether an amendment prescribing at what point in time a permission to bring a second claim should be sought, is merited.
58. It was **RESOLVED** not to make any change to the CPR, but to request the responsible White Book editor (Master Dagnall) for the Part 38 commentary to consider pointing out that the dictum was obiter and thus may be questioned.
59. **LSC2022/02 (Discontinuance where Permission is Required and What Notice is Required)**. The LSC considered *Galazi v Christoforou* [2020] EWHC 670 in which it was suggested (by Chief Master Marsh) that CPR 38.5 did not deal with the mechanism of discontinuance when permission or something similar was required for the claimant to be able to discontinue.
60. The LSC proposed an amendment to CPR 38.3 by way of a sub-rule “(5) the notice of discontinuance must be in Form N279 unless otherwise permitted by the court” because that would draw litigants’ (including litigants in person’s) attention to the need to use the prescribed form and would create a flexibility within the rule while not removing the requirement for a notice of discontinuance.
61. It was **RESOLVED** to include an express reference to the prescribed form of Notice of Discontinuance, N279, in the wording of the rule. **Action:** Drafting lawyers and Secretariat to include in the next mainstream CPR Update.

62. **LSC2022/03 (Discontinuance related – what is meant by “part of a claim” and the interaction with amendment applications).** This referral also relates to *Galazi v Christoforou* [2020] EWHC 670 and thus contains overlapping issues with the above topic (LSC2022/02). It focuses on CPR 38.1 and what is meant by “part of a claim” and the interaction with amendment applications. The *Galazi* judgment raised some interesting points because it departed from previous dicta, (for example, dicta of Mr Justice Leggatt (as he then was) in *Kazakhstan v Zhunus* 2016 EWHC 2363) as to what was meant by a claimant discontinuing “part of a claim” and referred to queries as to the meanings of the different words “claim” and “proceedings” as used throughout CPR 38, and applied CPR 38 to certain types of amendments. Overall, the view was not to make any amendments at this stage, with the discussion raising whether it would be suitable to consider Part 17 (Amendments to Statements of Case) in tandem. In doing so, it would be opportune to incorporate an outstanding issue from the public questions submitted for the 2021 open public meeting regarding CPR 17.4 (Amendments to statements of case after the end of a relevant limitation period), the Court of Appeal judgment in *Goode v Martin* [2001] EWCA Civ 1899 and whether any amendment to CPR 17.4(2) is necessary in light of such judgments and in order to be consistent with the wording in Section 35 of the Limitation Act.
63. It was **RESOLVED** to refer these matters to the Section 2(7) Sub-Committee for consideration, with a view to bring forward their review of Part 38 so that any interaction between CPR 17 and CPR 38 can be considered (and subsequently consulted upon) together, if appropriate.

Item 7 Closing Remarks from the Chair and Any Other Business

64. The concept of having a standalone print/downloadable version of the CPR was raised from the Chair and discussed. It was **RESOLVED** to look into feasibility options and report back. **Action:** MoJ/Secretariat to investigate and report back to the Chair by 10th June 2022.
65. The Chair expressed thanks to John McQuater, who reaches the end of his three-year term on the Committee this month. Mr McQuater was appointed in April 2019 as one of the two members representing the lay advice and consumer affairs sectors, based on his third sector experience. He has contributed to Committee activity on various sub-groups, principally Whiplash and Service (which is still ongoing), alongside other costs related topics, in particular. Mr McQuater responded with appreciation, observing how quickly the time had flown by and on the scale of change over that period. He has thoroughly enjoyed his time on the Committee, with the work being challenging, demanding and time consuming, but it has been a great opportunity to work with wonderful colleagues and he has learnt a lot.
66. The other member representing the lay sector is Lizzie Iron, who retires later this year and thus a recruitment campaign to recruit two new lay members has been launched by the Public Appointments Team.
67. Before closing the meeting, the Chair drew attention to Sir Peter Coulson’s tribute to the late Richard Viney (former CPRC member, who sadly passed away in August 2021) in the recently published 2022 edition of Civil Procedure (the “White Book”).

C B POOLE
April 2022

Attendees:

Carl Poole, Rule Committee Secretary
Master Dagnall, Chair, Lacuna Sub-Committee

Nicola Critchley, Civil Justice Council
Alasdair Wallace, Government Legal Department
Andy Currans, Government Legal Department
Amrita Dhaliwal, Ministry of Justice
Andy Caton, Judicial Office
Terry McGuinness, Judicial Office
Faye Whates, HM Courts & Tribunals Service
Richard Creese, Department for Transport (Item 3)
Sam Toyn, Ministry of Justice (Item 3)
Oliver Lendrum, Ministry of Justice (Item 4)
Mr Justice Johnson (Item 5)