Tribunal Procedure Committee (TPC) Meeting Minutes

Monday 5 October 2026

Meeting (Hybrid) at Field House, Breams Buildings, London

Minutes

Present

In Person/online

Lord Justice Ian Dove (ID)
Michael Reed (MJR)
Angela Shields (AS)
Mark Blundell (MB)
David Franey (DF)
Matt Jackson (MJ)
Gillian Fleming (GF)
Sean O'Brien (SOB)
Faridah Eden (FE)
Joy Hosie (JH)
Jonathan Dobson (JD)
Sanaz Saifolahi (SS)
Peace Egbulefu (PE)
Jennifer McCathy (JM)
Razana Begum (RB)
Hanna Polanszky (HP)
Vijay Parkash (VP)

Guests

Gareth Wilson (GW)
Gareth McMahon (GM)
Rawfiah Choudry (RC)
Catherine Gaskell (CG)
Abdul Huson (AH)
Amy Brown (AB)

1. Introductory Matters

1.1. ID welcomed the attendees to the meeting. The Committee recorded its thanks to Charlotte Wright, who had recently left her Ministry of Justice legal advisory (MOJLA) role supporting the TPC, and for her contribution and assistance to the Committee's work programme. Apologies were received and noted from Laurie Marks and John Keith.

Preliminary Matters

1.2. The TPC considered the draft minutes of the 06 July 2026 meeting and approved the presented draft minutes for publication on the government website pending some minor amendments.

2. **Immigration and Asylum Chambers Subgroup**

2.1. The attendees noted that the consultation response document titled 'possible amendments to the Tribunal Procedure (Upper Tribunal) Rules 2008 in respect of applications for judicial review' was published on 17 August 2026 on the TPC website.

3. **GTCL Subgroup**

The Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Act 2025

3.1. The Committee considered the draft consultation response concerning proposed amendments to the General Regulatory Chamber (GRC) Procedure Rules arising from the provisions in the Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Act 2025.

3.2. The members discussed the proposed exemption from the default 28-day time limit, arrangements for serving applications on interested parties affected by the appeal and the potential needed modifications to the content of the notices of appeal that required judicial approval. The Committee supported the proposed approach, subject to further clarification regarding the potential administrative burden of service on interested parties that would be performed by the tribunal's administration. Members also considered that detailed requirements for notices of appeal would be more appropriately addressed in a potential new practice direction which required judicial consideration for the likely contents .

3.3. The Committee also considered its general approach to identifying respondents in published TPC consultation responses and agreed that individual respondent responses should not generally be attributed unless there was a particular reason to do so.

3.4. RB recommended that publication of the consultation response document should be deferred pending further consideration of the proposed rule drafting by the MOJLA, to ensure consistency with the final prepared statutory instrument (SI). The TPC agreed to this approach.

3.5. DF confirmed that the draft consultation response would be refined and shared with the Home Office for further drafting consideration before returning to the Committee at the next scheduled meeting on 02 December 2026, with a view to include it in the planned Spring 2027 Amendment Rules SI package.

Property Chamber- Rule 7 (Procedure for applying for and giving directions)

3.6. JD provided an update on the proposed amendments to the Property Chamber Rules concerning rule 7 'service of documents', explaining that work remained ongoing to address a number of drafting difficulties highlighted by MOJLA. In particular, challenges had arisen in reconciling the proposed amendments with the structure and terminology of the existing

Property Chamber Procedure Rules, while seeking to avoid more extensive changes and subsequent unforeseen difficulties.

3.7. The Committee noted that further consideration was needed to establish whether the revised approach for an amendment to rule 7 remained within the scope of the previous conducted 2025 consultation or whether an additional consultation would be required to be initiated.

3.8. ID expressed concern about the time that had elapsed since the consultation response had been published on the TPC website to progress the matter and emphasised the importance of bringing the work to a conclusion. It was agreed that JD should return to the Committee with a clear recommendation on the proposed amendments and whether further consultation was necessary to achieve the desired objective as previously consulted.

3.9. JD agreed to aim to bring the matter back to the 02 November 2026 TPC meeting, with the 07 December 2026 meeting date established as the final deadline for presenting recommendations. This would allow the amendments to be progressed as part of the planned Spring 2027 Amendment Rules SI package.

(Section 404D of Financial Services and Markets Act 2000)

3.10. The Committee received an update on the drafting exercise for the proposed amendments relating to the consumer redress scheme under section 404D of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000.

3.11. MJ explained that progress had been limited following the departure of the judicial assistants (JA) previously supporting the work to prepare a first version of a draft consultation paper. The Committee noted that the matter had not progressed as initially planned and that further work was required to progress this work item.

3.12. ID acknowledged the important need for additional judicial support to assist in the drafting exercise and advised that the availability of suitable JA support remained subject to ongoing security clearance arrangements before the new JA's were in post. Once the position had been clarified with the Court of Appeal Master (who coordinates the work activities of the JAs), consideration would be given to allocating further JA resource to enable the work to progress.

Proposed changes to Tax Tribunal Procedure Rules

3.13. The Committee received an update on the proposed amendments to the Tax Tribunal Procedure Rules. It was noted that work had been progressing with Judge Blackwell (the nominated judicial support), although further progress

had been limited by competing work commitments since the matter being previously discussed at the meeting held on 06 July 2026.

3.14. Members recalled earlier discussions concerning which of the proposed amendments should be taken forward and an outstanding question requiring clarification from the Tax Chamber President. The Committee noted that resolving this issue would help determine how the remaining proposals should progress. MJ agreed to discuss the matter with Judge Blackwell, and he expected they would be in a position to bring forward a draft consultation paper for consideration at the 02 November 2026 meeting

AP/64/2026: To update the terrorism consultation response incorporating the points discussed, before sharing the updated document with the Home Office for their comments/drafting consideration - **DF/GF**

AP/65/2026: To seek clarification from the GRC President on the matter for service of applications on interested parties and any potential administrative burden- **DF/GF**

AP/66/2026: To consult with the Home Office on proposed rules drafting, with the matter returning to the Committee for the 07 December 2026 meeting - **RB**

AP/67/2026: To progress rule 7 outstanding drafting issues and determine whether further consultation is required. To provide a progress report for the November 2026 meeting - **JD**

AP/68/2026 To consider allocating judicial assistance support to the Consumer Redress work- **ID**

4. Employment Tribunals Subgroup

Employment Tribunals Procedural Rules Consultation

4.1. MJ presented the draft consultation paper concerning proposed amendments to the Employment Tribunals (ET) Procedure Rules, explaining that it reflected the priority areas identified by the ET Presidents following earlier discussions with the ET Subgroup.

4.2. The Committee considered a range of proposals intended to support more effective case management and procedural efficiency, including the potential use of Tribunal legal officers to provide support in preliminary case management arrangements for the resolution of disputes. Members discussed the scope of the proposed changes and noted that, while some were relatively limited in nature, they could attract significant stakeholder interest and differing views for the approach to be taken for potential amendments to the ET Procedure Rules.

4.3. Members also considered proposals relating to communicating oral decisions and written reasons on ET cases, including their potential

implications for parties and the onwards appeals process to the Employment Appeal Tribunal against decisions made by the ET. The discussion highlighted issues concerning access to transcripts for parties, associated fees costs if applicable and the practical arrangements for the ET providing written records of decisions to parties. The Committee noted that these matters would require careful consideration in light of future consultation responses.

4.4. The Committee noted that certain proposals were likely to attract significant interest from potential respondents during the consultation exercise and acknowledged that the responses received would need to be carefully considered by the ET Subgroup before any further decisions for potential amendments were taken by the full Committee.

4.5. The Committee further considered proposed changes to the reconsideration provisions and arrangements for dealing with claims or applications considered totally without merit. Members raised a number of drafting and procedural points, which MJR acknowledged and agreed to address in updating the draft consultation paper.

4.6. The Committee was content in principle for the draft paper to be finalised subject to taking account of the TPC comments raised requiring further modifications, with a view to publication by the end of 2026.

Ministry of Justice – Employment Tribunals Reform Proposal

4.7. The Committee welcomed Rawfiah Choudry (RC) and Abdul Huson (AH) to the meeting who presented the MoJ's emerging policy proposals aimed at improving the efficiency and management of ET proceedings in response to increasing backlog pressures being faced by the ET.

4.8. Members discussed the potential implications of the proposals, particularly for litigants in person. The Committee emphasised the importance of distinguishing between proposals requiring procedural rule amendments and those reforms that could be achieved by potential changes to primary legislation or alternative implementation arrangements such as updating existing ET user guidance information to achieve the desired objectives.

4.9. ID welcomed continued engagement with MoJ officials as proposals developed, emphasising the importance of early discussions to clarify the Committee's role and ensure that reforms could progress through the appropriate mechanisms.

AP/69/2026 To incorporate the relevant drafting points and finalise the draft ET consultation paper with a view to publication by the end of 2026 - **MJR**

5. Costs Subgroup

Interest on Costs, Payments on Account of Costs, Pro Bono Costs Awards and Costs in the Lands Chamber (Upper Tribunal)

5.1. MJ presented the draft response to the consultation, which closed on 29 July 2026. Attendees noted that the respondent responses received were broadly supportive of the proposed amendments to tribunal rules.

5.2. The Committee considered the proposed provisions relating to the date from which interest on costs could run. MJ explained that further legal clarification was required to establish whether the proposed approach fell within the Committee's existing rule-making vires powers.

5.3. Members also discussed the arrangements for notifying relevant parties and organisations of pro bono costs awards. It was agreed that the drafting should be clarified to accurately reflect the intended notification responsibilities.

5.4. The Committee was broadly content with the draft consultation response, subject to resolution of the outstanding legal and drafting points.

5.5. RB advised that she would review the latest version of the draft consultation response and provide legal assistance to MJ on the issue concerning the Committee's rule-making vires powers. She would then work with MJ to prepare formal drafting instructions for the proposed costs rules amendments.

5.6. The Committee agreed that the consultation response could proceed towards publication once the outstanding issues had been resolved, with a view to publication by the 02 November 2026 meeting. The proposed amendments were also intended for inclusion in the forthcoming Spring 2027 Amendment Rules SI package.

Potential rule amendments to the Lands Chamber Procedure Rules - costs-shifting powers in cases within its first instance jurisdiction to determine statutory or contractual claims for compensation

5.7. The Committee received an update on the drafting exercise for the proposed amendments to the Lands Chamber (Upper Tribunal (UT)) Procedure Rules concerning costs-shifting powers in cases within its first-instance jurisdiction.

5.8. It was noted that discussions with the Deputy President of the Lands Chamber (UT) were ongoing and further judicial comments were awaited on the revised drafting. The Committee confirmed that, in line with its previous agreement, the amendments could progress without returning for further formal consideration, provided no substantive issues arose.

Online Safety Act 2023

5.9. The Committee noted that the consultation response concerning proposed amendments to the UT Procedure Rules arising from the Online Safety Act 2023 had been published on 21 August 2026.

5.10. The associated rule amendments were being progressed for inclusion in the Tribunal Procedure (UT) (Amendment) Rules 2026 SI.

AP/70/2026 To review the draft costs consultation response and advise whether the proposed interest-on-costs provision is within the TPC's rule-making vires powers. - **RB**

AP/71/2026 To work together on formal drafting instructions for the proposed costs related amendments. - **MJ/RB**

AP/72/2026 To obtain outstanding comments from the Deputy President of the Lands Chamber (UT) on the revised drafting and progress the amendments, referring back to the TPC, if substantive issues arise - **MJ**

6. HSW Subgroup

Mental Health jurisdiction - Pre-hearing Examinations

6.1. The Committee considered the draft consultation paper concerning possible amendments to the Health, Education and Social Care Chamber Procedure Rules to remove provisions relating to pre-hearing medical examinations of mental health patients.

6.2. The Committee discussed the existing arrangements, particularly the implications for judicial independence and procedural fairness where a medical member conducts a pre-hearing examination and subsequently participates in determining the case. Members also considered the importance of ensuring that sufficient and up-to-date medical evidence would remain available to the Tribunal if the provisions were removed.

6.3. Members referred to a previous TPC consultation undertaken in 2018 on a judicial proposal to abolish pre-hearing examinations that was not taken forward following the Committee reviewing the consultation responses. Members suggested that the draft consultation paper should be modified to provide further context on why the earlier proposed changes had not been pursued at that time and the reasons for the matter being revisited at this time. Further consideration was also given to relevant case law and potential implications for tribunal users under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (right to a fair trial).

6.4. A number of drafting amendments were suggested, including clarification of the existing requirements for medical evidence, further consideration of relevant case law and procedural fairness concerns. The TPC approved the consultation paper for publication, subject to the amendments discussed, and agreed that a twelve-week consultation would be undertaken.

War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber Procedure Rule- proposal to seek a Rule Change to Allow Disposal Without a Hearing and without consent

6.5. AS presented a proposal from the President of the War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber of the First-tier Tribunal (FtT), to amend the procedural rules to permit the Tribunal to dispose of proceedings without a hearing where it considers it appropriate to do so, whilst preserving a party's right to request reconsideration at an oral hearing.

6.6. The Committee noted that the proposed amendments were similar to provisions already introduced in other Tribunal jurisdictions. Members considered the consistency of time limits within the existing rules and discussed the importance of ensuring that appropriate safeguards remained available where decisions were made without a hearing.

6.7. In particular, concerns were raised about whether the existing reconsideration and setting-aside provisions would allow decisions to be revisited where further relevant evidence subsequently became available. AS agreed, to review the relevant provisions to clarify the position before the proposals progressed.

6.8. The TPC was content for the proposals to proceed towards consultation, recognising that consultation would be required notwithstanding the similarity to provisions introduced elsewhere. It was proposed that a 12-week consultation be undertaken. AS agreed, to take forward the preparation of the consultation paper incorporating the points raised during the discussion. The TPC noted that AS may not lead on the drafting exercise as another TPC member may be designated to progress this work following the restructuring exercise of the membership of the TPC subgroups.

AP/73/2026 To incorporate the drafting amendments discussed and finalise the Mental Health jurisdiction consultation paper for publication - **FE**

AP/74/2026 To review the existing reconsideration and setting-aside provisions- **AS**

7. Online Procedure Rules Committee

7.1. SOB provided an update on the work of the Online Procedure Rules Committee (OPRC), including ongoing developments relating to digital services and online procedural arrangements. He highlighted ongoing engagement with the OPRC and the potential implications of its work for existing Tribunal Chambers Procedure Rules.

7.2. The Committee discussed the importance of ensuring that developments in online procedures remained consistent with existing Tribunal rules and reflected the practical requirements of different jurisdictions. Members raised concerns about the potential challenges of applying standardised digital

procedures across Tribunal jurisdictions, particularly given differences in operational arrangements and available resources.

7.3. SOB also provided an update on the work of the Property and Possession Working Group. Members emphasised the importance of maintaining engagement with the relevant OPRC working groups to ensure that the TPC remained informed of developments and could identify any implications for Tribunal Procedural Rules at an early stage.

7.4. The Committee considered opportunities for wider Tribunal involvement in the OPRC's work, including the possibility of additional representation on relevant working groups. SOB agreed to make further enquiries and report back on developments.

7.5. The Chair confirmed that the OPRC would remain a standing item on the Committee's agenda.

8. Contempt of Court

8.1. SOB provided an update on the work of the Contempt of Court (CoC) Working Group, including its consideration of whether Tribunal jurisdictions would benefit from Government Legal Department (GLD) support in contempt proceedings.

8.2. The Committee discussed the potential benefits of GLD providing an advocate to assist in contempt proceedings, particularly where an individual was unrepresented/ a litigant in person. Members also considered the practical and legal implications of such arrangements, including legal resource availability, potential conflicts of interest and the legal status of advocates appointed to assist in contempt proceedings. It was noted that changes to the Court and Tribunals Procedural Rules might be required to address the status of such advocates.

8.3. The Committee expressed support in principle for the availability of GLD assistance in appropriate contempt proceedings, subject to the necessary resources and legal support arrangements being in place. SOB agreed to communicate the Committee's position to the CoC working group.

8.4. Members also discussed the anticipated timetable for the Law Commission's review of contempt laws recommendations being implemented and noted the importance of engagement between the Law Commission of England and Wales and the Scottish Law Commission (for Scots law). SOB agreed to seek further information on the timetable and note the importance of coordination between the two Commissions for their different jurisdictional remit.

AP/75/2026 To communicate the Committee's position on the GLD support query in contempt proceedings and raise the importance of engagement with the

Scottish Law Commission. An update on the Law Commission timetable was also sought - **SOB**

9. Open Justice and Transparency Board

9.1. The Committee considered a note prepared by the Family Procedure Rule Committee (FPRC), providing an update on its work to consider whether, and if so how, open justice and transparency might be reflected in the overriding objective of the Family Procedure Rules 2010.

9.2. ID outlined a proposal to establish a small cross-jurisdictional working group to consider potential amendments to court and tribunals procedural rules. Members discussed the importance of ensuring that the proposed work was coordinated with existing activities undertaken by the Open Justice and Transparency Board (OJTB) and its working groups.

9.3. The Committee noted that further clarification was required regarding the relationship between the proposed working group and the OJTB's existing arrangements, including their respective roles and responsibilities.

9.4. The Chair proposed that GF represent the TPC on the OJTB working group, which the Committee supported. GF agreed to engage with the relevant group and provide updates to the Committee as the work progressed.

10. Artificial Intelligence

10.1. DF provided an update on the work of the newly created judicial cross-jurisdictional group established to consider the implications of artificial intelligence (AI) on potential procedural or rule changes in the justice system. He explained that the working group had met on two occasions and was awaiting the Civil Justice Council's (CJC) report on the use of AI by court and tribunal users in preparing court and tribunals documents before determining its next steps. It was anticipated that the working group might provide guidance/ judicial thinking to the individual Justice rule-making committees rather than propose a uniform set of rules in isolation.

10.2. The Committee noted that the CJC's findings would help inform its consideration of whether any changes to the current set of Tribunal Procedure Rules might be necessary. ID requested that DF coordinate circulation of the report to members once available, ahead of further discussion at the next meeting.

10.3. Members also highlighted the importance of understanding the experiences of individual Tribunal jurisdictions and ensuring that any future approach was informed/agreed by existing judicial guidance and the wider cross - jurisdictional work.

10.4. The possibility of establishing a dedicated TPC subgroup to consider AI-related matters was raised. However, it was considered premature to take this action forward until further information was made available from the cross - jurisdictional working group.

10.5. ID confirmed that AI subject matter would return to the agenda and would possibly require a subgroup when the Committee would be better placed to consider any further steps/approach to be taken. Arrangements would also be made for members to receive the CJC's report once available.

AP/76/2026 To arrange circulation of the Civil Justice Council report when available, ahead of further discussion at the 02 November 2026 meeting - **DF**

11. Review of subgroups /restructure

11.1. ID thanked HP for preparing a schedule summarising members' response to the subgroup membership review. ID explained that the intention was to review subgroup allocations to ensure an appropriate balance between members' specialist expertise and opportunities to contribute to work outside their principal areas of experience. This was considered particularly relevant for newer members, allowing them to participate in areas aligned with their expertise while gaining exposure to other jurisdictions.

11.2. The Chair advised that he would work with HP and VP to develop revised subgroup allocations, taking account of members expressed preferences and the wider needs of the Committee. The matter would be revisited at the 07 December 2026 TPC meeting.

12. The Tribunal Procedure (Upper Tribunal) (Amendment) Rules 2026

12.1. RB provided an update on the Tribunal Procedure (UT) (Amendment) Rules 2026 SI. The SI makes the following amendments to the UT Rules:

- Amendments that apply to the UT in respect of applications for judicial review.
- Accommodating the Online Safety Act 2023- introduces a three-month time limit (starting from the day after Ofcom publishes the relevant decision) for applications for permission to appeal by persons with a sufficient interest in Ofcom's regulatory decisions to be brought to the UT.

12.2. RB confirmed that the drafting reflected the proposals previously consulted upon, with only minor technical amendments made to ensure consistency with the existing Rules.

12.3. The Committee was informed that a laying date of 16 October 2026 had been secured, with commencement proposed for 6 November 2026.

12.4. RB advised that the final electronic signing version would be circulated to members, together with instructions for completing the signing process. Members were asked to return their signatures by the requested deadline to allow sufficient time for ministerial signing ahead of laying the SI before Parliament.

Spring 2027 Tribunal Procedure (Amendment) Statutory Instrument

12.5. RB outlined the rule changes potentially suitable for inclusion in the planned Spring 2027 Tribunal Procedure (Amendment) Rules SI exercise, including those potential amendments relating to:

- Rule 1(3) of the General Regulatory Chamber Rules for Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Act Determinations;
- Rule 7 of the Tribunal Procedure (FtT) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013 and
- Costs/expenses rules in the FtT, UT and ETS.

12.6. ID highlighted the significant volume of drafting legal work anticipated following recent proposals for rule changes being added to the TPC work programme and the forthcoming planned consultations. ID asked MoJ and MOJLA officials to consider how the necessary legal drafting resources would be managed to support future TPC Amendment Rules SI exercises including the legal resource required to support any potential ET reform work led by the MoJ.

12.7. The Committee noted that the planned Spring 2027 Tribunal Procedure (Amendment) SI package would need to focus on those potential amendments capable of progressing within the required timetable, with further consideration to be given to the legal resources needed for subsequent future SI exercises.

AP/77/2026 To circulate the Tribunal Procedure (UT) (Amendment) Rules 2026 SI signing version and signing instructions and coordinate members' signatures ahead of laying the instrument before Parliament – **RB**

13. Overview subgroup

13.1. The Committee briefly considered the work programme. It was noted that this document/record would be updated to reflect the consultation papers and other matters discussed during the meeting.

14. AOB

Chairing Arrangements

14.1. ID advised that he would be unable to attend the next meeting due to planned leave. AS agreed, to chair the meeting in his absence.

General Regulatory Chamber – Border Security, Asylum and Immigration Act 2025

14.2. The Committee considered a paper prepared by the Home Office, concerning proposed amendments to the GRC Procedural Rules arising from the Border Security, Asylum and Immigration Act 2025 (BSAIA). The Home Office had asked the TPC to consider making amendments so that the GRC can manage new appeals and determinations arising from the BSAIA. Implementation is planned for October 2027.

14.3. Members discussed whether the proposals required public consultation, noting that there appeared to be sufficient time to undertake a consultation exercise.

14.4. The Committee agreed in principle to progress the proposals and requested that a draft consultation paper be prepared for consideration at the 07 December 2026 meeting. It was agreed that the work would be allocated to the General Regulatory Chamber Subgroup, with responsibility for taking it forward to be confirmed following the review of subgroup membership. The potential need for judicial assistance resource was also noted.

Social Entitlement Chamber - Proposed Procedural Rule Amendments

14.5. AS presented a late paper outlining a package of proposed amendments to the Social Entitlement Chamber Procedural Rules, against the background of increasing caseload pressures and the need to improve procedural efficiency.

14.6. AS drew attention to the proposal concerning the withdrawal of asylum support decisions and raised the possibility of progressing this through a separate consultation. However, given the anticipated SI legislative timetable, it was considered more practical to progress and combine the proposals together.

14.7. Members discussed the wider implications of introducing an express anonymisation provision within the Social Entitlement Chamber Procedure Rules, particularly whether a consistent approach should be considered across Tribunal jurisdictions. The Committee supported seeking the views of other FtT and UT Chamber Presidents including the Employment Tribunal Presidents, before determining how this aspect of the proposals should progress.

14.8. The Committee also raised questions about the statutory basis for the proposed provisions concerning vexatious litigants and their potential implications for the overriding objective. It was agreed that legal advice would be sought from RB to clarify the legal position.

14.9. The Committee was content in principle for work on the proposals to progress, subject to further consideration of the outstanding legal and cross-jurisdictional issues identified. AS and the subgroup would take forward preparation of the draft consultation paper, with additional judicial assistance to be sought given the scale of the work involved.

EAT tribunal representative observer

14.10. ID advised that a request had been received for an Employment Appeal Tribunal (EAT) representative to attend TPC meetings periodically as an observer. He noted that this would provide an opportunity for engagement with the EAT, particularly in light of the potential future review of its procedural rules and the relationship between Employment Tribunal and EAT procedures.

14.11. The Committee was supportive of the proposal, and ID indicated that he would extend an invitation.

AP/78/2026	To update the TPC work programme to reflect consultation papers and matters discussed at the meeting - **VP**
AP/79/2026	To prepare a draft GRC consultation paper regarding Border Security, Asylum and Immigration Act proposals for the December meeting - **GRC subgroup**
AP/80/2026	To obtain legal advice on the statutory basis for the proposed SEC vexatious litigant provisions - **AS/RB**
AP/81/2026	To progress the SEC consultation paper after the subgroup membership review and seek judicial assistance to support the work- **HSW subgroup**

Next TPC meeting: Monday 02 November 2026