**Tribunal Procedure Committee**

**Consultation on possible changes to the Upper Tribunal Rules 2008 and the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) Rules 2010 in connection with CE-Filing**

**Questionnaire**

We would welcome responses to the following questions set out in the consultation paper. Please return the completed questionnaire by **16 August 2022**

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 agree that it is appropriate for there to be mandation of CE-Filing for certain parties in the UT? If not, why not? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 2:** If so, for which classes of party should the use of CE-Filing be mandatory? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 3:** For such parties, what (if any) additional safeguards should there be in the event of non-compliance with mandatory CE-Filing, over and above any provision for ‘down-time’, and the operation of UT rule 7? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 4:** If there is to be mandation of CE-Filing, should it be done through a Practice Direction? If not, why not? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 5:** If through a Practice Direction, what aspects should (or should not) be specified in a Practice Direction? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 6:** If there is to be mandation of CE-Filing, should it be done expressly through Rule change? If so, why? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 7:** If through Rule change, what aspects should (or should not) be specified in a change to the Rules? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 8:** Is it appropriate to amend Rule 13 in the way proposed (i.e. enabling a Practice Direction to deal with mandation)? If not, why not?  |
| Comments: |
| **Question 9:** Do you have any comments on the indicative drafting proposal? |
| Comments: |
| **Question 10:** Do you have any further comments? |
| Comments: |