

Approved

Minutes of the Civil Procedure Rule Committee

Friday 4th October 2024, 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 Trower
Mr Justice Pepperall
Master Sullivan
His Honour Judge Bird
District Judge Clarke
District Judge Johnson
Dr Anja Lansbergen-Mills
David Marshall
Isabel Hitching KC
Tom Montagu-Smith KC
Ben Roe
Ian Curtis-Nye
Elisabetta Sciallis

Apologies:

Members: His Honour Judge Hywel James. Non-Members: Josh Ivinson (MoJ – Item 3)

Item 1 Welcome

1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the first CPRC meeting of the new legal year and was pleased to **NOTE**, that Dr Anja Lansbergen-Mills' term of office on the committee has been adjusted to 11th July 2025, which accounts for maternity leave. His welcome was also extended to Kate Aujla who has been appointed as the new Deputy Secretary to the Committee.
2. **Minutes:** the minutes of the last meeting, on 5th July 2024, were **AGREED**.
3. **Action Log and matters arising not covered by later items.** The following was duly **NOTED** from the Chair:
 - **Ryan Morris -v- Williams & Co Solicitors [2024] EWCA Civ 376** (LSC2024/6 at paragraphs 26-29 of the July 2024 minutes): Master Sullivan and His Honour Judge Bird have discussed the fees related issues (regarding claims with multiple claimants) with officials and MoJ Fees Policy are now considering.
 - **Litigant in person recoverable hourly rates under PD 46** (as per paragraph 50 of the July 2024 minutes): MoJ Policy are considering Ian Curtis Nye's proposals.
 - **Domestic Abuse Protection Orders (DAPO) pilot (PD51ZF) pursuant to the 167th PD Update - commencement update (AL(23)227):** Both the family and civil pilot PDs were published in May 2024. Government, in liaison with the Senior Presiding Judge for England & Wales, has now determined that the DAPO pilot will launch in November 2024. This will operate in the previously agreed areas: Greater Manchester, London Boroughs of Croydon, Bromley and Sutton, and with the British Transport Police. This was publicly announced on 20th September, as part of a wider announcement: [New measures set out to combat violence against women and girls - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-measures-set-out-to-combat-violence-against-women-and-girls)

- **Retained EU Law - commencement update (AL(24)28):** The Civil Procedure (Amendment No. 3) Rules 2024 included a new CPR Part 68 to facilitate the effective operation of section 6 of the Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023. This was on the basis that s.6 was due to come into force on 1st October 2024 in parallel. However, the Chair has received correspondence from the Minister at the Department for Business and Trade, advising that following the General Election, the Government has cancelled the commencement of section 6 on 1st October [The Retained EU Law \(Revocation and Reform\) Act 2023 \(Commencement No. 2 and Saving Provisions\) \(Revocation\) Regulations 2024 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#) in order to “look at this issue again in the wider context of the new Government’s work to reset relations with the EU.” It was **FURTHER NOTED** that it remains open to the Government to bring s 6 into force at any point in the future. Officials will keep the Secretariat informed of developments.

The Secretariat confirmed that an update has been placed on the CPR web pages to advise that the new CPR Part 68 will have no effect until such time as s 6 might be brought into force.

It was **RESOLVED** that as the CPR rules are self-contained and that as there is no immediately available slot for an amending instrument to come into effect, Part 68 can be left in place, “*beating the air*”. Any amendment or revocation can take place later. This approach also assists that which is to be taken with the Supreme Court Rules, where any changes to remove the REUL rules now would risk adverse impact on the consistency (of numbering etc) with the rules for the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council appellate jurisdiction.

- **Parole decision referrals Sub-Committee (AL(24)55):** Currently Master Sullivan is the only member of the sub-committee and a preliminary meeting with officials has taken place. It was **RESOLVED TO APPOINT** Mr Justice Pepperall to the sub-committee.
- **Closed Material Sub-Committee (AL(24)65):** Lord Justice Singh is reviewing the Ouseley Report recommendations in the first instance.

Item 2 Lacuna Sub-Committee (LSC) CPR(24)43

4. District Judge Clarke presented the following two matters, which were discussed.
5. **Payment into court by cheque (LSC2024/8).** The LSC has recently been asked to look at the issue in the context of the growth of electronic payments and has considered whether PD 37 (miscellaneous provisions) should be amended to increase the discretion available to the court when ordering payment into court. A suite of possible amendments were proposed and carefully considered. However, although the committee could see a need and a value in the mainstream use of electronic payments, the committee’s options were constrained, due to the overarching Court Funds Rules, for which the committee does not have any jurisdiction. Equally, other practical considerations exist which were equally out of the committee’s control. On balance, it was **RESOLVED** not to amend the CPR because the current position is well established and certain. However, should the opportunity arise for engagement with the Court Funds Office, these issues will be raised. **Action:** Master Sullivan/Chair to relay if possible.
6. **Deadline for filing a respondent’s notice (LSC2024/9).** The LSC has considered whether an amendment to Part 52 (Appeals) is required to address an apparent error in the requirement for service of an appellant’s notice and the deadline for filing a respondent’s notice.

7. The LSC has been asked if an unsealed appellant's notice is served, does the time for filing a respondent's notice start from then or from receipt of the sealed appellant's notice? The discussion confirmed that a CPR reform in 2010 had not intended to change the practice by removing express reference to sealing. It was also explained that it does not appear to be the general situation in practice. Moreover, the committee's view was that it is not desirable for there to be a practice of producing un-sealed orders. It was **RESOLVED, in principle**, that the rules should reflect current practice, but before a decision as to any amendment is settled, wider judicial **CONSULTATION** should take place to gain views as to whether the appellant's notice is to be sealed and views as to the timing of the respondent's notice. **Action:** Secretariat and DJ Clarke to prepare a consultation letter for circulation to the judiciary for comment. Timetable and list of consultees to be agreed with the Chair out-of-committee.

Item 3 Whiplash Sub-Committee: Claims under the Pre-Action Protocol for Personal Injury Claims below the Small Claims Limit in Road Traffic Accidents: proposed PAP and PD27B amendments CPR(24)36

8. His Honour Judge Bird introduced the matter. Scott Tubbritt (MoJ Policy) was welcomed to the meeting and presented the proposed changes, which were discussed.
9. It was explained that the Official Injury Claim (OIC) portal is the online system for bringing low-value RTA-related personal injury (Whiplash) claims. As of last month, over 897,000 claims had been registered on the OIC and circa 92,500 of those were brought by unrepresented claimants. Now that OIC has been operating for over three years, the MoJ is working with the Motor Insurance Bureau (MIB) to ensure that claims affected by the three-year limitation period are dealt with appropriately.
10. In consequence, a suite of technical amendments to the related PAP and PD were proposed to update the process for dealing with limitation affected road traffic accident-related personal injury claims. The changes support technical amendments being made as part of the OIC Autumn 2024 upgrade.
11. A discussion ensued, during which Mr Tubbritt answered questions, with contributions from Nicola Critchley (co-opted member of the whiplash sub-committee).
12. It was confirmed that the changes include providing claimants with regular reminders that limitation is approaching so that they can start a court claim if required, and a process whereby limitation affected claims are removed from OIC and archived. Such claims remain retrievable and can be reinstated on request.
13. The amendments ensure that the Court Pack loop is triggered for the issuing of claims for limitation and ensure the compensator is aware that such proceedings are to be issued. Where there is no response received the claimant can also now issue directly against the compensator where they do not have the defendant's address for service. Taken as a whole, the updates aim to enhance the process for both claimants and defendants.
14. It was **NOTED** that consultation had been undertaken over the summer with the sub-committee (comprising HHJ Bird (Chair), Nicola Critchley, Brett Dixon, John McQuater and DJ Hennessy) and agreed in principle.
15. It was **RESOLVED** to amend, as drafted, the Pre-Action Protocol for Personal Injury Claims below the Small Claims Limit in Road Traffic Accidents and PD 27B.
16. It was **FURTHER NOTED** that:
 - The Chair requested that the sub-committee consider whether the OIC service caters for claims where the Limitation Act period is not three years;

- Arrangements should be made for Ian Curtis-Nye and Elisabetta Sciallis (and any other members expressing an interest) to see the OIC portal in operation.

17. **Action:** (i) Secretariat and Drafting Lawyers to incorporate into the next mainstream CPR Update as part of the April 2025 common-commencement cycle, if not before (ii) MoJ and sub-committee to consider the above point regarding workability of system where limitation period is not three years (iii) MoJ to facilitate OIC demonstrations as requested.

Item 4 Simplification (Section 2(7)) Sub-Committee: Part 25 and Part 4 reforms CPR(24)37

18. Ben Roe presented the matter and a discussion followed.

19. It was explained that this suite of proposed reforms represented the final element of the simplification project, instigated by Mr Justice Kerr, during his period on the committee, to review and simplify Parts 1 to 30 of the CPR (broadly the generic parts of the CPR). This remaining element of that phase of the project represents a significant milestone. **THANKS** were conveyed to all concerned, including MoJ legal, for drafting the proposed suite of ancillary amendments in consequence of the reformed Part 25.

20. The substantive reforms to Part 25 have had several appearances before the committee. They have been subject to a public consultation (which closed in February 2024) and further internal consultation and refinement.

21. CPR Part 25 is an important and complex part of the CPR. It is currently supplemented by two PDs. Under the reforms, the whole of Part 25 has been restructured into a more logical order. The two PDs are, in effect, dispensed with, although some provisions have been relocated within the reformed rules. The public consultation also included a proposed revision to Part 4 (Forms) to provide that the term "forms" includes model orders. The amendment is also intended to make clear that unlike the standing position whereby a court form must not be varied, model orders, can be. Part 25 will also include a hyper link to the revised Model Search and Electronic Data Imaging Order to improve accessibility. The final, collective, suite of amendments were reviewed and discussed. As a result, various detailed drafting revisions were made to improve consistency and clarify.

22. Mr Justice Trower led the work to revise the Model Orders. The reforms intend to provide better consistency and make general updating improvements. The Technology and Construction Court's contact details have also been added to the contacts (communications) section of the Model Order, as proposed by Mr Justice Pepperall.

23. Feedback from a practitioner association drew attention to the drafting (at footnote 7 of the Model Order) regarding unaccompanied persons, which was discussed in detail. The legacy text expressly included "women", which is proposed for removal under the reforms. The new draft text was intended to respond to developments in society and to recognise that not all vulnerable people are women and indeed that not all women would see themselves as vulnerable. This is consistent with the approach of other rules and PDs (e.g. PD1A para 4). The drafting should not be perceived as diluting anyone's protective rights. When considering the order, the court's consideration will be fact specific and not limited to gender. The proposed amendment removes gender as being seen as the defining factor. Following careful consideration, a solution was proposed to remove the word, "vulnerable" from the proposed reformed text and this was **AGREED**; footnote 7 of the model order now being cast as follows:

"Where the respondent or another person at the premises is likely to be unaccompanied, the court must consider whether to direct that some other appropriate person accompany the Supervising Solicitor at all times while the order is carried out."

24. It was **RESOLVED** to approve, subject to final drafting:

- The reformed Part 25 (Interim Remedies and Security for Costs);
- Revocation of the supplementing PDs 25A and 25B;
- The revised Model Search and Imaging Order;
- The amendments to Part 4 (Forms);
- The suite of consequential amendments as drafted.

25. **Action:** Drafting Lawyers and Secretariat, in consultation with Ben Roe, to incorporate the reforms into the next mainstream CPR Update as part of the April 2025 in-force cycle.

Item 5 Part 42 Change of Solicitor CPR(24)38

26. Anthony Cox (MoJ Legal) was welcomed to the meeting and presented the matter.

27. It was explained that a modest amendment was required to bring Part 42 up to date. CPR (42.2(6)) provides for legally aided representatives to come off the court record by filing a prescribed notice that legal aid has been withdrawn, instead of having to make an application (whether or not still funded under legal aid) to the court. The current text only refers to the previous two legal aid Acts and not the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012, which now governs civil legal aid. It was **RESOLVED** to amend CPR 42.2(6) as drafted.

28. **Action:** Secretariat and Drafting Lawyers to incorporate into the next mainstream CPR Update as part of the April 2025 common-commencement cycle.

Item 6 Part 46 Costs orders in favour of or against non-parties CPR(24)39

29. Anthony Cox (MoJ Legal) explained the proposed clarificatory amendment was presented following experiences in practice, regarding the conditions under which the Lord Chancellor should be joined as a temporary party to proceedings, for the purposes of making an adverse non-party costs order. A brief discussion followed, wherein it was made clear that before a final decision was made, the Senior Costs Judge should be consulted. The matter was therefore **DEFERRED** pending said consultation.

30. **Action:** Secretariat to facilitate a discussion between Mr Cox and the Senior Costs Judge.

Item 7 PD 52E Appeals by way of Case Stated CPR(24)40

31. This matter was prepared by Siân Jones (HMCTS Head of Legal and Professional Services) who was excused from attending. The Secretariat explained that HMCTS have been working on amendments to the Magistrates' Courts Rules 1981 and one of the judicial consultees had pointed out an error in the CPR PD on case stated (PD 52E).

32. Currently PD 52E states that the "procedure for applying to the Crown Court or a magistrates' court to have a case stated for the opinion of the High Court is set out in the Criminal Procedure Rules". However, technically that is only the position for criminal proceedings. For civil proceedings in the magistrates' court, it's set out in the Magistrates' Courts Rules 1981 and for civil proceedings in the Crown Court, it is set out in the Crown Court Rules 1982.

33. A clarificatory amendment was, therefore, proposed and discussed.

34. Overall, the view was that the drafting could be improved, notwithstanding that the text is not really operative text, but essentially a signpost. It was also NOTED that the term, "civil proceedings" requires careful thought, because the CPRC has no jurisdiction for civil proceedings in the Magistrates' Courts or Crown Court.
35. It was **RESOLVED** to retain a signpost in the CPR and this **AGREE IN PRINCIPLE** to amend the CPR for clarificatory purposes, subject to final drafting.
36. **Actions:** (i) Anja Lansbergen-Mills to work with Alasdair Wallace to produce perfected drafting for the Chair's approval out-of-committee (or further direction) (ii) Secretariat and Drafting Lawyers to provisionally include in the next mainstream CPR Update.

Item 8 PD 51ZC Small Claims Paper Determination Pilot CPR(24)41

37. Faye Whates (HMCTS) was welcomed to the meeting and presented the matter, in furtherance of the report at the last meeting (paragraphs 39 to 47 of the July 2024 minutes refer).
38. It was explained that, overall, the pilot was generally going well. Quantitative evaluation remains ongoing for those cases proceeding in the pilot courts, alongside which research is underway with internal and external users who have been subject to the pilot. This is enabling qualitative findings to be considered alongside the analysis. However, there have been some challenges in obtaining volunteers to participate. Before formal recommendations can be made, further time is needed to complete the evaluation and equality impact assessment processes.
39. A discussion ensued.
40. In response to the points raised at the last meeting, it was explained that work was ongoing, but the initial findings indicated that although the digital system (OCMC) could allow for cases to be determined on their papers, it is not a specific feature of the live service and so further work should be undertaken to properly accommodate paper determinations, including the notifications that are sent to users. The enabling enhancements would be subject to funding and priority. The Damages and Money Claims Committee will also need to consider this further and anticipate the opportunity to provide comments as part of any CPRC consultation. This was duly **NOTED**, as were the Chair's comments reiterating that external stakeholders, such as the Bar Council, should also be provided the opportunity to comment on future proposals to reform the scheme. Ian Curtis-Nye emphasised his concerns regarding functionality of the digital system and the process for any potential objections being raised and determined; this was **NOTED** by HMCTS.
41. HMCTS were also considering whether legal adviser powers need to be extended and any implications in consequence of the planned expansion of the small claims automatic referral to mediation pilot, to include digital claims. Other practical considerations, such as revisions to the Directions Questionnaire (which was amended for the pilot), will also need to be undertaken.
42. It was **RESOLVED** to:
 - Extend the operative period of the current pilot scheme, PD 51ZC (Small Claims Paper Determination Pilot) which is due to expire at the end of November 2024, to the end of October 2025 and to **NOTE** that the committee is not minded to extend the pilot further;
 - Matter to return no later than the February 2025 meeting, in order to finalise the scope and content of a consultation and related amendments with a view to de-pilot the scheme.

43. **Action:** (i) Drafting Lawyers and Secretariat to include the extension in the next available (ad-hoc) PD Update (ii) HMCTS to complete their investigations etc and keep the Secretariat apprised for programming purposes and to report back to the CPRC when ready, no later than February 2025.

Item 9 Guidance on E-mailing the Court and related amendments to PD 5B CPR(24)42

44. Katie Fowkes (MoJ Legal) presented the matter, explaining that the work has been prompted by work undertaken between HMCTS and the Family Procedure Rule Committee to revise the family guidance. Hitherto, there was joint civil and family guidance, accessible via a link with the respective rules pages online. However, that has now been archived, although some information is still publicly available via the respective Court Guides. Nonetheless, the collective civil guidance requires updating. Once finalised, a decision on whether to refer, within the CPR, to the guidance on emailing the court.

45. It was **NOTED** that:

- The CPRC does not own the guidance, it is an HMCTS product;
- HMCTS are considering the technical and practical feasibilities of increasing the page limit for emails to the county court containing originating applications and increasing the limit of the size of emails including attachments that may be sent to the county court;
- The capacity of a court's IT system for receipt, should not determine what is appropriate to be sent to the court by email;
- Simplification and consistency should be applied, avoiding wherever possible, different practices in different courts;
- Care should be given to the phrase, "filing" because it has a particular meaning;
- Some consultation has taken place, for example, with the Damages and Money Claims Committee. However, further consultation was required, across the civil jurisdictions and in the context of the work reviewing PD 51O (e-working).

46. It was **RESOLVED** to:

- **DEFER** this matter to allow for further consultation and redrafting and
- **APPOINT** DJ Johnson, Master Sullivan, Anja Lansbergen-Mills and Ian Curtis-Nye to work with MoJ Legal and HMCTS to revise the guidance and any associated CPR amendments.

47. **Action:** MoJ Legal (Katie Fowkes) and HMCTS to engage with members to undertake the above work and keep the Secretariat apprised for programming purposes.

Item 10 CJC Costs Report – Costs Budgeting Light CPR(24)35

48. His Honour Judge Bird led the presentation, with contributions from Master Kaye who serves of the sub-committee, along with Nick Bacon KC, both of whom were welcomed to the meeting and received **THANKS** for their time and contributions. **THANKS** were also conveyed to Master Sullivan for her valuable input.

49. The matter was introduced at the June meeting (paragraphs 42 to 46 of the June 2024 minutes refer) one draft PD was tabled, but it was decided to separate out the categories

incorporated therein and cast a collection of draft PDs. This approach also better fits with the recommendations from the originating report on costs by the Civil Justice Council (in May 2023) which identified certain areas in which the appropriate costs management regime may be different from the norm and from one another, namely: (i) personal injury and clinical negligence work (covered by Qualified One-Way Costs Shifting (QOCS)) (ii) claims progressing in the Business and Property Courts (BPC) and (iii) other specialist work. For these areas, a “costs budgeting light” approach may have value.

50. The sub-committee have, therefore, prepared two new, draft, costs budgeting pilots. One for cases within the Business and Property Courts and one for certain other cases valued at under £1m. A new Precedent costs form is also proposed (currently referred to for drafting purposes as Precedent “Z”) and has been modelled on the existing Precedent H costs form.

51. A discussion ensued.

52. In explaining the new Precedent form, HHJ Bird highlighted that parts of the draft form had been populated to serve as a worked example; a guidance note also accompanied it, just as there is for the existing Precedent H form. The guidance note will be reviewed to ensure it addresses any residual questions from members. Reference was also made to the existing information in the Chancery Guide, which the sub-committee will also review.

53. Paragraph 9 of the draft BPC PD (currently referred to for drafting purposes as PD51ZG1) provides for where the court does not make a costs management order. Para 9(b) makes provisions concerning the filing and serving of an updated Precedent “Z”. It was **AGREED** to recast para 9(b) to include the text , “unless the court orders otherwise” in the interests of clarity.

54. It was **NOTED** that:

- The draft PDs do not yet specify geographical locations. The BPC Pilot is intended to cover the BPC of England and Wales (i.e. the Rolls Building) and at least two BPC District Registries. It should also cover Business and Property work in the county court at the same District Registries.
- The sub-committee anticipate very few claims will come within the under £1m Pilot. It should probably operate in at least two District Registries.
- Each Pilot maintains the exclusions set out in CPR 3.12 (including claims valued at £10m or more and claims brought by children) with the intention of limiting the changes.
- The BPC pilot provides (as a default position) for:
 - The new Precedent form to be filed in all cases by represented parties
 - no costs management in cases valued at or more than £1m
 - costs management using the new Precedent form in cases valued at less than £1m
- The non-BPC under £1m pilot mirrors the BPC under £1m position.
- Various implementation issues, such as the pilot courts, PD and Precedent numbering/labelling, commencement and duration of pilot scheme are yet to be finalised.
- Work continues on a pilot PD for QOCS cases.

55. It was **RESOLVED** to **approve in principle, subject to final drafting**, the two new draft PDs and supporting new draft Precedent costs form.
56. **Actions:** (i) Secretariat to provisionally schedule in time for the matter to return to the November meeting (ii) Sub-Committee to keep the Secretariat apprised for programming purposes.

Item 11 Any other business / possible items for future business:

57. The following was raised from the Chair:

58. **Law Commission consultation on contempt of court.** It was **NOTED** with thanks that the Law Commission has offered to meet with the committee to discuss the proposals, with a view to informing the development of their final recommendations for reform. The consultation closes on 8th November 2024; chapter 8 deals with procedure: <https://lawcom.gov.uk/law-commission-launches-consultation-on-contempt-of-court/>. It was **RESOLVED** to invite the Law Commission to attend the November meeting. **Action:** Secretariat to facilitate.
59. **Correspondence from member/s of the public.** Two items of correspondence from members of the public were duly **NOTED** with thanks and carefully considered. One concerned the usability of the CPR, raising points which relate to the simplification project and the other correspondent raised some points regarding totally without merit claims, which may benefit from further consideration as part of the review of Civil Restraint Orders; Ian Curtis-Nye and Elisabetta Sciallis will also provide any views, from the perspective of the lay user. The committee was also mindful that although it was the CPRC which makes the rules, it is the courts that apply and interpret the CPR. It is not the CPRC's function to comment on matters undergoing litigation or to engage with parties involved in matters before the courts, as to do so may undermine judicial independence. **Actions:** (i) Secretariat to respond to the correspondents (ii) Ian Curtis-Nye and Elisabetta Sciallis to feed in any observations to the CRO sub-committee (iii) Trower J to advise the Secretariat when the CRO sub-committee's report is ready to be programmed in for CPRC consideration.
60. **Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Amendments.** A publisher stakeholder had raised an enquiry regarding a possible missed cross reference in the drafting of the ADR amendments in the last CPR Update (the Civil Procedure (Amendment No.3) Rules 2024). The ADR Sub-Committee has considered and confirmed that, the intention is that the new ADR provisions apply in all courts. On that basis, the working assumption is that the issue has been with the difference between the Technology and Construction Court (TCC) and the Commercial Court/Circuit Commercial Court wording for the disapplication process. It is, therefore, proposed to amend the latter's disapplication wording to bring it into line with that of the TCC. By doing so, the Commercial Court/Circuit Commercial Court do not need to be singled out as courts in which the ADR provisions expressly apply (because they are intended to apply to all courts). It was **RESOLVED IN PRINCIPLE, subject to consultation with the Commercial Court judiciary** to remove the inconsistency by amending CPR 58/59. **Action:** Chair to consult the Commercial Court and Circuit Commercial Court.
61. **Valedictory Remarks – Alasdair Wallace (Government Legal Department).** The Chair was pleased to acknowledge the outstanding public service of Alasdair Wallace, who is due to retire from the Civil Service later this month after 38 years. Mr Wallace has enjoyed an extraordinary and exemplary career, latterly leading the team of government lawyers supporting the CPRC and the other jurisdictional rule committees. The Chair reflected fondly with several personal examples, such as the work connected with Brexit and the Covid-19 Pandemic response which illustrated Mr Wallace's combination of meticulous attention to detail and encyclopaedic knowledge of the law and legal process, recounting his sense of humour, his human touch and the deep respect in which he is held by so many. The sentiments were endorsed unanimously.

C B POOLE
October 2024

Attendees:

Carl Poole, Rule Committee Secretary
Kate Aujla, Deputy Committee Secretary
Nicola Critchley, Civil Justice Council
Amrita Dhaliwal, Ministry of Justice (MoJ)
Andy Caton, Judicial Office
Crystal Hung, Judicial Office
Alasdair Wallace, Government Legal Department (MoJ)
Andrew Currans, Government Legal Department (MoJ)
Katie Fowkes, Government Legal Department (MoJ)
Faye Whates, HM Courts & Tribunals Service
Scott Tubbritt, MoJ Policy (Item 3)
Anthony Cox, Government Legal Department (LAA) (Items 5 & 6)
Master Kaye (Item 10)
Nick Bacon KC (Item 10)