



Ministry of Justice

FAMILY PROCEDURE RULE COMMITTEE

At 11:00 a.m. – 13:00 pm on Monday 15 June 2026,
Hybrid, in person at Royal Courts of Justice and online via Teams

Present:

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| • Sir Stephen Cobb | President of the Family Division |
| • Mr Justice Keehan | High Court Judge (Chair) |
| • Mr Justice Peel | High Court Judge |
| • Her Honour Judge Suh | Circuit Judge |
| • District Judge Foss | District Judge (County) |
| • Poonam Bhari | Barrister |
| • Jennifer Kingsley JP | Magistrate |
| • Shabana Jaffar | Cafcass |
| • District Judge Cassidy | District Judge |
| • Helen Sewell | Legal Advisor |
| • Lord Justice Baker | Court of Appeal Judge |
| • District Judge Nelson | District Judge (Magistrates) |
| • His Honour Judge Humphreys | Circuit Judge - Judicial Member for Wales |
|
• Laura Coyle |
Solicitor |
| • Sophie Crowley | Cafcass Cymru |
| • Rhys Taylor | Barrister |
| • Vicki Mulligan | Lay person |

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND APOLOGIES

1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted apologies from District Judge Cassidy, District Judge Nelson, His Honour Judge Humphreys, Shabana Jaffar and Graeme Fraser.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

2. The Committee considered and approved the minutes of the May 2026 meeting

Action Point [1]: Secretariat to arrange for the May 2026 minutes to be published on the relevant FPRC webpage.

ACTIONS LOG

3. The Committee noted that 24 actions points were recorded from the May 2026 Committee meeting with 14 of those having been actioned and marked as completed.

MATTERS ARISING

- 4.1 The Secretariat tabled a paper which contained updates on the following:

Register of Members' Interests (2024–2025)

- 4.2 The Secretariat confirmed that the Register covering the 2024–2025 reporting period has been compiled and will be published on GOV.UK following the June 2026 meeting.

- 4.3 The Secretariat will now invite members to complete declarations for the 2025–2026 Register, which will inform the next Annual Report. Members who have already completed and returned declarations for the 2024–2025 reporting period will not be required to resubmit for 2025–2026 unless there has been a change that should be reflected in the updated Register.

- 4.4 The Secretariat will share the draft FPRC Annual Report 2025–2026 for the Committee's comments at the July 2026 meeting.

Action Point [2]: Secretariat to share the draft FPRC Annual Report for 2025–2026 with the Committee at the July 2026 meeting.

Confidentiality of Parties' Contact Details (Rule 29.1) Form amendments

- 4.5 Officials reminded the Committee that amendments to rule 29.1 FPR, agreed in October 2025 in response to concerns about the disclosure of parties' contact details, came into force on 1 June 2026.

- 4.6 Officials further confirmed that revised versions of the relevant forms were implemented in English by HMCTS on 1 June 2026 and that work is underway to complete Welsh language versions, with implementation scheduled for 30 June 2026.

Jade's Law

OFFICIAL

- 4.7 Officials reminded the Committee that at the May 2026 meeting it agreed to proceed with a targeted stakeholder consultation.
- 4.8 Officials confirmed that the consultation had launched on 12 May 2026 and will run until 22 June 2026.
- 4.9 Officials noted that they will return to the Committee in July 2026 with a summary of responses and any proposed amendments to the draft provisions. District Judge Foss highlighted that the Association of District Judges had been granted an extension to the 2 July 2026 to respond.

Action Point [3]: Officials to bring summary of consultation responses in relation to the implementation of Jade's Law, with any proposed amendments to the draft provisions, at the July 2026 meeting.

Victims and Courts Act 2026

- 4.10 Officials noted that the Victims and Courts Act 2026 ('the VAC Act 2026') received Royal Assent on 29 April 2026.
- 4.11 Officials further noted that the VAC Act 2026 includes provisions relating to the restriction of the exercise of parental responsibility. These provisions will be commenced at a later date and policy officials have begun work on implementation so will engage with the Committee as this progresses.
- 4.12 Lord Justice Baker queried how many cases will be expected. Officials noted that an impact assessment has been prepared during the Bill stages of the VAC Act 2026 with estimates, but that given the difficulty in modelling perpetrator behaviour the figure does not indicate how many of those cases will lead to family proceedings.

Action Point [4]: Secretariat circulate the Impact Assessment in relation to the Victims and Courts Bill to the Committee.

Mediation Vouchers

- 4.13 Officials reminded the Committee that pilot Practice Direction 36V was extended by Practice Direction Update No.1 of 2026 to 31 March 2029 and confirmed that funding for the Mediation Voucher Scheme has now been secured until March 2027.
- 4.14 Decisions on funding allocations for the remainder of the Spending Review period (i.e. until 2029), including funding for the continuation of the Mediation Voucher Scheme, are ongoing. Officials will provide further updates when further decisions are made.

SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

FINANCIAL REMEDIES TRANSPARENCY ORDERS

OFFICIAL

- 5.1 The Committee was updated on consultation responses and the proposed approach to transparency in financial remedy proceedings.
- 5.2 Officials explained that the policy intention is to introduce a new rule, rule 9.47 FPR, which will act as a “hook” rule to underpin subsequent practice directions. It was noted that this approach differs from the children transparency model, as the rule will be introduced first to ensure that the statutory instrument, practice direction and rule framework are aligned ahead of the end of the current pilot in January 2027.
- 5.3 Officials summarised the consultation responses, noting that there was a clear divergence of views. Stakeholders with a transparency or media focus favoured broader access to information and more permissive reporting arrangements. In contrast, organisations focused on child welfare preferred a more cautious, case-by-case approach to disclosure.
- 5.4 It was also noted that some consensus had emerged, including concerns regarding access for non-UK accredited media and the risks associated with unrestricted onward sharing of information.
- 5.5 During discussion, members raised concerns regarding the legal framework governing disclosure prior to the making of a transparency order. In particular, it was noted that, in financial remedy proceedings, there may be fewer statutory protections in place compared to other jurisdictions. This raised concerns about the risk of inappropriate disclosure.
- 5.6 Mr Justice Peel indicated a provisional preference for maintaining a case-by-case approach to pre-transparency order disclosure, subject to further analysis of consultation responses. The Committee agreed that further work is required before a final position is reached.
- 5.7 The Committee also noted that a relevant Court of Appeal case is forthcoming. It was discussed that the timing of that case may affect the Committee’s work and could necessitate extension of the pilot if time is needed to consider the implications of the judgment before making any new practice direction provision.
- 5.8 Officials were asked to undertake further analysis of consultation responses, to continue policy development, and to bring draft proposals, including a draft practice direction, back to the Committee for consideration at the October meeting. It was also agreed that a Financial Remedy working group should be established, or that financial remedy experts should join the existing Information Sharing and Transparency Working Group to support this work.

Action Point [5]: Officials to undertake further analysis of consultation responses, continue policy development, and bring forward draft proposals, including a draft Practice Direction, for the Committee’s consideration at the October 2026 meeting. Officials to consider whether to establish or utilise a Financial Remedy working group to support this work. Officials to ensure His Honour Judge Edward Hess is invited to the existing Information Sharing and Transparency Working Group.

INFORMATION SHARING AND TRANSPARENCY WORKING GROUP

OFFICIAL

- 6.1 The Committee received an update on the progress of the Information Sharing and Transparency Working Group (“the Group”), including emerging policy issues and proposed next steps.
- 6.2 Officials explained that the Group has been testing early policy proposals relating to the disclosure of information from children proceedings. This work is focused on two principal objectives: enabling appropriate information sharing to safeguard children and vulnerable adults and ensuring that information is available to support child welfare within proceedings.
- 6.3 Officials advised that further work is required in a number of areas, including the development of appropriate thresholds for disclosure, the definition of key terms, the treatment of onward disclosure, and the interaction of any new framework with existing legal duties and protections. It was emphasised that this work raises complex questions, including compatibility with data protection requirements and the existing statutory framework governing family proceedings.
- 6.4 During discussion, the Chair raised a related issue concerning a point on rule 12.73 FPR which had been flagged with the Committee by Sir Nicholas Mostyn and queried how far the workstream on this issue had progressed. Officials noted this fell across a few workstreams and that they would provide further clarification either directly or via the Secretariat, to clarify how the issue is being taken forward within the work of the Group.
- 6.5 The Committee agreed that it would not be appropriate to move to detailed drafting at this stage, given the number of unresolved policy and legal issues. Instead members agreed work should focus on the development of a coherent and workable policy framework, with detailed drafting to follow once the key principles have been settled.
- 6.6 Officials confirmed that further work will be undertaken over the summer, with the Group expected to reconvene in September 2026. A further update, including proposed next steps, will be brought to the Committee at the October 2026 meeting.

Action Point [6]: Officials to undertake further legal and policy analysis over the summer, including consideration of thresholds for disclosure, interaction with existing legal frameworks, and the position of adults disclosing information about proceedings to which they were subject as children.

Action Point [7]: Officials to consider the r12.73 FPR point referenced by the Chair and confirm how the issues raised will be addressed within the work of the Group.

Action Point [8]: Officials to reconvene the Information Sharing and Transparency Working Group in September 2026 and provide a further update to the Committee at the October 2026 meeting.

FAMILY PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) RULES 2026 AND PRACTICE DIRECTION NO. 3 OF 2026

- 7.1 Officials invited the Committee to agree the Family Procedure (Amendment) Rules 2026 (“the 2026 Rules”) and, if content, to sign a hard copy at the meeting. The Committee indicated that it was content with the substantive amendments proposed. Committee members present at the meeting signed the 2026 Rules.

OFFICIAL

7.2 Officials confirmed that the 2026 Rules will be submitted to Baroness Levitt with a view to being laid before Parliament on 29 June 2026.

7.3 The Committee was also invited to note the Practice Direction Update and to agree that it be submitted to the President of the Family Division and subsequently to the Minister, subject to any necessary amendments. The Committee confirmed that it was content to proceed on that basis.

Action Point [9]: Secretariat to progress submission of the 2026 Rules to Baroness Levitt for laying before Parliament and to arrange submission of Practice Direction Update No.3 of 2026 to the President of the Family Division and the Minister following finalisation.

7.4 As part of consideration of Practice Direction Update No. 3 of 2026 the Committee considered the proposed drafting of the “signposts” to be inserted in various Practice Directions relating to the disclosure protocol between family and criminal jurisdictions. District Judge Foss noted that the proposed drafting refers explicitly to the “2024 Protocol” but that, because the Protocol is subject to periodic revision, referring to a specific year risks requiring repeated amendment to Practice Directions in order to remain up to date.

7.5 The Committee agreed that the drafting should refer to the current version of the Protocol but also noted the importance of ensuring that the title and reference used are sufficiently clear to avoid ambiguity where multiple protocols may exist.

7.6 The Committee noted that this item is not expected to return for further consideration unless substantive issues arise. It was agreed that an update will be provided via Matters Arising once the Rules have been laid and the Practice Direction has been signed.

Action Point [10]: Officials to revise the Practice Direction amendment drafting to refer to the “current version” of the disclosure protocol, ensuring that the reference remains sufficiently clear and avoids ambiguity.

NOTIFICATION OF FGM PROTECTION ORDERS AND FORCED MARRIAGE PROTECTION ORDERS TO THE POLICE: PD11A AMENDMENTS

8.1 The Committee received an update on the system for notifying the police of Forced Marriage Protection Orders and FGM Protection Orders. It was noted that, from 26 October 2026, orders are to be sent to a new central email address: acroprotectionorders@acro.police.uk, with notifications of service to be sent to local police forces.

8.2 Officials explained that ACRO will be responsible for routing orders to the relevant local police force for the protected person and, where directed by the court, to the respondent’s local police force.

OFFICIAL

- 8.3 The Committee noted that notifications of orders varying, extending or discharging a protection order are to be sent by the court to the relevant local police force(s), and that notifications of service are to be sent by the applicant's legal representative (or by the court where it has effected service) in the same way.
- 8.4 The Committee noted that, following a query raised at the May meeting by HHJ Suh, officials have amended the Practice Direction to clarify that HMCTS will provide to applicants the relevant police email address for notifying the police when an order has been served.
- 8.5 The Committee agreed with proposed amendments and confirmed the amendments should be included in the forthcoming practice direction update, with commencement on 26 October 2026

Action point [11]: Officials to include the agreed amendments to Practice Direction 11A in Practice Direction Update No.3 of 2026.

CHILD FOCUSED COURTS: FINALISING PROPOSED PD AMENDMENTS

- 9.1 The Committee considered proposed amendments to Practice Direction 12B (Pilot), annexed to PD36Z, intended to align the Practice Direction with agreed operational practice, following earlier discussion at the April 2026 meeting.
- 9.2 The Committee was invited to agree the proposed amendments. It was noted that further amendments, including the addition of new court areas due to implement the model later in 2026 (subject to readiness), will be brought back to the Committee in due course.
- 9.3 District Judge Foss highlighted a number of provisions within the Practice Direction where references are made to operational practice which is now out of date. The Committee agreed that detailed work is required through the Children's Working Group, including a wider review of the Practice Direction and consideration of those issues raised by the Committee. This should include identifying and updating provisions where the language is now out of date or does not accurately reflect current operational practice.
- 9.4 Jennifer Kingsley JP raised concerns regarding success of contacting the parties by telephone (in relation to draft wording in the proposed new paragraph 8.10A of PD12B (Pilot)), noting that there are a significant number of safeguarding letters under the Child Arrangements Programme where attempts to contact parties have been unsuccessful. Mrs Justice Knowles highlighted that under the Child Focused Model multiple attempts to contact litigants will be made, following the offer of a telephone appointment within the application letter. If these attempts are unsuccessful, the court will send a letter. The Committee agreed that this process is not currently well reflected in the drafting and should be considered further by the Children's Working Group as part of the review.

Action Point [12]: The Children's Working Group to consider operational issues relating to unsuccessful contact with litigants in person and whether these should be addressed within the Practice Direction.

- 9.5 HHJ Suh raised concerns in relation to draft new paragraph 14.3A of PD12B (Pilot), drawing attention to the current drafting which permits a social work agency to note they

OFFICIAL

have not shared the Child Impact Report (CIR) with a/the party/ies and to request that the court consider withholding it. HHJ Suh expressed concern that, at times, report authors do not provide an adequate explanation of the risk of disclosing the report, with notifications simply stating that the report has not been sent.

- 9.6 The Committee agreed that this creates difficulty for the court, which may be required to determine whether a CIR should be disclosed without sufficient information as to the nature of the alleged risk. It was emphasised that the drafting should reflect that any request to withhold a report must clearly articulate the identified risk and provide sufficient information to enable the court to make an informed decision. Requests to withhold could also include recommendations that only parts of the CIR be redacted.

Action Point [13]: Officials and the Children’s Working Group to consider revising paragraph 14.3A of PD12B (Pilot) to clarify the threshold for withholding Child Impact Reports and to require clear articulation of the risk relied upon to support any non-disclosure.

- 9.7 The Committee considered whether the current title used within the Practice Direction remains appropriate. Lord Justice Baker queried whether the reference to “Child Focused Courts” should be reflected more clearly in the title, while the Chair noted that the terminology is now established and is being adopted in practice.

- 9.8 The Committee also discussed the proposed wording regarding CIRs being, effectively, the same as a report under section 7 of the Children Act 1989. MoJ Policy and Legal noted that a CIR is intended to fulfil the statutory requirements of a report under section 7, although the template used for CIRs by Cafcass differs in format from what Cafcass use for a “section 7 report” under the Child Arrangements Programme. Officials emphasised that, notwithstanding differences in format or terminology (including Cafcass/Cymru templates), there is no distinction in legislative terms and so the purpose of the proposed amendments was to stress that section 7 report should not be ordered alongside or instead of CIR (or vice versa) under the Child Focused Model. The Committee agreed that the drafting should be clarified to avoid ambiguity on this equivalence.

Action Point [14]: Officials to clarify drafting in relation to the status of Child Impact Reports so that it is clear they fulfil the requirements of section 7 of the Children Act 1989.

- 9.9 DJ Foss raised a question regarding the potential inclusion of indicative timeframes for filing a CIR, noting that normal practice is for the deadline to be eight weeks from the application receipt. Mrs Justice Knowles acknowledged that the expectation is that CIRs will be filed within eight weeks but highlighted the value of flexibility in response to local circumstances which can warrant temporary variation of the deadlines. The Committee agreed that it remains preferable not to include rigid timeframes within the Practice Direction, in order to preserve flexibility and allow for extension where necessary.
- 9.10 The Committee discussed provisions in paragraph 22.3 of PD12B (Pilot) relating to judicial continuity, including in partially heard cases before lay justices. It was noted that existing drafting may not sufficiently emphasise the importance of continuity of judicial oversight. The President indicated support for strengthening the drafting to ensure that continuity is maintained wherever possible, while recognising operational constraints.

OFFICIAL

Action Point [15]: Officials to consider whether further drafting changes are required to strengthen provisions relating to judicial continuity, including in part-heard cases.

9.11 The Committee agreed that, subject to the revisions identified, the proposed amendments could be included in the next Practice Direction Update, if they are finalised in time.

Action Point [16]: The Children's Working Group to reconvene and undertake a full review of Practice Direction 12B (Pilot), including updating outdated language and ensuring alignment with current operational practice.

PD36ZI – Pilot Scheme: Notification to the police when certain orders are made under Part 4 of the Family Law Act 1996

The Committee was reminded that, at the May 2026 meeting, it approved the extension of Practice Direction 36ZI for a further year, from 14 July 2026 to 13 July 2027.

10.1 Officials confirmed that recent technical enhancements now enable orders to be extracted from the private law digital service (Manage Cases), including the ability to extract the applicant's date of birth.

10.2 Due to this, officials invited the Committee to approve the sharing of this additional data (the applicant's date of birth), where available, with the police. It was noted that, subject to agreement, this amendment will be incorporated into Practice Direction 36ZI and included in Practice Direction Update No. 3 of 2026.

10.3 The Committee confirmed that it was content for the amendment to be included in Practice Direction Update No. 3 of 2026.

Action Point [16]: Officials to incorporate provision for the sharing of the applicant's date of birth, where available, into Practice Direction 36ZI as part of Practice Direction Update No. 3 of 2026.

DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION BETWEEN FAMILY AND CRIMINAL AGENCIES AND JURISDICTIONS: 2024 PROTOCOL: CONSULTATION PROCESS

11.1 The Committee received an update on a proposed process for the ongoing review and updating of the 2024 Protocol by the Disclosure Working Group, alongside the Practice Direction amendments on signposting being taken forward separately.

11.2 It was explained that the proposed review process would involve an annual stakeholder consultation each October, followed by consideration of substantive issues by the Disclosure Working Group where required, consultation with the Committee and, where appropriate, the Criminal Procedure Rule Committee, and final approval by the President of the Family Division's Office and the Lady Chief Justice's Criminal Justice team prior to publication.

11.3 The Committee agreed the proposed process and confirmed that it was content for this approach to be adopted.

OFFICIAL

- 11.4 During discussion, Mr Justice Peel queried when the standard orders should be amended to reflect the revised Annex 5 of the Protocol. Officials confirmed they would clarify when the Annex has been finalised, which would then allow for updates to the standard orders.

Action Point [17]: Members to provide any comments on the proposed consultation and review process for the Protocol by the end of July 2026.

Action Point [18]: Secretariat to respond on behalf of the Committee following receipt of members' comments.

Action Point [19]: Officials to ensure that any relevant outcomes from the Protocol review process are considered for inclusion in standard orders, and to update Mr Justice Peel accordingly.

SECRETARIAT ITEMS

PRIORITIES TABLE

- 12.1 The Secretariat has updated the Priorities Table following the previous meeting. The Committee will be asked to confirm if they are content for the table to be published.

Online Procedure Rule Committee (OPRC)

- 13.1 The OPRC continues with work on laying a SI in Parliament in June 2026 following the OPRC's consultation in December/January on the first Online Procedure Rules (OPR).

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE RULE COMMITTEE (CrimPRC)

- 13.2 The CrimPRC is due to consider an Amendment Rules statutory instrument, expected to be laid before Parliament in early July 2026, subject to agreement.
- 13.3 The CrimPRC has also been asked to consider correspondence from the Association of Clinical Psychologists (ACP UK), which raises alignment with the FPRC's approach to unregulated experts.
- 13.4 It was noted that the CrimPRC Secretariat has expressed interest in understanding the FPRC's emerging position on expert evidence, including any conclusions arising from the current consultation. Family justice policy officials have engaged with the CrimPRC on this issue

CIVIL PROCEDURE RULE COMMITTEE (CPRC)

- 13.5 The CPRC is considering work relating to Artificial Intelligence and Open Justice, with anticipated engagement across jurisdictions, including family.
- 13.6 Initial contact has taken place between the CPRC AI sub-committee and the FPRC Secretariat, with engagement ongoing.

OFFICIAL

13.7 The CPRC will receive an update from its representative to Lord Justice Edis' Contempt of Court Working Group and will be invited to provide steers to inform that work.

13.8 The CPRC's next amending statutory instrument and Practice Direction update are expected to be laid or published in July 2026, subject to confirmation of the laying date.

FAMILY JUSTICE COUNCIL - DISCLOSURE OF FACT-FINDING JUDGMENTS

13.9 The Committee was reminded of the Family Justice Council's request to consider amendments to Practice Directions to clarify that disclosure of findings of fact to Cafcass would not amount to contempt.

13.10 Initial consideration by the Information Sharing and Transparency Working Group indicates that this is likely to be an operational and systems issue, but further work is ongoing to consider any potential rule or Practice Directions changes.

13.11 Officials noted that current practice involves findings of fact being shared with Cafcass where they are involved in proceedings, typically by email from the court, with documents also capable of being stored on court systems, including shared drives and the Manage Cases system.

13.12 HMCTS has advised that there is no inherent operational barrier to sharing findings of fact where Cafcass are not party to proceedings, although such sharing is unlikely to take place without further provision (for example, via a Practice Direction or memorandum of understanding).

13.13 Officials also noted that Manage Cases functionality allows documents to be stored and linked across cases, although where Cafcass are not party to proceedings, documents would require dissemination by email.

13.14 Policy officials are engaging with HMCTS and Cafcass to better understand current processes and any operational barriers.

13.15 The Working Group is not progressing rule amendments at this stage pending further work, and the Committee will be updated in due course.

CONTEMPT OF COURT

13.16 The Committee noted the ongoing work of the Contempt of Court Procedural Rules Working Group and its request for views from rule committees on proposed "template" contempt rules intended to apply across jurisdictions.

13.17 The Committee also noted the Court of Appeal decision in *Turk v Legal Aid Agency* [2026] EWCA Civ 469, in which it was held that the High Court has jurisdiction to make a Recovery of Defence Costs Order under the Criminal Legal Aid (Recovery of Defence Costs Orders) Regulations 2013. It was further noted that the Working Group has invited rule committees to consider whether their respective rules require amendment to accommodate such recovery.

OFFICIAL

- 13.18 Officials confirmed that further material is being obtained from the Working Group to support the Committee's consideration of these issues.
- 13.19 During discussion, HHJ noted that the Contempt Working group acknowledge that some of the aspects of the template rules would be inappropriate or insufficient for the family jurisdiction and would require adaptation. HHJ Suh gave some examples of this at the meeting.
- 13.20 HHJ Suh also noted that the Working Group's approach appears to be targeted at jurisdictions which do not already have established contempt procedures, whereas both the Family Procedure Rule Committee and the Criminal Procedure Rule Committee operate within more developed procedural frameworks.
- 13.21 In relation to recovery of defence costs by the Legal Aid Agency, MoJ Legal observed that the Family Procedure Rules do not currently contain specific provision for making applications for such orders. It may be that existing procedural mechanisms, including applications under Part 18, are capable of accommodating such applications, but further consideration may be required as to whether express provision should be made specifically for such applications, especially if other rule committees decide to make specific provision.
- 13.22 The Chair indicated that, in light of competing priorities, the Committee should adopt a proportionate approach on the recovery of defence costs issue and focus its resources on higher priority areas of work at this stage. Lord Justice Baker agreed and noted it would be preferable to await further development of the work being undertaken by the Criminal Procedure Rule Committee and the wider working group.
- 13.23 Poonam Bhari queried whether there is consistency of outcomes across jurisdictions in relation to contempt proceedings and associated remedies. In response, Lord Justice Baker noted that the purpose of the cross-jurisdictional work is, in part, to address gaps in jurisdictions which do not currently have clear procedural rules, whereas both the family and criminal jurisdictions already operate with established frameworks.
- 13.24 The Committee agreed that it would be premature to undertake detailed review of the Working Group's draft cross-jurisdictional rules at this stage. Instead, the Committee favoured maintaining a watching brief, allowing the cross-jurisdictional work to develop further before considering whether more detailed engagement or amendment of the Family Procedure Rules is necessary.
- 13.25 The Committee therefore agreed that, at this stage, it is appropriate to provide high-level observations only and to defer any detailed consideration of rule changes pending further clarity on the direction of this work.

Action Point [20]: Officials and HHJ Suh to provide high-level comments to the Contempt of Court Procedural Rules Working Group on behalf of the Committee, focusing on key issues from a family justice perspective.

Action Point [21]: Officials to continue engagement with the Working Group and the Criminal Procedure Rule Committee, and to report back to the Committee as the work develops.

OFFICIAL

Action Point [22]: Officials allocate Turk v Legal Aid Agency, to Tier 3 of the Priority Table.

DRAFT JULY 2026 AGENDA

14. The agenda will be updated to reflect developments in this meeting.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 6 July 2026

The next meeting will be held on Monday 6 July 2026 and will be a hybrid meeting both at the Royal Courts of Justice and via MS Teams.

FPRC Secretariat

June 2026

FPRCSecretariat@justice.gov.uk