

# **Administrative Court User Group Meeting**

**Monday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2025**

**16:30 Via Teams**

## **Minutes**

### **Present:**

Chamberlain J, Geraint Evans, Philip Shearer, Monika Patel, Sarah Christou, Olu Adedeji, Jawaid Luqmani, Christina Parkinson, Erin Alcock, David May, Rakesh Singh, Angela Warwick, Timothy Baldwin, Peter Campbell, Charles Bishop, Grace Benton, Kareem Williams, Sasha Rozansky, Elizabeth Mackie, Nazim Mahmood, Nusrat Zur, Shalini Patel, James Packer, Miranda Butler, Megan Goulding, Aneela Samrai, Ruth Buckland, Georgina Surry, Natalie Stevens, Shu Shin Luh, Donnchadh Greene, Alex Papasotiriou, Amy Tschobotko, Charlie Quant

### **Apologies:**

Jyoti Gill  
Lydia Watton  
Steve Broach  
Katie Meredith  
Caroline Bird  
Caroline Robinson  
Sylvia Nicolaou Garcia

Meeting started 16:30 Chamberlain J (**CJ**) thanked all for attending.

### **1. Minutes of last meeting/matters arising**

The draft minutes of the last meeting were agreed without amendment.

### **2. Court Performance**

**CJ** hopes that the set of stats provided, up to the end of December, are sufficient for this meeting,

**CJ** noted that the stats for Renewal Applications are still rather low. This is likely to be affected by figures earlier in the year before directions changed and hopes this will improve. Figures for Final Hearings continue to do better than targets.

### **3. Contacting the Admin Office**

**CJ** asked the group if contacting the Admin Court had got any better.

Shalini Patel (**SP**) advised that on calling the Admin Court, on a number of occasions the call had been cut off.

At times, she is able to get through to the Main Switchboard and is put through to the relevant team, but these calls are often unanswered.

James Packer (**JP**) said he often shared the same experience as **SP** and said when he did get through to the General Office by telephone he was told to put this in an email, which often was the purpose of the call.

Erin Alcock (**EA**) stated that she had a query, not specifically related to the problem of contacting the Admin Court, more to do with the advice she has been receiving relating to CE-File applications. The General Office are advising to send the application via the DUC or email when the CE-File application could not be found.

**CJ** noted that contacting the Admin Court seemed to continue to be a problem and asked for volunteers from the group to meet with key members of Admin Court staff to get closer to a resolution.

Kareem Williams (**KW**) asked **EA** to email him directly with examples and will follow this up with his team.

- 4. a) How to pay Out Of Hours (OOH) application fees**
- b) Fee receipts not served to case**
- c) How to make an application when an E-Filed claim awaits**
- d) Default rejection in E-Filing – rather than the “application issued at insistence” procedure**

**JP** stated there was no box on the OOH application to place the PBA number.

**CJ** said he would take this away, even though this is not an Admin Court form and will suggest that the form is modified.

**JP** noted that the fee receipt doesn't get forwarded to the case solicitor instructed but to the solicitors firm's accounts department.

**KW** said this may be something he would have to take up with the Fee's Team.

**JP** said that when using CE-Filing, there is no option to input the amount of the fee yourself, CE File tells you what the fee is, subsequently, applications were being rejected because an incorrect fee had been used. Once the application is rejected there is no way of resurrecting it.

**JP** noted that there used to be an “insistence” procedure whereby a form could be completed, and the application would be issued in any event.

**KW** noted that in the early pilot days of CE-Filing, incorrect fees had been input and at that time, court users were advised to re-lodge their applications via email.

The solution for now may be to email the Immediates Inbox if urgent, or if not urgent, email the General Inbox headed "urgent" and marked with High Importance.

Sarah Christou (**SC**) the CE-File Service Manager, confirmed that at the very start of E-Filing, there was a glitch in the system and a small number of cases were rejected, but wanted to re-assure everyone that this is not an ongoing problem.

Unfortunately, once the case is rejected, this process cannot be undone.

**KW** said that if a case had been rejected and consequently filed via email, this would be noted on CMS.

**JP** stated that he would like to volunteer to be a part of the group mentioned at the beginning of the meeting.

## **5. Size limits on electronic bundles and delays in fees**

**EA** asked if the size limit of Core Bundles could be changed to page limit rather than size limit.

**CJ** advised that the size of bundles was more to do with the capacity of the system.

**SC** advised that CMS can accept bundles up to 50mb.

**KW** confirmed that the 20mb limitation was due to the capacity of email attachments.

Geraint Evans (**GE**) will produce a note on the Admin Court website, this will supersede what is currently stated in the guide and we will make sure the guidance is updated later in the year,

**EA** has an issue where fees are not being taken from PBA accounts on time.

Monika Patel (**MP**) asked **EA** to email her with a list and she will look into this and provide a response to .

## **6. News and Notes**

**CJ** said that there is no news and notes, other than what has been gone through already.

## **7. Q & A**

**CJ** said that there are similarly no Q & A's.

## **8. AOB/Next meeting**

Sasha Rozansky (**SR**) mentioned that there seemed to be 2 email addresses for the Case Progression Team and wanted to know what the correct one was.

**CJ** advised that all Admin Court email addresses had recently changed due to a new system being introduced.

**GE** advised that updated email addresses will be published on the internet but that the old email addresses would still work.

**SR** also asked about the CPR requirements to file hard copy bundles.

**CJ** advised that the standard direction is to file paper bundle if requested.

He will look into this and have an answer for the next meeting.

Shu Shin Luh (**SSL**) said that previously, pre-Covid, when the ACO Guide was updated , the CUG would be told about the draft and be invited to comment on it.

**CJ** noted he was previously the editor of the ACO Guide.

The Guide is updated every year. The final version is sent off to the printers in July ready for uploading to the ACO website in September.

**CJ** noted it would be sensible to get comments from the Admin Court.

**CJ** will discuss this with the current editor, Clive Sheldon and take this forward.

**SC** said that with regards to CE-File, there is generic E-filing user guidance but she is keen to know what ACO users need on top of this guidance and would welcome feedback.

**CJ** asked if anyone has any feedback that this is sent to **MP** and she will pass this on.

**MK** advised she will share guidance link after the meeting.

Rakesh Singh (**RS**) said he was expecting specific guidance on CE-Filing before it became mandatory as this would benefit court users.

**CJ** thanked **RS** for his comment and advised this will be put on the list for Monika.

**CJ** thanked all for attending and advised that the next CUG meeting will be in April and will be in person/hybrid.

**Meeting ended 17:30.**