



Minutes of Court User Group Meeting  
Wednesday 27 October 2021 at 2.00pm  
Held remotely via MS Teams  
**Terms of Reference**

The purpose of the Court User Group is to provide a forum for discussion of matters causing concern for Court Users and views and comments on policy issues.

**These minutes may be widely disseminated.**

**Attendees**

Hilder, HHJ ( <b>HHJH</b> )	Senior Judge of the Court of Protection
Beckley, DJ ( <b>DJJB</b> )	
Owens, HHJ ( <b>HHJO</b> )	SE Regional Lead Judge
Amrit Panesar ( <b>AP</b> )	HMCTS Court of Protection - Operations Manager
Mala Nair ( <b>MN</b> )	HMCTS Court of Protection- Delivery Manager
Tom Gearing	HMCTS Court of Protection- Delivery Manager
Joan Goulbourn ( <b>JG</b> )	MOJ Mental Capacity Policy Team
Jennifer Li	HMCTS Court of Protection - ACO
Elizabeth Jeary	HMCTS Court Funds Office
Christine Leggett	HMCTS Senior Courts Costs Office
Janet Ilett	Official Solicitor & Public Trustee
Mark Higgs	Official Solicitor & Public Trustee
Mandy Giedrojcz ( <b>MG</b> )	Office of the Public Guardian
Zahrah Jabeen	Office of the Public Guardian
Natalie Cheesewright	HMCTS Court of Protection
Scott Soley	HMCTS Court of Protection
Angela Smith	Abbotstone Law (on behalf of MHLA committee)
Alice Jackson	Albin & Co Solicitors

Kirsty MacMillan	Anthony Collins Solicitors
Karen Royall	Bath & North East Somerset Council
Elizabeth Cleaver	Bindmans LLP
Louise Nettle	Blake Morgan
Ruth Meyer	Boyes Turner LLP
Alexander Wright <b>(AW)</b>	Boyes Turner LLP
Michael Barrett <b>(MB)</b>	Burke Niazi
Caroline Bielanska	Caroline Bielanska Consultancy
Stephanie Oxley	Cartwright King Solicitors
David Hilton <b>(DH)</b>	CFG Law (On behalf of COPPA)
Clare King	Clarion Solicitors Limited
Shirley Otomewo	Croydon Council
Sophy Miles	Doughty Street Chambers
Nikki Bedford	Enable Law
Karon Walton	Footner & Ewing
Robyn Hemmings	Freeths LLP
Melanie Williams	Freeths LLP
Laytoya Thompson	Higgs & Sons
Claire Whittall	Higgs & Sons
Stuart Farmer	Howden Insurance Brokers
Julia C Lomas <b>(JL)</b>	Irwin Mitchell LLP
Mathieu Culverhouse	Irwin Mitchell LLP/CoPPA
Georgina Baidoun	Lay Deputy
Desmond Mohabir	Leicestershire County Council
Ian Williams <b>(IW)</b>	London Borough of Havering
Melanie Wrench	London Borough of Havering
Neil Micklewright	London Borough of Islington
Shadia Ousta Doerfel	London Borough of Islington
Zena Bolwig	Mackintosh Law

Musonda Phiri	Miles and Partners LLP
Molly Sanghera	Mills & Reeve LLP
Holly Chantler	Morrisons Solicitors LLP
Samantha Hamilton	Mullis & Peake LLP
Chelle Farnan	NHS Castle Point and Rochford CCG
Clare Hall	North Tyneside Council
Rosemarie Martin	North Tyneside Council
Sarah Norman	NP Law
Megan Shaw	Odonnells Solicitors Ltd
Yvonne Mitchell <b>(YM)</b>	On behalf of the Association of Public Authority Deputies
Celia Kitzinger	Open Justice Court of Protection Project
Uzmah Rasool	Osborne Morris and Morgan Solicitors
Ashleigh Bryant	Paris Smith Solicitors
Adrian Hawley	Partners in Costs
Rachel Taylor	Penningtons Manches Cooper LLP
Philip Warford	Renaissance Legal
Polly Sweeney <b>(PS)</b>	Rook Irwin Sweeney
Sara Isenberg	Royds Withy King Solicitors
Maria Meek	Royds Withy King Solicitors
Eirian Hitchmough	Royds Withy King Solicitors
Ross Gilbert	Roythornes Limited
Alexandra Stephenson	Roythornes Limited
Elizabeth Young	Roythornes Limited
Anna Tkaczynska	Sergeants' Inn Chamber
Sue Bowler	Shoosmiths LLP
Pamela Clarke	South London Legal Partnership
Emma Story	South Tyneside Council
Hannah Rodgers	Stonegate Legal

Neil Cawthorn	The Professional Deputy Service Trust Corporation
Tonina Ashby	Tollers LLP
Tom Evans	Tom Evans Law
Esha Kansal	Torbay Council
Martin Terrell <b>(MT)</b>	Warners
Lisa Flynn	West Berkshire Council
Laura Knowles	West Berkshire Council
Chantal Ul Haq-Weedon <b>(CUHW)</b>	Wilkin Chapman LLP
Holly Mieville-Hawkins	Wills and Equity Committee (Michelmores)
Katrina Vollentine	Wollens
Owen Brown	Wrigleys Solicitors LLP
Andrew Graham <b>(AG)</b>	
Carol Knotts	No 5 Barristers Chambers
Geoffrey James	
Kerry-Jo Hatfield	
Amanda Coyne	
Evelyn David	
Kate Wilson	
Laura Metcalfe	
Emmett Madison	
Nicola Rigby	
Vani Chenganna	
Victoria Park	
Ash	
RC	
Guest	

**14:05 Meeting started by HHJ Hilder (HHJH)**

**1. Apologies**

- DJ Ellington
- DJ Eldergill
- DJ Jackson
- DJ Batten
- Jessica Newton (HMCTS Jurisdictional Operational Support)
- Jill Weston (Mills & Reeve LLP)
- Rob Hurling (Hugh James)
- Richard Charlton (Richard Charlton Solicitors)
- Keith Clarke (Burke Niazi)
- David Rees QC (5 Stone Buildings)
- Alison Lamont (Wards Solicitors)
- Alison Meacher (Gate House Chambers)
- Elaine Browne (Official Solicitor & Public Trustee)
- Glen Miles (Knights plc)
- Kiran Vasudera (JMW Solicitors LLP)
- Eleanor Vida (Miles and Partners)
- Shanhaz Patel (London Borough of Ealing)

**2. Minutes and action points from previous meeting 14 April 2021.**

HHJH -Minutes and action points of previous meeting agreed and adopted

**3. Operations/Delivery Manager's Report, inc. pilot update and graph – COP Senior Management Team. Amrit Panesar (AP)**

AP requested for any comments/observations to the statistics provided ahead of the meeting.

No feedback given

AP continued with the operations report.

Applications - 35% increase in applications received over past 6months (quarters 2 and 3 2021), compared to the last quarter of 2020 and 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2021. The highest rise in P&A deputyship applications, with a 19% increase, with 16762 cases in the last 2 quarters compared to 14064 in last quarter of 2020 and first of 2021. This was noted as a significant peak.

Disposals during the same timeframes there has been a 4 ½ % decrease in orders made (see chart) Disposal quarters 2 and 3 2021 4.25% decrease.

The decrease in these numbers and downward trend is due to backlog being addressed by further staff recruitment to reduce these timeframes. 10 full-time staff have been recruited, with a 2<sup>nd</sup> Band E campaign in progress and more agency staff to be brought in. Existing staff training and continuous improvement in place to take out further waste and reduce delays.

The orders hub is continued to be improved. Recent work has been completed with the OPG on interim orders which has reduced delay. The new Efiling system is currently used for the DOLS, with possible further roll out to follow in discussion with the development and digital teams. EApplication Pilot and P&A upfront service pilot continues. 752 applications received within these. 268 are currently live, 458 are concluded. Of 51 upfront service pilot, there was no defective applications the general EApplication P&A timeframe of 13 weeks which is reduced to 11 weeks with the introduction of Efiles. The average time frame of the upfront service pilot is 2-7 weeks, this however is from a very small sample, so this work still needs to be reviewed. But it was noted that on average it usually takes around 20 weeks for the COP20's to be received on paper files, so there will be much value in these pilots.

Bundles – the court has piloted the Document Upload Centre with the OPG, with on demand implementation. This is in the early stages, with other products are also being reviewed

Request for any questions  
None received.

#### **4. Filing COP20 Certificates –HHJ Hilder (HHJH)**

HHJ Hilder (HHJH) followed on from the management update with a plea that COP20 certificates are sent to the designated email address (only) or by post. They should be filed by email or post, but not both. If sent to any other inbox they may be lost, causing delay.

Email address for COP20's:

[cop\\_service@justice.gov.uk](mailto:cop_service@justice.gov.uk)

## **5. Update from the Mental Capacity Policy Team – Joan Goulbourn (JG)**

JG updated that the Modernising Lasting Powers of Attorney consultation closed on 13 October 2021, with over 300 responses, 100 of which were from members of the public. A government response to this is expected in the Spring.

The Code of Practice for the Mental Capacity Act and for the LPS safeguards has been delayed due to the ministerial reshuffle. The draft code has therefore needed to be re-submitted to ministers for consideration. The LPS Safeguards are due to be implemented in April next year. Further information will be provided on this as soon as it is received.

Child Trust Funds (CTF) – JG advised that they have been inundated Freedom of information requests and letters to ministers. So far there have been 5 oral parliamentary questions, with other parliamentary questions. Ministers have asked us to engage with stakeholders, so there will be a consultation on whether there should be legislation around accessing small payments.

Cost Consultation – JG informed that the work on the fixed cost practice directions and the cost consultation was shelved whilst CTF work was completed. This may be able to be picked up at the end of this year/early next year. As the guideline rates have now been increased this may provide some comfort to users.

JG requested any questions following her update  
None received

HHJH - informed JG that the court has to date received 28 CTF applications in total.

## **6. HHJ Owens (HHJO) - support for listings in SE Region.**

HHJO explained to the CUG that that will be some use of COP fee paid Judges in the SE region. She noted the shortfall in COP ticketed judges in the SE and the general shortfall in district judges in SE and national. It is hoped that these regular fee-paid COP ticketed judges will be available from January 2022 to deal with shorter hearings and though will affect judicial continuity, it is hoped this will be offset by being able to offer earlier hearing dates. The implementation of this is delayed to the impact of administrative issue in the SE including loss of clerking support staff. We will notify all as soon as this is up and running

HHJH confirmed that she is working closely with HHJO on this and they will deal with any issues that may arise on this.

## 7. Yvonne Mitchell (YM) (On behalf of the Association of Public Authority Deputies)

- OPG requirement for the completion of a COP4 form when applying for a Local Authority to become replacement Deputy.

YM explained her query for the CUG. When the OPG requests for the Local Authority to act as a replacement deputy and a new COP4 is being requested. YM noted that it has been explained that the Local Authorities are not required to provide a COP4 for each case, as a master copy is used. Can the COP assist with providing guidance to the OPG on this?

HHJH advised that the OPG are an independent body so she cannot answer on their behalf. From the Court's perspective, every deputy is expected to sign up to the COP4 undertakings, but as Local Authorities are a statutory body historically the approach has been for one COP4 to be signed and this is kept at court. Unfortunately, due to changes in Local Authority boundaries, some COP4s are outdated and there are some which we do not hold. This question has started an internal audit on the COP4s held, and an update will be provided to the OPG upon completion for them to decide the next steps.

**Action point 1: to update the CUG at the next meeting as to progress in this regard.**

**DJ Beckley (DJJB)** advised that where the OPG raises with the court concerns about conduct of a deputy or attorney and seeks interim appointment of a deputy (LA or otherwise), the court would usually want something from the OPG to confirm that the proposed interim person/body agrees to the interim appointment.

YM responded that they typically check and confirm that they are happy to take on and then make this declaration.

YM enquired whether it would be useful for updated COP4s to be submitted by the Local Authorities as it may help local authorities and the OPG.

HHJH advised that **Mala Nair (MN)** would be taking this forward. MN confirmed this.

**Mandy Giedrojc (MG)** responded on behalf of the OPG to confirm that they were aware of this issue and happy to liaise with MN on this

YM enquired whether the APAD could join this discussion  
MG confirmed, yes.

**Ian Williams (IW)** on behalf of the London Borough of Havering confirmed that they have received similar requests from the OPG, but that they did not have an issue with providing a new COP4.

HHJH noted this but advised that it would still be useful to have a review of this list.

## **8. Samantha Hamilton (SH) – Mullis & Peake LLP**

- [current timescales \(deputy orders/ other property applications/ welfare applications\)](#)

SH updated the CUG that timescales have got longer. Can an update be provided re the timescales for standard deputy orders? The OPG provide their timescales online. Can the COP do this too? It would be helpful to be able to refer third party queries to.

HHJH reminded users that at the last meeting details re the statistics which can be published were discussed and noted in the minutes and graphs, and there has been no change since. The court acknowledges that there are backlogs in P&A matters. Unfortunately, this very significant part of the court's work remains predominantly paper based. It is therefore particularly susceptible to being hit by the impact of covid on staffing levels. Without improved resources, both in staff numbers and modern IT, it is not possible to promise rapid improvement. However, the indications from the e-p&a pilots are that timescales are much reduced with these processes. There will be formal review of the pilots, with a view to seeing if they can become standard approaches.

SH agreed this and noted that, though this was understood, there is a need to limit and manage expectations, which in turn may reduce chasing calls

HHJH referred to the disposal charts sent in advance of the meeting, which confirmed timescales of over 20 weeks. It was requested that users refrain from chasing within this timeframe.

MN agreed that more numbers would be useful and that she is liaising with statistics team to improve the statistics in a more meaningful way to manage expectations and in line with National Statistics protocols.

HHJH confirmed that this is an active project.

**Martin Terrell (MT)** requested that start to finish figures would help to have expectation benchmarks. Eg if it is 2 weeks to issue an application, but the practitioner is waiting beyond two weeks, they should then chase? He advised that 3 or 4 benchmarks would be useful.

HHJH re-confirmed that she understood that this would be useful, but the court's hands are tied by courts-wide statistics protocols, as previously discussed. Attempts to widen this continue. For now, the overall target is 16 weeks and it is not possible to give other benchmarks. Delay is acknowledged; please there is constant striving to address this as best we can.

## 9 Chantal UI Haq-Weedon (CUHW) - Wilkin Chapman LLP

- Delays in orders (with example).

CUHW advised of a delay of over 1 year from application to hearing, discussed with MN prior to CUG. She enquired if there is any way solicitors can apply to act as a judge to speed the process?

HHJH read the text of CUHW's email:

The Order was made on 5 February but not issued until 20 July (5.5 months later). I have also had another matter whereby a gentleman has been left without any personal allowance (despite a request for an urgent release of £250 for haircuts, chiropody, clothes etc). Again, he hasn't had access to funds and this has left him looking unkempt and totally against how he would normally wish to present himself.

We are working with extremely vulnerable individuals and it is not acceptable to be leaving them for such a long period of time without any progression.

HHJH acknowledged this very real impact of delay, as described. In terms of judicial resources, there is a formal application process through the JAC and also (for those who already hold judicial appointment) by way of annual EOI for COP nomination. (It is not possible for practitioners simply to lend their time as such to the court.) HHJH encouraged eligible practitioners to consider making a formal application for judicial appointment. There is a current JAC exercise open, specifically including posts for up to 3 full-time COP tier 1 judges at the central registry. Mentoring conversations can be arranged within formal schemes, if requested.

**Andrew Graham (AG)** raised that he felt his queries raised 3 or 4 years ago have not been responded to. He expressed his belief that he had been ignored and that he would need to complain to the Law Society and Bar Council.

HHJH confirmed AG's attendance at previous user groups, and that the issue he had raised had been looked into. The case in question had not been before HHJH and AG's communications were dealt with within those proceedings. HHJH advised that, if AG had a new issue to raise, the meeting

could address that as an item of “any other business” at the end of the agenda. AG confirmed he was content with this.

## **10. Polly Sweeney (PS) – Rook Irwin Sweeney LLP**

1. Urgent applications for ACC authority for costs on education appeals.
2. Delays in receiving orders from the court after they have been made.

PS advised on 2 matters. Dealing with (2) she reported on welfare applications with an average of a 2-month delay in an order being made to order being issued. She noted the courts previous comments re being unable to provide benchmarks on this.

HHJH advised that it had been explained at the last meeting that staffing issues had caused particular delays with the issuing of orders, and so there had been an HMCTS reorganisation, setting up an “orders hub”. This is still a work in progress in terms of staff training but is already showing improved issue times. AP confirmed the timeline has been reduced and there is work on moving staff to reduce this further.

PS continued with her point (1) with regards to the provision of quotes for education appeals following the ACC judgment. These have been problematic regarding quotes for which given but are not heard back on due to the time it takes the court to deal with non-urgent applications. This creates a challenging of managing workloads, therefore some solicitors are now reluctant to provide these quotes. In respect of urgent applications, PS raised whether the court is able to deal quickly enough with cases within the tight deadlines of education appeals and judicial reviews. As small firms they are not able to work at risk, which sadly in some cases this creates a barrier to the child or young person seeking advice. Can these applications be flagged so that they can be dealt with in the time needed?

HHJH noted that the court is aware of the limits of times. The difficulties re quotes had also be raised at the recent PDF conference. HHJH revisited the position that quotes from providers outside the deputy’s own firm are required to address the problem of conflict of interest where a deputy is considering giving in-house instructions. In terms of timing, an application should be made as soon as possible, clearly marked as urgent. There is an established process of referral to the Urgent Business Judge of the day. The UBJ judges have confirmed that there has not been an excess in this type of application and those that have been received have been dealt with promptly.

PS responded that she was reassured by the urgent procedure in place

**Alexander Wright (AW)** raised the practical difficulties in retrospective applications, and the limitations of an orders for costs when things change. Is a COP9 is acceptable to flag this as urgent change?

DJJB confirmed that there has not been a high volume of urgent applications received in this area. If such are received, they are dealt with by the UBJ within a day. He noted that he had seen lots of completely speculative applications, without timescales or quotes. He advised that these would generally be refused, but still took up time to deal with.

HHJH confirmed that the *Re ACC* judgment stands for itself. For the court to process applications efficiently, there should be a clear differentiation in the application between speculative and urgent applications

**Julia Lomas (JL)** reminded the issues raised by PS had been raised at the last meeting, but it was useful that PS had raised this as an education solicitor, rather than deputy. The small number of specialised practitioners makes it difficult to get required quotes.

HHJH confirmed understanding that practitioners who are repeatedly asked to give quotes but never instructed may be disinclined to take part in the quotation process. HHJH emphasised that the process of must be part of a genuine search for the most appropriate instruction, not be a tick box exercise. If a conflict of interest cannot be managed with openness and transparency, the alternative is that it cannot be allowed to arise.

JL emphasised that ‘the pool is small’ and it is not always about the cheapest quote.

HHJH agreed that it has been helpful to air these issues.

## 11. Michael Barrett (MB) -Burke Niazi

- Accredited legal representatives (ALRs), staff are waiting for courses to resume. Is the Court able to assist by raising this in some forum with the Law Society?

MB informed the court that he has 2 ALR’s keen to progress with training for ALR accreditation, but this has not re-started yet with the Law Society, can the court assist on this?

AP confirmed that due to change in provider there had been a delay and that the court are working with the Law Society on this to restart this training and hope to update soon on this.

PS advised that she had contacted the law Society re timescales, and she will also go back to them on this.

HHJH noted that the ALR scheme is run by The Law Society, not the Court or HMCTS, and no training course had been offered recently because of covid issues. Issues about lack of opportunity to train as ALR had been recently raised in the SE region. It is understood that availability of training opportunities has an impact on a firm's business. The feedback received by HMCTS (Jess Newton) indicates that the Law Society is keen to run further training courses as soon as possible.

## **12. Celia Kitzinger (CK) - Open Justice Court of Protection Project**

- "Public Observers' Issues"

CK advised that 3 questions to be raised in her role as supporting open justice and transparency in Court of Protection

1. She thanked First Avenue House for including the listing descriptions on their court lists, advising it is really useful to know this information. Is it possible for the SE to also do this?

HHJO confirmed that she would take this back to the Hub team. She was not aware that this issue remained as a lot of work had been completed in this area and this was mainly arising in local court level.

CK thanked HHJO and advised of inconsistencies in this area and that this would make a huge difference to efficient observation of hearings.

2. CK responded to Judges concerns re last minute requests to attend hearings. This was noted as frustrating where the delays are internal and not through the lateness of the request. CK requested whether the process could be streamlined?

HHJH responded that covid-working arrangements meant that ensuring transparency represents an additional administrative burden to the judges and staff. We all need to work together on this. Administratively, requests to observe received withing 30 minutes of a scheduled hearing's start time cannot realistically be processed in time to be effective. With more than 30 minutes notice, HHJH is confident that all parts of the court system are fully onboard with the importance of facilitating observation.

3. CK advised that opening summaries by the Applicant or Judge were being completed in some cases, but around 10% not doing this. Please can these be provided.

HHJH replied that she understood this is a suggestion of the Vice President, but in reality it is not always achievable for Tier 1 and 2 judges, who have shorter time frames from heavy lists and larger number litigants in person. HHJH noted that she tries to give these summaries herself to avoid delay but understands that other judges feel that they do not have the luxury of time to do this. It has to be the particular judge's decision as a matter of case management in the specific case.

HHJO re-enforced this, noting the high caseloads of COP/Civil and Family work for judges which does often call for a judgment call to be made on this.

CK noted that it would assist even if the judges announce that for example the case is a S21a hearing.

HHJH noted that this would hopefully be assisted by the listing notice description

CK advised that feedback was welcomed on how they could be less disruptive, more supportive and help the judicial commitment to transparency. Email/DM

HHJH - Additional questions raised but not in time for inclusion on the agenda:

### **David Hilton (DH) On behalf of COPPA**

DH raised queries by COPPA members

1 Point raised by Laura Milner on whether there has been any change in the appointment of a joint professional and lay deputy. As a hearing has been called to review the suitability and level of security

HHJH read email to CUG and specific example:

We have twice now had directions orders or hearings called as it is felt that it may not be in P's best interest to have a lay Deputy alongside a Professional as security will need to be set as if it is solely a lay Deputy. We have not experienced this historically, and have had lay and professionals appointed alongside each other in other cases and security has been set at a reasonable level, with bond providers able to issue bonds with a reasonable premium.

Both applications in which this has happened has set out extensive evidence as to why these particular circumstances require a lay deputy alongside a professional, and have vouched for the reliability of the lay.

Has there been a particular change in approach at all? Or is there something we are expected to provide to allow these types of applications to proceed?

HHJH confirmed that there has been no change in approach. It is not possible to comment on an individual case. HHJH noted that it is helpful to explain clearly why a particular proposal is in P's best interests.

2. Point raised by Ruth Wright general delays- noted that this has already covered

3. Point raised by Ruth Wright COP3 query. DH read email noting that his was case specific:

Upon the court considering the documents filed and noting that the COP3 dated 26.01.2021 by XXXX, Consultant Clinical Neuropsychologist has not provided adequate information for the court to determine the capacity question. At para 7:2 he has not completed at all the questions as to what information about property and affairs was given to P which he was not able to understand. The next paragraph and part of the test is too general and refers to decisions in hand – these must be specified. The final box is left entirely blank.”

In fact, that was not the case and the form contained all the necessary information.

HHJH noted that the quoted order provides a clear explanation of the judges/ACO view. It would be of more concern if there was no explanation to COP3 objection. As always where an order is made on the papers, the right to apply for reconsideration applies.

### **13. AOB**

HHJH raised to the CUG that the streamline applications for DOLS are increasing in numbers but not the resourcing to manage this. A possible LPS rescue is at best some months away. The applications being made are becoming less streamlined with more documents attached, Users are reminded to file only those documents which are required by the streamlined process as set out in the Practice Direction. The court is using a new IT tool – CaseFinder - to process this work. If titled correctly, documents received electronically will be saved to the court file automatically. Practitioners are requested to use the standard descriptors.

**Action point 2: The court will send the key terms to users within the next 14 days.**

AP raised the use of PBA and a request for this to be used where possible, as the courts preferred method of payment. The use of card and cheque payments is a long and slow process, further increasing delays.

YM observed that the PBA process is difficult to set up. She advised that legal teams may be more able to put this in place, but that this is riskier for financial affairs team. She requested whether it would be possible to have a meeting with AP to discuss the PBA system.

AP agreed to this.

HHJH enquired if the group would prefer to continue with the MS Teams platform for future meetings. The majority agreed to this, so it is noted that the next general meeting will take place via MS Teams (but with an option for in-person attendance upon request)

**The next P&A User Group meeting has already been scheduled for:  
19 January 2022 at 2pm via MS Teams**

**The next General User Group meeting is agreed to be held on:  
20 April 2022 at 2pm via MS Teams (in person upon request).**

Confirmation of the email address for CO20 filing: [cop\\_service@justice.gov.uk](mailto:cop_service@justice.gov.uk)

HHJH returned to AG to raise any concerns. AG experienced technological difficulties and was unable to unmute himself. Time was allowed but the problem remained unresolved so further communication remained not possible and the CUG was concluded.

**HHJH called the meeting to an end at 15:32**