

Approved

Minutes of the Civil Procedure Rule Committee

Friday 4th April 2025, 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 (until item 7)
Master Sullivan
His Honour Judge Bird
His Honour Judge Hywel James
District Judge Clarke
District Judge Johnson
David Marshall
Dr Anja Lansbergen-Mills
Isabel Hitching KC
Tom Montagu-Smith KC
Ben Roe
Campbell Forsyth
Ian Curtis-Nye
Elisabetta Sciallis

Apologies

None

Item 1 Welcome

1. The Chair welcomed everyone and opened the meeting.
2. **Minutes of the last meeting:** The minutes of the last meeting, on 7th March 2025, were **AGREED**, subject to one clarificatory amendment to paragraph 3, regarding the updating of certain Court Guides.
3. **Action Log and any matters arising not covered by later items:** The following items were raised and **NOTED**:
 - **AL(25)26 – MoJ Memorandum to the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments (JCSI) re The Civil Procedure (Amendment) Rules 2025 S.I. number 2025/106 and the JCSI’s Eighteenth Report of Session 2024-25**
The MoJ’s response to the JCSI’s request for further information regarding the term “nominal claimant” as part of the new simplified Part 25 has been submitted to the JCSI who have concluded that, “*the term “nominal claimant” has a technical legal meaning which justifies not including a definition for the reasons given*”.
The MoJ response and the JCSI’s full report is available on the Parliament website: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/jt5901/jtselect/jtstatin/99/report.html>.
The Chair reiterated his appreciation to MoJ Drafting Lawyers for all their hard work and this was endorsed by the committee. It was **FURTHER NOTED** that being reported in this way is not necessarily a criticism, but rather that the point may not be clear to the general public, in which case, in future, further detail can be provided in the explanatory memorandum that accompanies each CPR amending SI.

- **AL(25)16 – Insolvency PD amendments in consequence of the revisions to the Foreign Process Section PD 6B and PD 43A (from the last meeting).** The Chancellor of the High Court’s private office has confirmed that the consequential amendment to the Insolvency PD will take place in due course. This may take some time, if it is decided to include it in a mainstream update along with other Insolvency related amendments. Such amendments also require the Lord Chancellor’s approval.

Item 2 Open Justice: Access to Court Documents CPR(25)18

4. Mrs Justice Cockerill was welcomed to the meeting.
5. The Chair made some introductory comments and expressed **THANKS** to the sub-committee, comprising Mrs Justice Cockerill (Co-opted Chair), His Honour Judge James, District Judge Clarke and Crystal Hung (Judicial Office) for their time and care on this important work. The natural overlap between this item and the review of PD 51O (item 3 below) was also observed.
6. It was explained that the impetus for this work was the UK Supreme Court judgment in *Cape Intermediate Holdings Ltd -v- Dring* [2019] UKSC 38 (see specifically, paragraphs 41-51 inclusive). A summary of the background was given. It was reiterated that the initial work was conducted by a multi-jurisdictional sub-committee to which Lord Justice Bean was co-opted as Chair; that sub-committee prepared a suite of proposed amendments for public consultation. The consultation took place in April 2024. Soon after, the work was paused to allow the Lady Chief Justice’s Open Justice and Transparency Board to commence its work. Sara Cockerill J serves on that Board and now leads the re-constituted CPRC sub-committee, which is considering the April 2024 consultation responses as part of its deliberations in formulating renewed proposals. This work is set in the wider context of the Lady Chief Justice’s broader agenda of looking at transparency issues and the MoJ’s open justice call for evidence; the work from which is still ongoing.
7. The aims and purpose of the pilot are to advance the principle of open justice in the civil courts by testing a relatively simple protocol which works within the Court’s existing systems. This is designed to maximise accessibility for the public without adding to the burden on court staff. It represents both a tempered approach and a more gradual introduction of changes than the earlier proposals. It will allow an acceptable and workable process to build gradually via phased pilots; shorten the feedback loop from lawyers, litigants, judges and other court users and essentially serves as a scoping tool for possible future work.
8. The sub-committee recommends a new draft pilot PD “access to public domain documents (PDD Pilot PD)” initially in the Commercial Court, London Circuit Commercial Court and the Financial List only, to provide public access, via CE-File, of certain documents.
9. A discussion and review of the drafting ensued. The importance of advancing the principles of open justice was emphasised, however the practical complexities were readily acknowledged, including the context for digitally excluded users.
10. It was **NOTED** that:
 - in addition to the April 2024 consultaion responses, the main practitioner groups (Commercial Bar Association, London Solicitors’ Litigation Association and City of London Law Society) have also been recently consulted;

- in response to a question concerning defamation - for example, whether, by taking something that was temporarily said in open court and creating a permanent record of it in a public document, presented liability risks - an indication was given that the Transparency Board did not consider there to be a material risk in this regard;
- a suite of drafting comments from MoJ legal had been provided out-of-committee and will be further considered by the sub-committee.

11. The Chair observed that the reforms are quite a radical change and was pleased that practitioner views had been considered as part of the sub-committee's work.

12. In response to various other points, it was **RESOLVED** that:

- paragraph 1 (scope) - litigants in person (LIP) should not be in scope of the pilot scheme at this stage;
- paragraph 1 (scope) – London Circuit Commercial Court (LCCC) be added to the list of courts in which the pilot scheme will operate;
- paragraph 5(a) (interpretation) – change “from” to “after” to make the filing period clear;
- paragraph 5(b) (interpretation) – recast to incorporate “in public” [hearing];
- recast the description of “Restriction Order” and consider incorporating an extra provision in regard to a Restriction Order, for judges to invite submissions, in appropriate cases;
- paragraph 7 (public domain documents) - include a description of “key document” to make clear this is a document that is essential to understand the hearing;
- move the text of draft paragraph 9 (for the avoidance of doubt...) to become paragraph 7(i) and recast to make clear the “hearing” is a hearing “in public”;
- review the potential inconsistency between paragraphs 10 and 11;
- change “fails” [to comply] to “does not” in the interest of clarity and simplicity;
- delete draft paragraph 12 because it is unnecessary;
- delete draft paragraph 15, because it merely paraphrases the law and the test in Cape -v- Dring, which does not need to be replicated in the PD;
- paragraph 16 (making a Restriction Order by the court's own initiative) - change “named” to “referred to” [in a Public Domain Document];
- paragraph 18 (determining a written request) - to be recast as it is just a statement and not an imperative rule;
- an ancillary guidance note is to be drafted, in doing so, consideration should be given to cover a point raised by Kelly Stricklin-Coutinho as regards any reference being made to illustrate the difference in practice (in the Court of Appeal) between the pilot and the practice set out in PD 52C.

13. It was **FURTHER RESOLVED**, subject to the above points and to final drafting and subject to clarification of the point regarding defamation liability risk, to approve in principle:
- a new pilot PD under CPR Part 51 (access to public domain documents PD);
 - pilot PD to operate in the Commercial Court, London Circuit Commercial Court and the Financial List with effect from 1st October 2025 for two years, unless varied;
 - a scheme to evaluate the operation of the pilot PD to be settled out-of-committee.
14. **Actions:** (i) Chair to commission advice on defamation risks out-of-committee (ii) In consultation with the Chair, the Sub-Committee and Drafting Lawyers are to finalise the guidance and pilot PD for incorporation into the next mainstream CPR Update cycle, which, subject to Ministerial approval, is due to be published in July as part of the October 2025 common-commencement date (iii) Sub-Committee to consider and propose plans to monitor and evaluate the operation of the pilot PD in practice.

Item 3 PD 51O E-Working Pilot CPR(25)17

15. The Chair provided some brief introductory remarks and expressed **THANKS** to Master Sullivan, Chancery Master Pester and Katie Fowkes (MoJ Legal) for all their hard work to date.
16. Master Sullivan presented the item, with input from Master Pester.
17. It was explained that the sub-committee has been working on proposals for a replacement to PD 51O (electronic working pilot scheme). The pilot PD commenced in November 2015 and has been incrementally revised and extended over this circa nine-year period. PD 51O is due to expire on 1st November 2025.
18. The proposed new rules and PD will regularise and standardise what has been happening with the use of CE-File; the new PD will make provision in the rules for CE-File. CE-File is the current filing and case management system in the High Court jurisdictions/District Registries and the Court of Appeal. At present it is not intended to make it mandatory in the PD for the Administrative Court Office.
19. Consultation with staff from different courts has taken place and is ongoing; this includes lawyers in the Court of Appeal and Administrative Court. Some other internal consultation has already taken place and has included the Senior Costs Judge.
20. It was **NOTED** that it is unlikely to be possible to fully future proof the rule/PD given that the landscape for digital reforms is evolving and a future replacement for CE-file is inevitable at some point. Nonetheless, the work may usefully inform the future state process. This rationale contributed to the sub-committee's view that the replacement scheme should be by way of PD rather than substantive rules because a PD provided more scope for flexible amendment in the event that the underlying system changed. The Chair agreed in principle, but tested this with the observation that as electronic working is now the norm, should it not be prescribed in the substantive rules. A discussion ensued in which Isabel Hitching KC referred to the work of the simplification project. On balance, it was concluded that the provisions were more about how the practice and procedure will work, which more naturally sits within a PD.

21. The proposed drafting, supporting destination table and case extracts were reviewed and discussed; various points of detail were **NOTED**. In summary, they comprise the interaction with wider work as regards open justice and access to court documents, to this end, a conscious decision has been made not to refer to the “court file”, as the purpose of these provisions is to provide for the filing and processing of documents at court. The handling of urgent applications and out of hours procedures were raised. Acceptance and rejection of court documents (and the categorisation thereof); Timing of filing/sealing and a potential workaround; Confidential documents; Litigants in Person and the digitally disadvantaged were also raised, as was the use of the word “must” in place of “shall”, to provide consistency and to better express an obligation.
22. It was **AGREED** that the proposed provisions concerning system downtime or failure of CE file (at proposed new paragraph 2.5) is to be recast to include, “with CE file” after “technical difficulty” and “the court gives” [instructions].
23. Security and the use of passwords was also raised, whereupon it was decided that the provision in the current PD 51O on security should not be retained in the replacement PD because it is essentially data protection policy rather than rule related and this was **AGREED**.
24. Other points of drafting detail were raised, including from Drafting Lawyers, some of which will be settled out-of-committee, other points were **RESOLVED** upon, as follows:
- remove 3.4(3)(e)(iii) under the paragraph setting out the circumstances when court staff can reject a submission. Mr Justice Pepperall highlighted a judge’s general power under CPR 3.10 to rectify an error of procedure;
 - retain the reference to fax, because it is still used in some Chancery Division matters.
25. It was **FURTHER RESOLVED to approve in principle**, the draft rule amendment to CPR 5.5 and a draft new PD 5C to replace the pilot scheme PD 51O, subject to:
- the revisions resolved upon above and to the final draft PD returning to the committee for further ratification, prior to inclusion in an CPR Update cycle;
 - consultation to include non-judicial system users, such as District Registry court staff, paralegals and the civil justice committee of the Law Society;
 - final draft PD to return in time to implement the new PD before PD 51O expires on 1st November 2025, otherwise a further extension will be required;
 - amend CPR 2.8(5) (time) to remove the out-of-date reference to a forerunner PD 5C, in consequence.
26. **Actions:** (i) In liaison with Master Sullivan (a) HHJ Bird to facilitate consultation with HMCTS District Registry staff (b) David Marshall, to facilitate consultation with the Law Society (ii) Secretariat to provisionally allocate time at the June 2025 CPRC meeting.

Item 4 Closed Material Procedure CPR(25)14

27. Chloe Wood (Ministry of Justice) was welcomed to the meeting.

28. At the November 2024 meeting (paragraphs 16 to 23 of those minutes refer), officials provided an introductory presentation on the proposals recommended by the independent report on closed material procedure (CMP) by Sir Duncan Ouseley. In consequence, it was resolved to appoint District Judge Clarke to provide input to the official level working group to draft the amendments. Lord Justice Singh has also provided input out-of-committee. Additionally, MoJ have undertaken consultaion with practitioners, including the Government Legal Department Litigation teams, HMG Advocates and Special Advocates. This was duly **NOTED** and **THANKS** were conveyed to all concerned.
29. It was explained that the proposed draft amendments to CPR 82.23 (directions for hearing of an application) essentially reflect existing practice, but which is not formally recognised in the rules. By doing so, it provides consistency, understanding and gives effect to recommendation 4 in the Ouseley Report, namely to make provision as to the circumstances in which the court may direct the relevant person to provide a draft closed defence or draft closed summary when determining an application for a declaration under section 6(2) of the Justice and Security Act 2013.
30. It is not intended that the amended rule should become standard practice in determining Section 6 applications, as this may cause unnecessary delays to proceedings and this was **NOTED**.
31. Various drafting points had been raised by DJ Clarke and each was reviewed and resolved upon.
32. It was **RESOLVED to approve, subject to the following and to final drafting**, the amendments to CPR Part 82, to give effect to recommendation 4 from the 2022 Independent Report on the Operation of Closed Material Procedure under the Justice and Security Act 2013 (the Ouseley Report):
- adoption of the additional text in square brackets [] as proposed by DJ Clarke to the new sub rule 1A under CPR 82.23, in the interest of clarity: thus:

(1A) If the court considers that it is necessary before it can determine whether to make a declaration under section 6(2) of the Act, it may, on application or of its own motion, direct the relevant party to file—
a draft [response] document, addressing the matters directed by the court (“a draft closed summary”); or
having first considered whether a draft closed summary is sufficient to determine the matter, a draft defence or response, as appropriate, to one or more of the grounds identified in the claim [, together with such further directions as to its content as the court considers appropriate] (“a draft closed defence”).
 - clarifying the use of the word, “draft”. When this phrase is used in the Ouseley Report, caselaw is cited and should therefore be looked at. The Chair's preference is to avoid the use of “draft” if appropriate because it may suggest a later version will be produced. If it is to be used, suitable elucidation should be given in the rule amending instrument's supporting explanatory memorandum. This was **NOTED** by officials.
33. It was **FURTHER NOTED**:
- that Government intends to enact the amendments by way of a standalone statutory instrument, so that they come into force in July 2025. However, if that is

not possible, then they can be included in the usual mainstream CPR update as part of the October 2025 common-commencement cycle;

- further work is ongoing as regards actions against the remaining recommendations in the Ousley Report and on which officials will return to the CPRC in due course.

34. **Actions:** (i) MoJ promulgate their standalone SI as they see fit and to cover the above point regarding “draft” in the SI’s EM if needed (ii) MoJ to advise Drafting Lawyers and Secretariat by 6th June 2025 if the amendments need to be included in the mainstream CPR Update

Item 5 Lacuna Sub-Committee CPR(25)15 (LSC2025/2)

35. Dr Anja Lansbergen-Mills presented the matter.

36. It was explained that Chief Chancery Master Shuman raised the issue with the sub-committee. The matter concerns Beddoe Applications (costs to be met from a trust fund in appropriate cases).

37. It was proposed to amend PD 64B (applications to the court for directions by trustees in relation to the administration of the trust), in effect, by substituting a new paragraph 7.11, to reflect practice in Beddoe applications by (i) accurately conveying the (differing) jurisdictions of Masters and District Judges to dispose of *Beddoe* applications and (ii) identifying the usual practice adopted by Masters and (iii) to bring it up to date, by removing outdated cross-references to PD 2B.

38. Drafting Lawyers pointed out that the proposed cross reference to, “paragraph 6” (“*A Master may give the directions sought, whether at a hearing or on paper pursuant to paragraph 6.....*”) required further consideration because there was no paragraph 6 in PD 64B, but rather a collection of paragraphs: 6.1; 6.2 and 6.3. The committee considered whether to be specific or retain a general reference. It was **AGREED** that as it was a signpost only it was acceptable to retain the general reference to paragraph 6.

39. It was **RESOLVED to approve, subject to consultation with the Chancellor of the High Court, relevant Chancery Masters and to final drafting:**

- the proposed amendment to PD 64B (applications to the court for directions by trustees in relation to the administration of the trust).

40. **Actions:** (i) Mr Justice Trower to consult the Chancellor (ii) Sub-Committee to consult Masters as needed (iii) Subject to satisfactory consultation, the Secretariat and Drafting Lawyers to include in the next mainstream CPR Update as part of the 1st October 2025 common-commencement date cycle.

41. **Post-Meeting Note:** *Chancellor of the High Court is content with the amendments.*

Item 6 Judicial Review Changes for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects CPR(25)16

42. Isabel Hitching KC **DECLARED A PERSONAL INTEREST**, in that a close family member is employed by East West Railway Co Limited and has a leadership role in the Development Consent Order (‘DCO’) process for the Oxford to Cambridge rail project. This was duly **NOTED**. Ms Hitching KC did not participate in the discussion or determination of

this matter and confirmed that she will not participate in any discussions or decisions at future meetings either; this was also **NOTED WITH THANKS**.

43. The Chair made some introductory remarks.

44. Lam Tran (Ministry of Justice) was welcomed to the meeting, along with Jennifer Tugman (MoJ Legal). It was explained that Government proposes a suite of amendments in response to the recommendations made in Lord Banner KC's independent review and on which there has been a call for evidence. Draft primary legislation is currently before Parliament. The reforms include: (i) judicial review provisions for the removal of the paper permission stage for judicial reviews of certain planning decisions and removes the right to appeal for cases deemed totally without merit at the oral permission hearing and (ii) supplementary proposals concerning the introduction of target timescales in the Court of Appeal and for case management conferences in nationally significant infrastructure judicial reviews.

45. It was **NOTED** that the overall aim is for Royal Assent in October 2025, however, the CPR provisions in the Bill are not tied to Royal Assent and expected to be commenced via separate Regulations, meaning there is some flexibility on the commencement date, although there is an eagerness from Government to finalise the CPR amendments. The Chair acknowledged this and said that the committee will endeavour to act with characteristic pace, but cautioned that it was unusual for drafting to be settled without a minimum of two substantive appearances before the committee.

46. It was **RESOLVED to:**

- **agree in principle** to amend the CPR in consequence of the reforms;
- **establish a sub-committee** to consider draft amendments. Mr Justice Pepperall was duly appointed to serve on the sub-committee, other members will be assigned as necessary, out-of-committee. The Planning Liaison Judge and/or the Judge in Charge of the Administrative Court will be co-opted, subject to any outstanding consultation with the President of the King's Bench Division.

47. **Actions:** (i) In consultation with the relevant judges, MoJ officials to settle sub-committee membership and convene the sub-committee (ii) Secretariat to provisionally timetable in time for the May, June and July meetings (iii) MoJ to keep the Secretariat apprised for programming purposes.

Item 7 Paper Determination of Small Claims Consultation (Pilot PD 51ZC)

48. This item follows the last meeting on 7th March (paragraphs 16 - 21 of those minutes refer). Upon presentation of HMCTS' evaluation of the operation of PD 51ZC (at the 7th March meeting), it was agreed in principle, not to extend the pilot PD beyond its current operative term (31st October 2025) and not to mandate small claim paper determination. However, the opportunity to determine small claims on paper in appropriate cases was considered to have utility and the CPR should be amended to expressly provide the option for a judge to give directions for a matter to be determined on the papers if deemed appropriate, without the consent of all parties.

49. District Judge Johnson explained that the post implementation sub-committee comprising herself, Elisabetta Sciallis and Ben Roe, have held a preliminary discussion and carried out an initial review of the pilot PD. DJ Johnson has volunteered to Chair the sub-committee and this was **AGREED WITH THANKS**.

50. The sub-committee sought clarity on whether their task was to prepare a consultation on the principle or to prepare a draft set of amendments for consultation.
51. **A STEER was provided:** the sub-committee should prepare the draft amendments and revert to the committee prior to consultation. The expectation is that the new rules will be incorporated into Part 27 (small claims track) and they will look quite different from the pilot PD. However, as agreed at the last meeting, the temporary changes to the Directions Questionnaire (form N180) will be retained, duly revised to remove any reference to the pilot.
52. **Actions:** (i) DJ Johnson and the sub-committee, with input from MoJ legal, HMCTS and the Secretariat, to prepare (a) the draft amendments and (b) the associated draft consultation material, as soon as practicable (ii) Secretariat to provisionally schedule in time for the June 2025 meeting.

Item 8 Any other business / possible items for future business

53. The following items were raised from the Chair and duly **NOTED**:
54. **Part 75 and PD 75 (Traffic Enforcement).** His Honour Judge Ranson is reviewing the traffic enforcement rules and although this does not have any fixed timetable, it will be allocated agenda time in due course.
55. **CPRC meetings for 2026.** The calendar of committee meetings for 2026 is being finalised and will be circulated to members shortly. It should be noted that Easter 2026 means that there are likely to be two meetings in March. **Action:** Secretariat to circulate meeting dates when finalised.
56. **Justice Select Committee's Inquiry into the County Court.** The MR and Deputy Head of Civil Justice gave evidence to the Justice Select Committee's Inquiry into the work of the County Court on 18th March 2025 at the Houses of Parliament. A wide range of issues, including rules of court, the advantages of digitisation, efforts to reform the courts, judicial recruitment, mediation and the use of artificial intelligence were covered. A video of the evidence can be watched on Parliament TV:
<https://parliamentlive.tv/event/index/c6667ebe-da49-4ac2-a145-1d7a00983769>.
The MoJ Minister, Sarah Sackman KC MP, is due to give evidence on 8th April 2025.
57. **Annual open meeting.** Arrangements and programming for the next meeting in May, where members of the public are invited to observe the committee in session and have pre-submitted questions answered, are progressing well. A brief around up was provided.
58. **Costs Sub-Committee.** An emerging item of future business is to be raised with the sub-committee prior to formal presentation at a future meeting. **Action:** Officials to discuss with the Secretariat for onward referral to Mr Justice Trower and the Costs Sub-Committee as needed.
59. **Correspondence.** Various items of correspondence were considered and **NOTED**, covering the following topics:
- **The application of Part 35 (experts and assessors)** was raised by an expert witness. It was confirmed that the fee (of £80.00 plus VAT) is fixed within the CPR as it is considered to be a just and proportionate figure in appropriate cases. However, it highlighted whether Government should review the figures, possibly as part of the upcoming extending fixed recoverable costs stock take.

- **Third Party Disclosure and a possible amendment to CPR 31.16** (disclosure before proceedings start). The Association of Personal Injury Lawyers (APIL) proposed a rule to enable the court to make an order for pre-action non-party disclosure. The preliminary view was that the committee did not have the vires to make the amendment being proposed, because the statutory powers to make pre-issue disclosure orders are in s.52 County Courts Act 1984 and s.33 Senior Courts Act 1981, which are limited to orders against prospective parties and refer to a "... person who appears to be likely to be a party..." . This is why CPR 31.16 (which is concerned with disclosure before proceedings start) is limited to persons likely to be a party to subsequent proceedings. Section 53 Senior Courts Act and s.34 County Courts Act relate to third party disclosure, but they are limited to applications "in proceedings". Accordingly, CPR 31.17, which is about disclosure from a "person not a party", is written by reference to "the proceedings" because there have to be proceedings on foot for the power under those sections to be exercised. In the absence of a rule making power under the Civil Procedure Act 1997, a rule of the kind which appears to be proposed, would be ultra vires.
- **Credit Hire Standard Directions (SDO).** A claimant solicitor and professional trainer has raised some points regarding the Damages Claims Portal SDOs in credit hire cases and PD16 (statements of case) which require further review.

60. **Actions:** (i) MoJ to consider whether the FRC stock take is a suitable opportunity to conduct a review of the Part 35 fixed fees (ii) Enquiry regarding Credit Hire SDOs to be referred via HMCTS to the Damages and Money Claims Committee Chair (iii) Secretariat to relay above outcomes to respective correspondents.

61. **Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).** The Chair reiterated that the committee was listed as a public authority under Schedule I of the Act, notwithstanding that the committee is sponsored by the MoJ. Internal processes will be reviewed to ensure that this is clear to anyone participating in sub-committee work as a co-opted member. Any FOIA requests made to members or co-opted members should be referred to the Secretariat and this should be done promptly given the statutory timelines prescribed. **Action:** Secretariat to discuss with the Chair and MoJ out-of-committee.

Next meeting: 9th May 2025 (annual open meeting)

C B POOLE
April 2025

Attendees:

Carl Poole, Committee Secretary
Kate Aujla, Deputy Committee Secretary & Policy Adviser
Kelly Stricklin-Coutinho (new member - observing)
Nichola Critchley, Civil Justice Council (observer)
Andy Caton, Judicial Office
Crystal Hung, Judicial Office
Amrita Dhaliwal, Ministry of Justice (MoJ)
Andrew Currans, Government Legal Department (MoJ)
Katie Fowkes, Government Legal Depart (MoJ)
Faye Whates, HM Courts & Tribunals Service (HMCTS)
Smita Shah, Judicial Office - Chancellor of the High Court's Private Office
Mrs Justice Cockerill (Item 2)
Chancery Master Iain Pester (Item 3)
Chloe Wood, MoJ (Item 4)

Lam Tran, MoJ (Item 6)

Jennifer Tugman, Government Legal Depart (MoJ) (Item 6)

Daniel Spillman, Judicial Office - President of the King's Bench Division's Private Office (Item 6)