**Tribunal Procedure Committee**

**Consultation on possible changes to the procedure rules of all Chambers of the First-tier Tribunal, the Employment Tribunal and the Employment Tribunal (Scotland) concerning the provision of written reasons for decisions and other case management measures**

**Questionnaire**

We would welcome responses to the following questions set out in the consultation paper. Please return the completed questionnaire by **22 October 2024** to:

 **Email:** **tpcsecretariat@justice.gov.uk**

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

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 1: time limits for requesting written reason (paragraph 23 to 28) |
| Question 1: Do you agree that the time limit for requesting discretionary written reasons should, in general, be reduced to 14 days? |
| Comments to Question 1: |
| Question (2): Do you agree with the proposed exceptions? Should there be any other exceptions for other classes of case, and if so, why? |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments to Question 2: |
| Question (3): Do you have any other observations about this proposal? |
| Comments to Question 3: |
| Proposal 2: decisions and reasons in the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber) (paragraphs ‎29 to ‎31) |

|  |
| --- |
| *Proposal 2*Question (4): Do you agree that rule 35(2) of the Tax Chamber rules should be amended to remove the obligation to provide the notice of decision within 28 days? |
| Comments to Question 4: |
| Question 5: Do you agree that the consent of the parties should not be required in the Tax Chamber for an unreasoned written decision to be given provided sufficient oral reasons have been provided? |
| Comment to Question 5: |

|  |
| --- |
| Question 6:(a) Do you agree that full written reasons should be restricted to the unsuccessful party, where oral reasons have been given at a hearing?(b) Do you agree that such reasons should be limited to the issues upon which the party was unsuccessful?(c) Do you agree with the proposed definition of “unsuccessful party”? |
| Comments to Question 6:a)b)c) |
| Question 7:(a) Do you agree that an “interests of justice” test will be sufficient to address any concerns raised by the TPC (and any other observations you may have)?(b) Are the proposals consistent with the principle of open justice or nonetheless desirable to achieve greater efficiencies in the system? |
| Comments to Question 7:a)b) |

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 3: General Regulatory Chamber tracks and reasons (paragraphs 32 to 46) |
| Question 8:Do you agree with the introduction of the “standard track” and the “open track” in proceedings before the General Regulatory Chamber? |
| Comment to Question 8: |
| Question (9): Do you agree:(a)that the rules should make provision for the GRC to identify the “principal issues” in standard track cases; and(b) that reasons in a standard track case may focus on its conclusions on the principal issues in the proceeding. |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments to Question 9:a)b) |
| Proposal 4: Employment Tribunals (paragraphs 47 to 54) |
| Question 10: Do you agree with the introduction of short-form and full reasons in the Employment Tribunals? |
| Comment to Question 10: |

|  |
| --- |
| Question 11: Should the time limit for requesting short form reasons be 7 or 14 days? |
| Comment to Question 11: |
| Question 12: Do you agree with the omission of rule 61(3) of the ET Rules? |
| Comment to Question 12: |

|  |
| --- |
| ALL PROPOSALSQuestion 13: Do you have any other observations about any aspect of the proposals? |
| Comments to Question 13: |