Ministry of Justice

FAMILY PROCEDURE RULE COMMITTEE
At 11:00 a.m. – 12:30 pm on Monday 5 October 2026,
Hybrid, in person at Royal Courts of Justice and online via Teams

• **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**
• **Poonam Bhari**	**Barrister**
• **Jennifer Kingsley JP**	**Magistrate**
• **Shabana Jaffar**	**Cafcass**
• **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**
• **Vicki Mulligan**	**Lay Person**
Guest	
• **Mrs Justice Knowles**	**High Court Judge**

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND APOLOGIES

1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting; apologies were received from Rhys Taylor, Graeme Fraser, Helen Sewell and District Judge Cassidy.

1.2 The Chair passed on the FPRC Secretariat and MoJ Legal's thanks to Rhys Taylor for his article in the Financial Remedies Journal, and for his kind words about the work of officials in preparing for, and supporting the running of, Committee meetings. The article is available to read at https://financialremediesjournal.com/my-time-on-the-family-procedure-rule-committee/.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

2.1 The Committee approved the minutes and the priorities table from the 6 July 2026 meeting.

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

ACTIONS LOG

3.1 The Committee noted that 31 action points were recorded from the 6 July 2026 meeting with 14 of those having been actioned and marked as completed.

3.2 The Committee considered the Actions Log and noted progress against the outstanding actions.

MATTERS ARISING

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

Family Procedure Rule Committee Annual Report 2025–2026

4.2 The Committee noted that the Annual Report had been amended following the July meeting, cleared by the President of the Family Division and published on GOV.UK on 3 September 2026. Members were thanked for their contributions.
4.3 Officials confirmed that work on the 2026–2027 Annual Report would begin in spring 2027.

Register of Members' Interests 2025–2026

4.4 The Committee noted that the Register of Members' Interests for 2025–2026 had been prepared from members' declarations and published on the FPRC page on GOV.UK.
4.5 Officials confirmed that they will ask members to complete declarations for the 2026–2027 reporting period next year.

November 2026 Open Committee Meeting

4.6 The Chair reminded the Committee that the annual open meeting would take place on 2 November 2026 and would be held online via Microsoft Teams.
4.7 Officials advised that registration had closed on 16 September 2026 and that 18 expressions of interest had been received, five of which included advance questions. The Chair will allocate questions to Committee members following discussion with the Secretariat, and draft responses would be prepared with support from the relevant policy teams and shared with the members concerned before the meeting.

Service Forms C9, FP6, FL415 and C7

4.8 The Chair reminded the Committee that, at its March 2026 meeting, it had received an update on amendments agreed by the Forms Working Group to Form C9, Statement of Service; Form FP6, Certificate of Service; Form FL415, Statement of Service; and Form C7, Acknowledgement of Service.

4.9 Officials informed the Committee that they had worked with HMCTS Forms and Content Design colleagues to implement the agreed amendments. The updated English and Welsh versions of all four forms had been published and came into effect on 30 September 2026.

4.10 Officials explained that a grace period had been provided to allow practitioners and court users to move to the updated forms and to allow any necessary operational and digital changes to be completed. The Committee noted that the work had now been completed.

Form D89

4.11 The Chair noted, at the July 2026 meeting, the Forms Working Group had agreed an amendment to the post-April 2022 version of Form D89 following a data incident involving the disclosure of confidential address information.

4.12 Officials informed the Committee that a warning had been added to the top of the form stating, “For internal use only – not to be served on the parties”. No changes had been made to the questions or substantive content of the form.

4.13 The updated English version was published on GOV.UK on 5 August 2026 and the Welsh version had also been updated. HMCTS operational colleagues had confirmed that the post-April 2022 form was the version currently used in practice.

Disclosure of Information between Family and Criminal Agencies and Jurisdictions: 2024 Protocol

4.14 The Chair reminded the Committee it had received updates at its June and July 2026 meetings on the review of the 2024 Protocol concerning disclosure of information between family and criminal agencies and jurisdictions.

4.15 Following the Committee’s request, the agreed Annex 5 order template and Handling Instructions had been provided to Mr Justice Peel for consideration of any related changes required to the Judicial Compendium of Standard Orders.

4.16 Officials advised that paragraph 8 of the Annex 5 order had been removed as it was no longer required following discussions with the Legal Aid Agency.

4.17 The revised Handling Instructions and Annex 5 order template had been published on the Judiciary and Crown Prosecution Service websites on 15 September 2026.

4.18 Officials confirmed that any further updates concerning the future review of the Protocol would be brought back to the Committee where appropriate.

FPRC Recruitment Update

4.19 Officials updated the Committee on plans to launch a recruitment campaign to appoint two barrister members and one solicitor member to the Committee.

4.20 The campaign was expected to be approved by Ministers, with the aim of launching the campaign in October 2026. Applications were expected to be sifted during October, with interviews taking place later in autumn 2026.

4.21 Officials confirmed that Shabana Jaffar had agreed to serve a further three-year term as the Cafcass member. Her Honour Judge Suh and Jennifer Kingsley JP had also agreed to be reappointed for further terms.

4.22 The Committee noted that District Judge Nelson had indicated that he wished to step down from the Committee when his current term ended in February 2027. Officials would therefore begin the process of identifying a suitable replacement ahead of the end of his term.

4.23 Officials were working with the Judicial Office and Public Appointments Team to complete the necessary approvals and would provide a further update once the recruitment process had concluded and recommendations had been made to Ministers.

Confidentiality of Parties' Contact Details: Rule 29.1 Form Amendments

4.24 The Committee was reminded that, in June 2026, officials had confirmed that the required form amendments arising from the recent amendments to rule 29.1 FPR had been successfully completed and implemented in the English-language versions of the relevant forms.

4.25 Members had also been informed that work had commenced to translate the relevant forms into Welsh, with the intention that this work would be completed by 30 July 2026.

4.26 Officials advised that progress on the translation work had been delayed because the request had accidentally been closed before the work was completed. The request had since been reopened and the remaining work prioritised.

4.27 The Committee noted that the Welsh Translation Team had now provided completed versions of Forms C1, C68 and D11.

4.28 Officials further advised that the Welsh Translation Team had identified that a number of the existing Welsh forms were significantly out of date and might need to be fully re-translated.

4.29 A further update would be provided to the Committee once the remaining translation work had been completed.

Department of Health and Social Care - Health Bill Secondary Legislation

4.30 Officials advised the Committee that the Health Bill 2026 (if enacted) will require two minor consequential amendments to rule 12.3(1) of the Family Procedure Rules 2010.

4.31 The Committee was informed that the Bill would abolish NHS England and transfer most of its functions to the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care or integrated care boards. It would also allow NHS trusts to be established under new section 57B of the National Health Service Act 2006. The relevant provisions were intended to take legal effect on 1 April 2027.

4.32 Officials explained that the proposed amendments would remove the reference to "NHS England" from the table in rule 12.3(1) and replace the reference to a National Health Service trust established under section 25 of the National Health Service Act 2006 with a reference to a trust established under the National Health Service Act 2006.

4.33 The Committee noted that these were consequential amendments and would not change the underlying policy or operation of rule 12.3(1).

4.34 The Department of Health and Social Care proposed to make the amendments through a consequential statutory instrument under clause 85 of the Health Bill. The amendments are intended to come into force on 1 April 2027.

4.35 The Committee agreed that the proposed amendments could be made through a Department of Health and Social Care consequential statutory instrument rather than through an FPR amending statutory instrument and agreed the wording of the proposed amendments.

Child Focused Courts

4.36 The Chair reminded the Committee that, at its July 2026 meeting, it had received an update on the planned rollout of the Child Focused Model to eight additional Designated Family Judge areas.

4.37 At that stage, local readiness assessments had not been completed and a start date had not been agreed. The Committee had agreed that, once the start date was confirmed, the new areas could be added to PD36Z through a Practice Direction Update without returning to the Committee for further approval.

4.38 Officials advised that the start date had now been agreed as 17 November 2026, subject to the President approving the amendments to PD36Z.

4.39 The necessary amendments had been included in draft Practice Direction Update No. 5 of 2026, which was before the Committee in draft at this meeting.

Information Sharing and Transparency Update

4.40 The Chair reminded the Committee that, at its June 2026 meeting, it had received an update on the work of the Information Sharing and Transparency Working Group.

4.41 The Working Group had identified questions of principle requiring further policy and legal work, including the balance between information sharing and confidentiality and whether the Rules should state positively when disclosure was permitted.

4.42 Officials advised that, since June, targeted engagement had been undertaken with domestic abuse stakeholders to consider whether greater clarity would assist victims and professionals and what safeguards might be needed to reduce the risk of misuse.

4.43 Officials had also identified further matters which might require consideration by the Working Group. These had been submitted to the Committee for triage.

4.44 The Committee was advised that progress over the summer had been slower than anticipated because of competing ministerial priorities and unexpected absences within MoJ policy. These resourcing pressures were expected to ease shortly.

4.45 Officials confirmed that policy and legal work would continue to develop a revised framework, including consideration of the scope of any disclosure provision, who information might be disclosed to, onward disclosure, safeguards and what changes could properly be made through the Family Procedure Rules or Practice Directions.

4.46 The Working Group was expected to meet later in October 2026 to test the revised strategic approach, identify any outstanding issues of principle and consider how the work should be sequenced alongside wider transparency reforms.

4.47 Subject to the outcome of that meeting, officials intended to return to the Committee in November 2026 with a substantive update and, where appropriate, revised proposals. A clearer timetable would also be provided once the Working Group had considered the revised approach.

4.48 Her Honour Judge Suh (‘HHJ Suh’) drew attention to the Family Justice Council's (FJC) earlier request for development of a repository of fact-finding judgments. HHJ Suh noted the FJC’s concern that the proposal had originally been referred to the Committee several years earlier and that stakeholders appeared increasingly concerned by the perceived lack of progress. HHJ Suh suggested there may be reputational risks if stakeholders concluded that the issue was not being actively progressed.

4.49 The Chair acknowledged those concerns and agreed that further engagement with the FJC would be helpful in explaining the current position and the reasons for the timescales involved.

- **Action Point [2]: HHJ Suh to provide the Chair with further information about the FJC’s concerns regarding the proposed repository of fact-finding judgments and its future engagement.**
- **Action Point [3]: The Chair to write to the FJC to explain the current position and address its concerns**.

4.50 HHJ Suh also referred to Triage Form 2, concerning *Shropshire Council v Mother and Paternal Aunt*, and noted that the issues raised fell closely within the remit of the Information Sharing and Transparency Working Group. The Committee agreed that the proposal should be considered as part of the Working Group's wider work on transparency and information sharing, including the scope of the family court's power to make transparency orders outside PD12R and PD14G.

- **Action Point [4]: Secretariat to add Triage Form 2 concerning Shropshire Council v Mother and Paternal Aunt to Tier 3 of the Priorities Table.**
- **Action Point [5]: Policy Lead refer the issues raised to the Information Sharing and Transparency Working Group for consideration as part of its wider work on transparency and information sharing.**

- *Practice Direction Update No. 4 of 2026*

4.51 The Chair reminded the Committee that, at the July 2026 meeting, officials had advised that a consequential amendment to paragraph 1.4(b) of PD36ZI had been omitted from Practice Direction Update No. 3 of 2026.

4.52 Practice Direction Update No. 4 of 2026 had corrected that omission so that the pilot applied to notifiable orders made until 13 July 2027.

4.53 The Committee noted that the Update had been signed by the President on 7 July 2026 and by Baroness Levitt KC on 10 July 2026. It had come into force on 11 July 2026 and had been published on GOV.UK.

- *Practice Direction Updates No. 5 and No. 6 of 2026*

4.54 Officials updated the Committee on work underway on Practice Direction Updates Nos. 5 and 6 of 2026 and advised that they were working with policy, legal and HMCTS colleagues to finalise the amendments.

4.55 A draft of Practice Direction Update No. 5 of 2026 was attached to the Matters Arising paper. The Committee noted that it was expected to include amendments relating to:

- the next tranche of Child Focused Court locations, as proposed at the July meeting;
- the sharing of confidential contact details with the police under PD11A (for FGM Protection Orders and Forced Marriage Protection Orders), subject to approval at this meeting, and under PD36ZI (for non-molestation orders), as approved at the July meeting;
- Domestic Abuse Protection Orders, subject to approval at this meeting;
- Jade's Law, subject to approval at this meeting; and
- minor correcting amendments to PD41H to remove references to a pilot scheme, which had been approved out of Committee.

4.56 Officials advised that the new Child Focused Court locations were expected to become operational on 17 November 2026. The related Practice Direction amendments would therefore need to come into force before that date.

4.57 The Committee noted that the Jade's Law amendments had been agreed by the Domestic Abuse Working Group and were before the Committee at this meeting.

4.58 Subject to the Committee's agreement, the Jade's Law amendments were intended to come into force alongside the related Family Procedure Rules on 18 December 2026.

4.59 Officials advised that Practice Direction Update No. 6 of 2026 was expected to include provisions to be considered at the November Committee meeting. A further update would be provided once the contents and timing of both Updates had been finalised.

SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

SECTION 18 OF THE VICTIMS AND PRISONERS ACT 2024 ('JADE'S LAW')

5.2 Officials reminded the Committee that, at its July 2026 meeting, it had considered the targeted stakeholder consultation on the Family Procedure Rule ("FPR") and Practice Direction ("PD") amendments required to implement section 18 of the Victims and Prisoners Act 2024 ("Jade's Law") and had asked for further work to be undertaken with the Domestic Abuse Working Group ("DAWG").

5.3 Officials advised that the DAWG had considered the revised amendments on 3 September 2026. Following points raised by members, further consideration had been given to the drafting relating to service, without notice applications and safeguarding. No further changes were considered necessary to rules 12.2, 12.3, 12.8, 12.16 or 12.19.

5.4 Officials advised that the previously proposed provision in PD12B that would have required the relevant local authority to call other parties to obtain safeguarding information had been removed. The DAWG had subsequently confirmed that it was content with the revised drafting.

5.5 The Committee considered the final Rule and PD amendments, which establish the procedural framework for the family court's review of prohibited steps orders ("PSOs") made by the Crown Court and for applications to vary or discharge such PSOs made by the Crown Court.

5.6 Officials updated the Committee on the three bespoke family court application forms, C145, C146 and C147, which had been developed with the DAWG and shared with the Jade's Law Implementation Board.

5.7 Officials also updated the Committee on the Crown Court PSO and associated notifications developed with HMCTS Crime and Legal Operations. These were intended to support notification of the relevant local authority at key stages of the criminal proceedings and were due to be considered by the Criminal Procedure Rule Committee ("CrimPRC") in October 2026.

5.8 Officials advised that they did not anticipate returning to the Committee on Jade's Law before commencement unless an issue arose through the remaining clearance processes which required further consideration.

5.9 The Committee noted that Jade's Law was due to come into force on 18 December 2026 and that officials would return through Matters Arising in February 2027 to update members on implementation following commencement.

5.10 HHJ Suh queried the need for the proposed amendment to rule 12.16(1)(a) relating to without notice applications. HHJ Suh questioned whether circumstances would realistically arise in which review proceedings following notification by the Crown Court would proceed without notice. Members observed that reviews would ordinarily take place following notification from the Crown Court and therefore on notice. The Committee accepted that variation/discharge applications could arise without notice in exceptional circumstances but considered that reference to without notice reviews did not accurately reflect how the provisions would operate in practice. Members were not persuaded that the additional wording added anything of substantive effect to the existing provision and considered that the policy rationale for the amendment was unclear. The Committee agreed that the additional wording should be removed.

- **Action Point [6]: Officials to amend rule 12.16 so that proceedings for the review of a prohibited steps order made under section 10A(3) of the Children Act 1989 cannot be made without notice and circulate the revised drafting.**

5.11 The Chair raised a drafting point regarding rule 12.8(2)(a). The Chair expressed concern that the exception permitting an applicant to effect service where they request to do so be inappropriate in applications to vary or discharge a prohibited steps order made under section 10A(3) of the Children Act 1989. Members discussed whether the provision might enable a parent whose exercise of parental responsibility had been restricted to effect service, including through family members, contrary to the intended policy position. The Chair noted the importance of avoiding unintended changes to the wider section 8 framework whilst ensuring appropriate safeguards in Jade's Law cases.

5.12 Mrs Justice Knowles suggested that rule 12.8(2)(a) should not apply to applications to vary or discharge a prohibited steps order under section 10A(3), with service instead continuing to be effected by the court officer unless the court directs otherwise. The Committee agreed that this would address the safeguarding concern without creating wider procedural impacts and agreed that officials should prepare revised drafting to give effect to this approach whilst preserving the court's discretion to direct service where appropriate.

- **Action Point [7]: Officials to revise rule 12.8 to make clear that the exception in rule 12.8(2)(a) does not apply to applications to vary or discharge a prohibited steps order made under section 10A(3) of the Children Act 1989, whilst preserving the court's power to direct service where appropriate, and circulate the revised drafting to members.**

5.12.1 The Committee reviewed the package as a whole and confirmed that, subject to the agreed amendments and any consequential drafting changes, it was content to approve the rule and Practice Direction amendments. Officials advised that the Rules could not be signed at the meeting because the Committee's agreed changes first needed to be incorporated into the statutory instrument and insufficient members were present in person to complete the signature process. They proposed that signatures be obtained outside the meeting once the changes had been made. Members were content with that approach.

- **Action Point [8]: Officials to make the agreed amendments and any consequential drafting changes to the Family Procedure (Amendment No. 2) Rules 2026 and the Practice Direction amendments.**
- **Action Point [9]: Officials to circulate the final Rules to members for signature and submit the Practice Direction amendments for the necessary approvals.**

5.13 The Committee considered the draft application forms and HHJ Suh and Jennifer Kingsley JP identified a small number of proofreading and grammatical amendments.

- **Action Point [10]: HHJ Judge Suh to provide drafting comments on Forms C145, C146 and C147 to officials.**
- **Action point [11] Officials to amend Forms C145, C146 and C147 according to HH Judge Suh comments.**

5.14 The Chair thanked officials, working group members and all contributors for the significant volume of work undertaken since July. The President joined the Chair in expressing appreciation for the work completed in support of implementation.

DOMESTIC ABUSE PROTECTION ORDERS (DAPOS*)*

6.1 Officials updated the Committee on the issues raised at the July 2026 meeting relating to notification of confidential information to the police, service on landlords and mortgagees in without notice applications, and terminology used in the PD, forms and court order template.

6.2 Officials explained that small amendments were proposed to the PD to clarify the distinction between programme-based positive requirements and non-programme-based positive requirements, reflecting the updated policy position. Consequential amendments were also proposed to Forms DA1 and DA3 and the court order template to ensure that courts could include non-programme-based positive requirements in a DAPO where appropriate.

6.3 Officials explained that FamilyMan did not currently have the functionality to share confidential contact information with the police. This reflected the existing position for non-molestation orders and was not unique to DAPOs. A manual process was used for forced marriage protection orders and female genital mutilation protection orders, but officials did not consider that approach sustainable for the anticipated volume of DAPO cases. The longer-term position would depend on migration to modern case-management systems (Manage Cases).

6.4 The Committee was informed that FamilyMan would shortly be able to include the protected person's date of birth in notifications to the police where that information was known. A corresponding amendment had therefore been made to paragraph 20.2 of the draft Practice Direction. Members approved that addition.

6.5 HHJ Suh queried the interaction between the proposed DAPO arrangements and the notification pilot operating under PD36ZI for non-molestation orders. HHJ Suh noted that DAPOs were not included in that pilot but questioned whether courts already using a bespoke notification process for non-molestation orders could use the same process for DAPOs, rather than reverting to the existing manual arrangements.

6.6 Officials explained that the drafting and systems used for DAPOs differed from those used for non-molestation orders, including reliance on FamilyMan rather than Manage Cases. Officials agreed to discuss the position with HHJ Suh whether any aspect of the pilot notification process could also be used for DAPOs.

❖ **Action Point [12]: Officials to clarify with HHJ Suh whether notification arrangements used for non-molestation orders in PD36ZI pilot courts could also be used for DAPOs.**

6.7 In relation to the provisions concerning service on landlords and mortgagees within without notice proceedings, officials explained that the draft wording reflected the approach used for occupation orders. District Judge Foss noted that DAPOs were closer in nature to non-molestation orders and that serving a landlord or mortgagee before determination of a without notice application could create a safeguarding risk. In particular, a landlord might be a family member, friend or other person connected to the respondent and could disclose the application before the court had considered it.

6.8 The Committee considered whether service should instead take place only after the respondent had been served, noting that this could lead to delay where personal service on the respondent proved difficult. The Committee therefore considered whether paragraph 9.5 should be removed so that landlords and mortgagees were not served before the without notice hearing.

6.9 Members agreed that paragraph 8.8 should remain unchanged because it applied to on-notice applications. They agreed that paragraph 9.5 should be removed and that paragraph 17 should instead be amended so that, where a DAPO was made without notice, the landlord or mortgagee received both the application and the order after the hearing.

6.10 The Committee also considered whether the Practice Direction should expressly prevent service on any other person. Members supported wording in paragraph 9.2(b), and any equivalent provisions, to provide that the applicant must not serve any other person unless directed by the court. Members considered that this would reduce the risk of unnecessary disclosure while preserving the court's power to direct service where appropriate.

6.11 Lord Justice Baker asked what proceedings were envisaged by paragraph 10.1. Officials explained that this could include care proceedings. The Committee agreed that the drafting should refer to service on no other person unless directed by the court, rather than attempting to list particular proceedings or recipients.

- **Action Point [13]: Officials to retain paragraph 8.8, remove paragraph 9.5 and amend paragraph 17 so that the application and DAPO are served on a landlord or mortgagee after a without notice order is made.**
- **Action Point [14]: Officials to amend paragraph 9.2(b), and any equivalent provisions, to make clear that the applicant must not serve any other person unless directed by the court.**

6.12 The Committee considered terminology used throughout the Practice Direction, forms and court order template. Jennifer Kingsley JP said that the use of "P" could be confusing and suggested using "respondent" instead. The Chair noted that "P" was the term used in the Domestic Abuse Act 2021. Officials acknowledged the concern and agreed to consider whether the forms and supporting materials could use clearer terminology where possible.

6.13 Jennifer Kingsley JP further queried whether the expression "positive requirement" was appropriate. The Chair confirmed that it was the expression used in the legislation.

6.14 Officials reminded the Committee that, during earlier stages of development, officials had removed references to positive requirements on the basis that programme-based positive requirements would not initially be available in the family court. Since the Committee's July 2026 meeting, Ministers had indicated that a distinction should be drawn between programme-based positive requirements and other forms of positive requirement available under the legislation.

6.15 Officials explained that programme-based positive requirements included referrals to behaviour-change programmes or substance misuse programmes. By contrast, non-programme-based positive requirements remained available and could include obligations such as removing material from social media platforms or returning keys to a property. Members agreed that these represented important distinctions that ought to be reflected more clearly within the drafting.

6.16 The Committee supported the proposed approach to distinguish between programme-based positive requirements and other positive requirements. Officials agreed to make the necessary amendments to the Practice Direction, Forms DA1 and DA3 and the court order template.

- **Action Point [15]: Officials to amend the Practice Direction, Forms DA1 and DA3 and the court order template to distinguish between programme-based and non-programme-based positive requirements.**

6.17 HHJ Suh asked whether an undertaking could be accepted instead of making a DAPO, including whether an undertaking could contain positive or negative obligations.

Officials explained that this issue had been considered in detail by the cross-jurisdictional working group in the lead-up to the pilot launch, but that a definitive position had not been reached. Mrs Justice Knowles advised that the issue was due to be considered further in connection with a DAPO case in Greater Manchester on 4 November 2026.

6.18 HHJ Suh asked whether the Committee would be given sight of the DAPO pilot evaluation and whether its findings would inform work after commencement. Officials advised that the evaluation was expected to conclude in November 2026 and that publication would be subject to Ministerial agreement. Subject to agreement from the Home Office analysts leading the evaluation, officials agreed to share early findings with the Committee when available and to return in early 2027 with an update on rollout.

- **Action Point [16]: Subject to agreement from the Home Office analysts leading the evaluation, officials to share findings from the DAPO evaluation when available and return to the Committee in early 2027 with an implementation update.**

6.19 Mr Justice Peel asked officials whether the draft court order template and service arrangements had been considered by the relevant service working group. Officials confirmed that the DAPO working group had considered the court order template and forms in June and that the revised court order template would be provided to Mr Justice Peel for review.

6.20 The Committee discussed the practical arrangements for service of DAPOs. District Judge Foss noted that the speed of court bailiff service varied between courts and depended on local resources and other factors. Where court bailiff service was requested, Form D89 would need to be completed. Litigants in person could also instruct a private process server, and members considered that this option should be made clear even where a party was not legally represented. District Judge Foss was concerned that reliance on court bailiffs could build delay into cases requiring urgent protection. Alternative methods of service, including personal service and electronic messaging, were discussed, but members noted that these raised practical and legal issues. Officials agreed to review the service wording in the court order template.

- **Action Point [17]: Officials to review the service provisions in the court order template, including how litigants in person are informed about use of private process servers and the need for Form D89 where court bailiff service is requested**.
- **Action Point [18]: Officials to provide the revised court order template to Mr Justice Peel for review.**

6.21 The Committee considered section 20 of the draft Practice Direction concerning notification of DAPOs to the police with officials confirming that notification of the making of an order and most variations of an order would be automatic. Some variations however may need to be done manually. Officials agreed to consider the position further and amend the Practice Direction if necessary to make that distinction clear.

- **Action Point [19]: Officials to amend section 20 of the Practice Direction if necessary to clarify notification of variations to the police.**

6.22 Subject to the agreed drafting amendments, the Committee approved the amendments to the DAPO Practice Direction, Forms DA1 and DA3 and the court order template. The Chair asked if he and the President could have sight of the revised draft PD and officials confirmed once the revisions had been made it would be sent to them for their consideration and approval. Officials advised that the Practice Direction would be submitted for the President's approval and Ministerial agreement so that the package was ready for national rollout on 25 November 2026. Officials did not anticipate returning to the Committee before rollout but expected to provide an implementation update in early 2027.

PD11A: SHARING OF CONFIDENTIAL CONTACT DETAILS WITH THE POLICE IN FMPO AND FGMPO PROCEEDINGS

7.1 Officials reminded the Committee that, at its July 2026 meeting, it had approved the sharing of confidential contact details with the police when a non-molestation order was made.

7.2 At the July meeting, officials advised also advised that confidential contact details of the applicant, person to be protected and respondent are already being shared with the police in Female Genital Mutilation Protection Order ("FGMPO") and Forced Marriage Protection Order ("FMPO") proceedings.

7.3 The Committee agreed the proposed amendments to PD11A to reflect this sharing of contact details with the police and agreed that they should be included in Practice Direction Update No. 5 of 2026 for submission to the President and subsequently the Minister.

7.4 Officials confirmed that the Committee would be updated once the Practice Direction Update had been made. Officials noted that associated amendments to template orders were being developed and will be submitted for consideration by Mrs Justice Knowles ad then by the judicial Standard Orders Group.

- **Action Point [20]: Officials to incorporate the approved amendments to PD11A into Practice Direction Update No. 5 of 2026.**
- **Action Point [21]: Officials to provide the proposed amendments to the relevant standard orders to Mrs Justice Knowles for initial consideration, before submitting them to the Judicial Standard Orders Group.**

WISH LIST

8.1 Officials reminded the Committee that the Wish List records work that has been temporarily deprioritised because related work is progressing elsewhere or because of competing priorities and resource constraints. Unlike the Priorities Table, the Wish List is not published.

8.2 The Committee noted that the Wish List had been established in 2024 following agreement to move specified items from the Priorities Table where active Committee work was not currently required.

8.3 Officials proposed that no changes should be made to the Wish List at this stage.

8.4 The Committee agreed that the Wish List should remain unchanged.

8.5 Officials confirmed that the items would continue to be kept under review and that further updates would be brought to the Committee where appropriate.

SECRETARIAT ITEMS

PRIORITIES TABLE

9.1 The Secretariat presented the updated Priorities Table following the July 2026 meeting.
9.2 The Committee noted that Domestic Abuse Protection Orders had moved to Tier 1, reflecting that the work was now being actively progressed.
9.3 The Committee confirmed that it is content for the Priorities Table to be published.

- **Action Point [22]: Secretariat to arrange for the updated October Priorities Table to be published on the relevant FPRC webpage.**

TRIAGE FORMS

9.4 The Committee considered three triage forms. Members were invited to agree the recommended placement of the first two proposals in Tier 3 and the third proposal in Tier 1 of the Priorities Table.

Rule 29.1 Amendments – Draft Amended Forms – C8

9.5 The Committee first considered a proposal concerning rule 29.1 and the treatment of confidential contact information. Officials explained that the proposal arose from broader work across a number of projects concerning Form C8, confidential contact details and information-sharing arrangements.
9.6 Members were advised that preliminary work indicated a potential overlap with issues already being considered by the Information Sharing and Transparency Working Group. The proposal also intersected with the wider transparency and information-sharing reforms discussed earlier in the meeting.
9.7 Members agreed that establishing a separate workstream at this stage would risk duplication. As the Working Group was already considering related questions about the handling, protection and disclosure of information across several Family Justice jurisdictions, the Committee agreed that the proposal should be referred to that group and added to the Priorities Table at Tier 3.

- **Action Point [23]: FPRC Secretariat to add "Rule 29.1 Amendments – Draft Amended Forms – C8" to the Priorities Table at Tier 3.**
- **Action Point [24]: Policy leads to refer the proposal to the Information Sharing and Transparency Working Group.**

Shropshire Council v Mother and Paternal Aunt

9.8 The Committee next considered the proposal arising from Shropshire Council v Mother and Paternal Aunt, concerning the family court's jurisdiction to make transparency orders outside PD12R and PD14G.
9.9 Officials explained that the judgment raised issues requiring detailed consideration alongside the Committee's wider work on transparency and information sharing. The proposal received an overall triage score of 15 and was recommended for Tier 3.
9.10 The Committee agreed that the proposal should be added to the Priorities Table at Tier 3 so that it could be considered alongside the wider transparency and information-sharing work.

- **Action Point [25]: FPRC Secretariat to add "Shropshire Council v Mother and Paternal Aunt" to the Priorities Table at Tier 3.**

Family Courts' Referral Mechanism for Programmes and Support, including DAPO Positive Requirements

9.11 The Committee considered a proposal concerning the development and implementation of an assessment and referral mechanism to support the use of programmes and other interventions in the family courts, including positive requirements attached to Domestic Abuse Protection Orders.

9.12 Officials explained that the proposal concerned the development and implementation of an assessment and referral mechanism through which the family courts could support access to programmes and other interventions. This included the future use of programme-based positive requirements under the DAPO regime, rather than the drafting amendments relating to non-programme-based positive requirements considered earlier in the meeting.

9.13 The proposal received an overall triage score of 24 and was recommended for Tier 1. The Committee agreed that the work should be added to the Priorities Table at Tier 1.

- **Action Point [26]: Secretariat to add "Family Courts' Referral Mechanism for Programmes and Support, including DAPO Positive Requirements" to the Priorities Table at Tier 1.**

FPRC WORKING GROUP

9.14 The Secretariat has updated the Working Groups paper to provide an overview of the Committee's active, inactive and past working groups as of October 2026. Following the Committee's discussion at the July 2026 meeting, the Family Justice AI Working Group has been added to the list of active working groups, and its membership has been updated.

9.15 The Bundles Working Group has been moved to the list of past working groups, reflecting that its work to review and modernise PD27A has been completed.

OTHER PROCEDURE RULE COMMITTEES

ONLINE PROCEDURE RULE COMMITTEE (OPRC)

9.16 Members were informed that the OPRC continued to progress implementation of its new responsibilities and powers.

9.17 The Committee noted that the OPRC's first statutory instrument had come into force on 7 September 2026. Members were advised that substantial work was continuing behind the scenes, including consideration of the future role of the Committee following recent changes affecting the online procedure landscape.

9.18 During discussion, Lord Justice Baker noted that questions remained regarding the future pace and direction of digital reform, including the extent to which responsibility for certain procedural areas may ultimately transfer from existing Rule Committees to the Online Procedure Rule Committee. Members acknowledged that the position remained subject to ongoing policy and legislative developments and that greater clarity was expected in due course.

9.19 The Committee noted the update and agreed to continue monitoring developments.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE RULE COMMITTEE (CRIMPRC)

9.20 The Committee received an update regarding work being undertaken by the CrimPRC. Members were informed that the CrimPRC had been provided with the draft Jade's Law Crown Court prohibited steps order template together with associated

notices and supporting documentation. Officials advised that the materials were due to be considered by the relevant CrimPRC subgroup and subsequently by the Committee itself.

9.21 The Committee noted the update and welcomed the continued collaboration between the Family Procedure Rule Committee and CrimPRC in support of implementation of Jade's Law. Members recognised the importance of ensuring that documentation developed across jurisdictions remained aligned and coherent.

DRAFT NOVEMBER 2026 AGENDA

9.22 The Chair reminded members that the November meeting would be held as the Committee's annual public meeting and that a significant level of external interest had already been received through expressions of interest and advance questions.

9.23 During discussion, members reflected on the format adopted for previous public meetings and considered how best to facilitate engagement with attendees. The Chair noted that advance questions had already been received and that responses would be prepared with support from policy teams and allocated to members as appropriate.

9.24 Members also discussed approaches used elsewhere within the Family Justice system for public-facing meetings and stakeholder engagement. It was noted that, as with previous public meetings, the Committee would wish to ensure that attendees were provided with meaningful opportunities to understand the Committee's current work programme and priorities whilst recognising the procedural nature of the Committee's remit.

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

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

10. The next meeting will be held on Monday 2 November 2026 at 11:00am online via MS Teams.

FPRC Secretariat
October 2026
FPRCSecretariat@justice.gov.uk