

## Approved

### Minutes of the Civil Procedure Rule Committee

Friday 4<sup>th</sup> November 2022 conducted in a fully remote format via video conference.

#### Members attending

Lord Justice Birss (Chair)  
Mr Justice Kerr  
Mr Justice Trower  
Master Cook  
His Honour Judge Jarman KC  
His Honour Judge Bird  
District Judge Clarke  
District Judge Cohen  
David Marshall  
Dr Anja Lansbergen-Mills  
Isabel Hitching KC  
Tom Montagu-Smith KC  
Virginia Jones

#### Apologies

Ben Roe and Ian Curtis-Nye

#### Item 1 Welcome

1. **Minutes:** The minutes of the meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2022 were **AGREED**. The Chair raised the following matter arising:
  - **Service Sub-Committee:** Given that the substantive work to reform the service-out provisions is now complete, the sub-committee is ready to set its priorities for the next phase of work. To do so, two additional CPRC members (and possibly additional co-optees, contingent upon the topics to be considered) are required. Once appointed, the sub-committee should draft its work programme in outline before agreeing a final plan with the Chair. **Action:** nominations for membership to be with the Secretariat by 2<sup>nd</sup> December.
2. **Action Log:** The following topics were duly **NOTED**:
  - **AL(22)79 CPR 5.3 (e-signatures) Sub-Committee:** The Chair was pleased to confirm that Virginia Jones is willing to join the sub-committee to consider the drafting proposals for an updated r.5.3 (along with Dr Anja Lansbergen-Mills) and was duly appointed.
  - **AL(22)92 Project to review Part 19 Parties and Group Litigation:** Further to the last meeting (Item 8, 7<sup>th</sup> October 2022) it was confirmed that the Senior Master and Chief Chancery Master are not conducting any wider review on Part 19 at present (but are willing to be co-opted to any sub-committee or working group to be set up for that purpose; which was duly noted with thanks). Given the weight of CPRC work generally, it was **RESOLVED** not to commence a wider review at present. The s.2(7) sub-committee's review of Part 19 for duplication, clarity and modernisation was thus complete and the reformed drafting agreed at the last meeting will be incorporated into the next mainstream CPR Update, as planned.

- **AL(22)98 Damages and Money Claims Committee:** An additional legal member of the CPRC is required to fill a current vacancy following natural member turnover.  
**Post Meeting Note:** *The Chair has duly appointed Virginia Jones.*

## **Item 2 Costs Sub-Committee: Extending Fixed Recoverable Costs (FRC) CPR(22)58(a)-(I)**

3. This matter was last before the Committee on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2022.
4. The Chair provided some introductory remarks. Thanks were expressed for extensive work being undertaken by the sub-committee, which continues at pace by all concerned. This is a complex topic, and the work is not underestimated. Appreciation was extended, especially, to District Judge Simon Middleton and Andrew Parker (co-opted members of the sub-committee) who were welcomed to the meeting, along with Robert Wright (MoJ), all of whom contributed to the discussion.
5. Working drafts of the proposed draft amendments to Part 26 (Case Management – Preliminary Stage), PD 26, Part 28 (The Fast Track), PD 28 and Part 45 (Fixed Costs) were before the Committee and contained various associated drafting points; all of which were duly **NOTED**, as was the collection of worked examples requested at the last meeting by Lord Justice Birss.
6. Mr Justice Trower advised that detailed comments had also been provided out-of-committee (by His Honour Judge Bird and Nicola Critchley, respectively), for which thanks were conveyed. Those comments needed to be reviewed more comprehensively by the sub-committee and this was **NOTED**.
7. A detailed discussion ensued, which concentrated on points of principle.
8. Master Cook explained progress concerning the proposed amendments to Part 26 and PD 26 (Case Management – Preliminary Stage: Allocation and Re-allocation). It was explained that PD 26 has been in its current form for some time and will, in due course, be the subject of the usual review by the s.2(7) Sub-Committee (and will undergo consultation), but that does not fit with the timescale for completion of the FRC project. Accordingly, although no radical changes should be made now, there are some issues which should be addressed within the FRC reforms, such as gender neutral language, not attributing form numbers as express provisions and some other textual amendments.
9. As a matter of principle, the location of the proposed new Table in PD 26 (which intends to set out the complexity bands to which a claim will normally be assigned in the fast track) was discussed. It was proposed that it would be better placed in the substantive rules within Part 26, given its prescriptive nature and the interests of lay users. Consideration was also being given as to whether PD para 2.5 “Consequences of failure to file a Directions Questionnaire” is better suited for incorporation into r.26.3.
10. Consequential form changes will also need to be considered, when the drafting is settled; this may extend to model Directions Orders (as currently exists for multi-track cases) and this was duly **NOTED**.
11. Actions against the police and public authorities (r.26.6 (5C)) remains unresolved. The sub-committee has canvassed wider views via its practitioner members, but the situation remains difficult to define and is still being considered.
12. The topic of further guidance regarding assignment to Complexity Band raised a number of issues, whether that be for parties or judges. The Chair urged the sub-committee to consider how best this can be addressed. Judicial training will also be necessary.

13. Trower J raised a point of fundamental principle and on which the sub-committee has given considerable thought, namely, whether, and to what extent, the court should have discretion as to orders for costs where Part 45 applies. In particular, beyond the discretion as to whether costs are payable and when they are to be paid. The discussion ventilated the challenge of maintaining the court's discretion in a way that does not undermine the principles of fixed costs; when applying FRC a compromise is necessary. The sub-committee will revisit the drafting of the proposed new rule 45.1(3).
14. The parameters and mechanism of categorising costs where a litigant in person (LiP) has legal representation for only part of the claim are still under consideration; the steer provided was that, whatever the system is to be, it should be clear.
15. The potential costs related risks where a counterclaim amounts to a defence only is under active consideration. In that context, Dr Anja Lansbergen-Mills raised that the use of "also" in the current draft new rule 42.7(2) may not meet the policy aim; this will be reviewed by the sub-committee.
16. The interplay between FRC and Part 36 offers was highlighted and will be considered in due course.
17. The proposed amendments to the sections on disbursements were explained and **NOTED**; it was recognised that the legacy rules contain a degree of repetition and thus the favoured drafting approach was for one free standing provision.
18. It was **RESOLVED** to **AGREE in principle**:
  - rule and PD headings and related contents sections to be updated to include "intermediate track" where necessary
  - add a signpost at PD 26 paras 26.8A (1) and 26.8B (1) to rule 45.43, Table 13 and 45.48 and Table 15, because that is where Complexity Bands are dealt with in detail
  - move the Table at PD para 9.1A to rule 26.8A(2)
  - gender neutral language to be adopted throughout
  - specific form numbers should not be expressly included in the rules/PDs, but rather should refer to "the appropriate approved form"
  - not to incorporate an auto-updating rule making mechanism (for adjusting rates for inflation) but to commit to review the position 18 months after implementation
  - the sub-committee to consider a solution, other than guidance, as a means of addressing the call for further information regarding Complexity Bands
19. **Actions:** (i) Secretariat to allocate time at the December meeting (ii) MoJ Policy to note the resolution regarding a review of the inflation position 18 months after implementation.

### **Item 3 Judicial Review (JR) of decisions of the Upper Tribunal CPR(22)51**

20. Liam Walsh (MoJ) was welcomed to the meeting.
21. Mr Justice Kerr introduced the item. It was explained that this matter was before the Committee at the last (7<sup>th</sup> October 2022) meeting when it was resolved, in principle, to retain the 16 day expedited time limit for bringing a *Cart* JR (under the limited exemptions contained in s.2 Judicial Review and Courts Act 2022 ("the Act")) and that the 16 day

period be subject to review after one year. It was also accepted that there was no longer a need to incorporate the transitional provision for cases decided on or after 14<sup>th</sup> July 22.

22. Following consultation with Lord Justice Singh and Mr Justice Chamberlain, to whom thanks were conveyed, a further revised draft r.54.7A had been prepared which, following discussion, was **AGREED**.

23. It was further **NOTED** that the Administrative Court JR Guide has already been updated in response to the changes introduced by the Act and will be further updated in consequence of the CPR amendment, but this is not anticipated until the next annual update in September/October 2023. Having discussed the matter with relevant officials responsible for the administration of the Upper Tribunal, it was confirmed that no other forms or guidance required updating.

24. **Actions:** Drafting lawyers and Secretariat to incorporate into the next mainstream CPR Update, for April 2023 in-force. (*The action to review the 16 day limit in one year, was noted at the 7<sup>th</sup> October meeting*).

#### **Item 4 Amendments in consequence of the Chartered Institute of Legal Executives' (CILEX) new Qualifications Regime CPR(22)52**

25. Siân Jones (HMCTS Legal Operations) was welcomed to the meeting. It was explained that a suite of modest “housekeeping” amendments were required to bring the rules and PDs up to date in consequence of changes to the Chartered Institute of Legal Executives’ (CILEX) qualifications, essentially by way of the introduction of “CILEX Lawyers”.

26. This impacts on the CPR as regards the qualifications for court officers authorised to exercise judicial functions in civil proceedings. Without updating the CPR, the present rules and PDs will cease to reflect the qualifications which the Chartered Institute issues and unreasonably reduce the pool of those eligible to carry out the functions under the CPR. Alasdair Wallace (MoJ Legal) confirmed he was content with the drafting, whereupon, it was **RESOLVED** to:

- **APPROVE the amendments** (to CPR Part 52 Appeals, Part 54 Judicial Review and Statutory Review, PD 2E Jurisdiction of the County Court that may be exercised by a Legal Adviser and PD51R Online Civil Money Claims Pilot) as drafted.

27. **Action:** Drafting lawyers and Secretariat to incorporate into the next mainstream CPR Update, for April 2023 in-force.

#### **Item 5 Amendments in consequence of HMCTS Reform: Courts and Tribunals Service Centres CPR(22)53**

28. Faye Whates (HMCTS) was welcomed to the meeting. It was explained that in early July 2022, HMCTS announced plans to move the existing County Court Money Claim Centre (CCMCC) administration into either the County Court Business Centre (CCBC) in Northampton or into the Court and Tribunal Service Centre (CTSC) in Salford, to support reform transition.

29. Additionally, and to simplify terminology, HMCTS propose combining the CCMCC and CCBC into one entity, “The National Civil Business Centre (NCBC)”.

30. In consequence, a suite of, “housekeeping”, amendments to the CPR and some prescribed forms will be necessary to update references to work being handled by a specific HMCTS centre or legacy geographical location.

31. It was **NOTED** that the movement of work is taking place in stages and the indicative timetable is that this will continue up until May 2023. Where the rules specify the legacy address, the site will remain active to receive and redirect work as appropriate.
32. The Chair emphasised that until the drafting was prepared it was not possible to give final approval or properly consider any other consequential impacts and/or amendments. However, if the amendments were modest, it may be possible to agree them out-of-committee and prior to which, consultation with the relevant leadership judges, will also need to take place.
33. It was **RESOLVED**:
- to **APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE, subject to final drafting**, the amendments necessary to effect the operational changes above (to replace references to CCMCC, CCBC and the legacy address/es) within the CPR and relevant prescribed forms.
  - consequential amendments to prescribed forms to be referred to the Forms Sub-Committee (in the first instance) for consideration/approval under delegated powers.
34. **Actions:** (i) Drafting Lawyers and HMCTS to produce draft amendments to CPR and forms (ii) HMCTS to revert to the CPRC for final determination on 2<sup>nd</sup> December for inclusion in the Update cycle to come into force from April 2023, otherwise an out-of-cycle Update will need to be agreed) (iii) Secretariat to provisionally programme in time for the 2<sup>nd</sup> December meeting.

#### **Item 6 Independent Monitoring Authority (IMA) Practice Direction CPR(22)54**

35. David Jenkins and Robert Ritchie (MoJ) were welcomed to the meeting.
36. Mr Jenkins set out the background. It was explained that the MoJ has been approached by General Counsel to the Independent Monitoring Authority (IMA) with the proposal, which MoJ support in principle, to introduce a new PD, following issues in practice. The IMA are experiencing a lack of notification when claims are made and thus restricting the opportunity for the IMA to discharge its statutory functions and to intervene in proceedings if relevant.
37. The IMA was established under section 15 of, and Schedule 2 to, the European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Act 2020 (EUWAA) and became operational at the end of the transition period (11pm on 31/12/20), following the UK leaving the EU. Under the EUWAA, the IMA's general duties are to monitor and promote the adequate and effective implementation and application in the United Kingdom of Part 2 of the Agreements. This ensures that rights relating to residency, social security, reciprocal healthcare, mutual recognition of professional qualifications, and economic rights are protected for EEA citizens. To promote the implementation and application of Part 2, the IMA can 'intervene in any legal proceedings (including proceedings on an application for review)' (para. 30 of Schedule 2).
38. The proposed draft PD has been cast in similar terms to the existing PD for equality claims, which requires the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) to be notified of such claims, so that they can decide whether to intervene.
39. The PD would require the IMA to be given notice (by the claimant) of any proceedings in relation to Part 2 of the Agreements, allowing the IMA to decide whether to intervene in proceedings.

40. A discussion ensued. A summary of the issues ventilated include: concerns as to scope and the cases which may be captured by the PD, given the potentially very wide ranging nature of the current draft paragraph 1.2(3)(b); the fact that the Equality PD flowed from a long standing agreement and which is very narrowly defined; any operational implications and case volumes; the question of vires, but given that (i) the Equality PD already exists and (ii) the proposed new PD would “bite” when a claim is made, it was considered to be practice and procedure and thus within the CPRC’s vires.

41. It was further confirmed that there was no specific time pressure in which to implement any agreed new PD and thus this was not something that needed to be settled at this meeting or for inclusion in the upcoming mainstream PD Update.

42. It was **RESOLVED**:

- to **NOTE** the IMA’s proposal to introduce a new PD
- MoJ officials to work with Master Dagnall to review the current draft PD
- matter to return when ready

43. **Action:** MoJ (David Jenkins) to advise the Secretariat when the matter is ready to return, so that it can be programmed in.

#### **Item 7 Admiralty Court**

44. This item comprises two elements:

#### **Collision Pleadings proposed amendments to CPR 61, PD 61 and Form ADM3 CPR(22)55**

45. Mr Justice Andrew Baker (Admiralty Judge) was welcomed to the meeting.

46. It was explained that all the proposed reforms are recommended by the Admiralty Court Users Committee (ACUC). The intention of the proposed amendments is to ensure early disclosure and the proper particularisation of statements of case, in collision claims with the collective aim of greatly enhancing the ability of both the court and the parties to identify the issues in a collision action at an early stage and to manage the case appropriately.

47. The ACUC submit that the proposed changes should not cause the parties to a collision action any undue difficulties and will, in essence, bring the pleadings in Part 2 of the Collision Statement of Case into line with statements of case generally in the Commercial Court, while maintaining the spirit of ‘blind pleading’ that has been a part of Admiralty Court procedure since the 19<sup>th</sup> Century.

48. The proposed reforms also include expanding and improving the list of questions in form ADM3 (Collision Statement of Case).

49. The ensuing discussion highlighted some drafting points in the interests of consistency with other PDs, for example the use of, “full particulars of ...” rather than “full and proper”, whereupon it was **AGREED** to adopt the use of, “full particulars of...” throughout.

50. It was **RESOLVED** to:

- **APPROVE, subject to the above points and to final drafting,** the amendments to CPR Part 61 (Admiralty Claims) and the supplementing PD 61

- **APPROVE, subject to final drafting**, the amendments to form ADM3 (Collision Statement of Case). It was **NOTED** that the textual amendments (to form ADM3) in consequence of the change of Sovereign (and thus Queen’s Bench Division becoming King’s Bench Division) and the up to date Statement of Truth, had been approved by the Forms Sub-Committee under delegated powers and were already set in train.

51. **Actions:** (i) Andrew Baker J to provide perfected final draft drafting to the Secretariat and Drafting Lawyers by 2<sup>nd</sup> December for the usual checks, prior to incorporating in to the next mainstream Update as part of the April 2023 common-commencement date cycle (ii) Secretariat/HMCTS Forms Design to produce the updated form ADM3 to be introduced inline with the amendments.

### **Personal Injury “Hotel Claims” CPR(22)56**

52. Andrew Baker J expressed thanks to Master Davison, the Admiralty Registrar, (who was also present remotely) for his and the Admiralty Court Users Committee’s work in preparing the proposed reforms.

53. It is proposed to amend CPR 61.2 and PD 61, so that personal injury claims which do not require the expertise of the Admiralty Court (often referred to amongst Admiralty practitioners as “hotel claims”) may be issued in the county court. The reforms were presented as having a wider access to justice and interests of justice context.

54. A consultation was conducted between 1<sup>st</sup> June to 15<sup>th</sup> July 2022. The responses were duly **NOTED** with thanks. The proposed amendments had been revised following consultation and were discussed. The Chair highlighted that although neither MoJ nor HMCTS have raised objections, HMCTS have noted that there are two operational actions for them in relation to staff guidance and potentially Damages Claims online, which they are looking into separately. The use of the term “hotel claims” was highlighted in the consultation responses as potentially confusing. It was explained that, “hotel claims” is quite entrenched in the terminology now adopted by Admiralty practitioners and has, therefore, been retained. However, every effort will be made to avoid its use in public facing material where possible.

55. Andrew Baker J drew attention to certain passages of draft text which had been included in the interests of helpfulness, but acknowledged that it may not be usual for incorporation in a PD and could, as an alternative, be included in a Practice Note or Guide issued by the Admiralty Judge. On balance, it was **AGREED** to include it in the PD, save for one textual amendment to update Queen’s Bench Division to King’s Bench Division.

56. It was **RESOLVED** to:

- **APPROVE, subject to final drafting and incorporation of the above points**, the amendments to CPR 61.2 and PD 61.

57. **Action:** Secretariat and Drafting Lawyers to incorporate (together with the collision pleadings related amendments above) in to the next mainstream Update as part of the April 2023 common-commencement date cycle.

### **Item 8 Voter Identification Regulations 2022 – proposed amendments to PD 52D to facilitate an appeals process CPR(22)57**

58. Guy Daws (Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC)) was welcomed to the meeting.

59. It was explained that draft amendments to PD 52D (Statutory Appeals and Appeals Subject to Special Provision) have been prepared to facilitate an appeals process for appeals arising from the Voter Identification Regulations 2022, due to come into effect in January 2023.
60. The Elections Act 2022 received Royal Assent in May 2022. It seeks to implement a broad range of changes relating to elections, primarily seeking to secure the integrity of the electoral system. One such change is the introduction of voter identification, whereby an elector must present photographic identification (from a specific list of accepted documents deemed sufficiently secure) before voting in person at a polling station for certain elections in Great Britain (Northern Ireland has an existing voter identification system). A small minority of electors will not already possess one of the accepted documents. In order to ensure they will continue to have the opportunity to vote, the Elections Act 2022 mandates that they will be able to apply for a free form of photographic identification – a Voter Authority Certificate – from their local Electoral Registration Officer (ERO). Electors who are registered to vote anonymously will be able to apply for a similar document that will not show their name – an Anonymous Elector’s Document. EROs will determine the applications. Should an ERO reject an application, section 56(1)(ac) of the Representation of the People Act 1983 (as amended by Schedule 1 to the Elections Act 2022) and regulation 13 of the Voter Identification Regulations 2022 sets out that the elector will have the right to appeal this decision. Although the expectation is that such appeals will be rare, the appeal process is best situated within PD 52D, alongside the other appeals that already exist in electoral legislation.
61. It was **NOTED** that a wide range of consultation has been carried out for the policy as a whole but DLUHC do not consider further consultation to be necessary, given the relatively modest nature of the proposed amendments.
62. A discussion ensued. The Government’s intention is that the Regulations SI will commence in phases, the first phase will be 14<sup>th</sup> January 2023, at which point electors will be able to apply for Voter Authority Certificates. This is, therefore, also the point at which an application could be rejected and appealed against. It is envisaged that there would be a three to four week window whereby appeals would be possible. In the event that there was a delay between the amendments being approved and coming into force, officials take the view that the impact is low because it is very unlikely that any appeals will be made that quickly.
63. Amendments to existing forms did not appear to be necessary, however, Master Cook raised the prospect of devising a new form for appealing against non-judicial decisions and his intention to discuss this with Kerr J and HHJ Jarman KC. If this garnered support, it would be a future piece of work and thus the proposed amendments to PD 52D were not contingent upon the creation of a new prescribed form.
64. It was **RESOLVED**:
- to **APPROVE** the amendments to PD 52D (paras 31.1; 31.2; 31.3) as drafted
  - to **NOTE** the prospect of a future piece of work (by the Forms Sub-Committee) to devise a new prescribed form for appealing against non-judicial decisions
65. **Action:** Drafting Lawyers and Secretariat to incorporate the amendments to PD 52D into the next available PD Update, which was likely to be the mainstream Update cycle (and for these amendments to be given the earliest possible in-force date, so that they come into force as close to the commencement date of the Regulations, in January 2023, as possible).



## Item 9 Any Other Business & Close

### Civil Procedure (Amendment No.2) Rules 2022: Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments (JCSI) Memorandum.

66. The JCSI's recent report (the Fourteenth Report of Session 2022-23) and the accompanying memorandum response from MoJ was duly **NOTED** and discussed. Thanks were conveyed to Kerr J and Master Cook for their respective input. The overriding view was that, where drafting imperfections were raised, they were, invariably, an illustration of the pace of change and weight of business being transacted by the Committee (the SI extended to some 30 pages in length) and the limited resources available to carry out the usual level of detailed checking. Where additional work was required, the matter would return to the next meeting, with the aim of incorporating any necessary amendments into the next CPR Update, due to be settled in December and, subject to Ministerial and Parliamentary approval, to come into effect as part of the April 2023 common-commencement cycle. **Action:** Secretariat to programme in time at the December meeting.

### Part 20 consequentials

67. Following the resolution at the last meeting (7<sup>th</sup> October 2022) to approve the Part 20 (Counter Claims and other Additional Claims) reforms flowing from the work of the s.2(7) Sub-Committee, Drafting Lawyers presented a suite of consequential amendments (namely removing references to "Part 20 claim" and "Part 20 claimant") which were considered and **AGREED, subject to consultation with the Commercial Court and Circuit Commercial Court judiciary.**

68. For this to be included in the next mainstream CPR Update, any feedback will need to be considered and drafting settled by 2<sup>nd</sup> December.

69. **Action:** The Chair to consult with the Commercial Court and Circuit Commercial Court judiciary (by 2<sup>nd</sup> December).

### Correspondence concerning PD 32 Witness Evidence

70. The Chair explained that a letter had been received from the Association of Consumer Support Organisations (ACSO) following a recent county court judgment, which highlighted some language issues arising from PD 32 Witness Evidence. The PD had been amended in 2019 (coming into effect in 2020, pursuant to 113<sup>th</sup> PD Update).

71. The purpose of those amendments (together with amendments to PD 22 Statements of Truth) were intended to allow a witness to use a language in which they are fluent, even if that is not their mother tongue.

72. The aim was to address the issue of cases where a witness statement is presented in English but where, notwithstanding signature of the statement, the witness cannot speak English and the statement is not necessarily "in their own words"; the changes also aim to make it possible for such cases to be identified much earlier in the process.

73. The Committee concluded that the PD rules mean what was intended and thus do not require further review.

74. It was **RESOLVED:**

- to **NOTE** the correspondence with thanks

- no further action is required at this stage, because the PD rules mean what was intended

#### **Part-Transfer of Deeds Poll AL(21)64**

75. Master Cook advised that the drafting was currently with the MR's Legal Adviser and nearing completion. Accordingly, the item was expected to return for full Committee consideration in due course. **Action:** Secretariat to be advised when matter is ready to be programmed in.

#### **Part 52 Appeals AL(21)107**

76. HHJ Bird provided an oral update concerning the focused consultation with the Supreme Court Registrar et al and is working towards a substantive item at the next meeting. **Action:** Secretariat to programme in time for the 2<sup>nd</sup> December meeting, if ready.

C B POOLE  
November 2022

#### **Attendees:**

Carl Poole, Rule Committee Secretary  
Pete Clough, Secretariat  
Master Dagnall, Chair, Lacuna Sub-Committee  
Nicola Critchley, Civil Justice Council  
Alasdair Wallace, Government Legal Department  
Katie Fowkes, Government Legal Department  
Andrew Currans, Government Legal Department  
Amrita Dhaliwal, Ministry of Justice  
Andy Caton, Judicial Office  
Faye Whates, HM Courts & Tribunals Service  
Robert Wright, Ministry of Justice (Item 2)  
District Judge Simon Middleton (Item 2)  
Andrew Parker (Item 2)  
Liam Walsh, Ministry of Justice (Item 3)  
Siân Jones, HM Courts & Tribunals Service, Legal Operations (Item 4)  
David Jenkins, Ministry of Justice (Item 6)  
Robert Ritchie, Ministry of Justice (Item 6)  
The Admiralty Judge (Item 7)  
The Admiralty Registrar (Item 7)  
Guy Daws, Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (Item 8)