

Administrative Court User Group Meeting

Wednesday 15th April 2026

9:15am via Teams

Minutes

Present:

Chamberlain J, Monika Patel, Mark Hamilton, Geraint Evans, Jyoti Gill, Vincent Lyddon, Oludotun Onasanya, Lydia Watton, Emma Alloh, , Christina Parkinson, Rebecca Hacker, Shu Shin Luh, David May, Elizabeth Mackie, Moshe Bordon, Olivia Peake, John Crowley, Sasha Rozansky, Steve Broach, Serana Fasso, Erin Alcock, Nikolas Barnes, Chris McKendry, Jawaid Luqmani, Ruth Anne Cathcart, ConRoom 5, Angela Warwick

Apologies:

Georgina Surry, Iwona Chuchla, Rakesh Singh, Nusrat Zar, Philip Shearer, James Packer, Amy Tschobotko and Charles Bishop

Meeting started 9:15am Chamberlain J (CJ) thanked all for attending.

1. Minutes of last meeting/matters arising - Judge

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

2. ACO Performance - Judge

- Summary of performance against targets
- New policy for case allocation to DHCJs

CJ advised that the targets were not being met for paper applications or oral renewals but were for substantive hearings.

CJ noted that DHCJ's can now hear substantive appeals in disciplinary cases and also, DHCJ's will now be dealing with some paper applications in extradition cases.

3. Anonymity orders and sealing of claims – Sasha Rozansky

Sasha Rozansky (**SR**) asked for clarification if the court would prefer redacted copies of the claim form, Statement of facts and Grounds and Witness Statement or all documents within the permission bundle to be filed with the redactions in it?

Lydia Watton (**LW**) advised that it is helpful to have a separate redacted copy of the Statement of Case but wanted to check with the team that deals with Office Copy Requests from Non-Parties.

SR asked for clarification that when there is an Anonymity Order pending that the court will use initial ciphers?

CJ advised that, subject to discussion, there needs to be a process that when a claim is issued administratively where anonymity is sought, then it is issued in an anonymised form for the time being, then if the judge rejects the application for anonymity it reverts back to the real name.

CJ will take this offline and come up with a protocol which deals with this point.

SR said that in previous meetings, it was advised that there would be no difference in time for a case to be sealed if filed by either email or CE-File. Colleagues have found this not to be the case. It would be helpful to know which level is best to choose.

Olu Onasanya (**OO**) apologised for previous delays and advises to continue to use CE-File.

4. News and notes – Judge

- Hillmore (France removals)
- New system for immediates
- Practice Statement: Opposed applications for extensions of time (6 March 2026)
- Broadcasting cases in the Admin Court
- Parole referrals
- Embargoed judgments

Q & A

- **Hillmore (France removals)**

CJ gave some background on Hillmore cases and advised that these cases have been putting a considerable strain on the court since September of last year, both on the Immediates system and the Out of Hours system.

The volume of these cases was placing considerable strain on the limited resources of the court.

Moshe Bordon (**MB**) raised a point to advise that GLD had a number of cases where the Immediates Judges have made orders the day before charter flight removals granting stays before their client, the Home Secretary, had an opportunity to respond to the applications before making an order. Two examples were where GLD had received orders granting stays without being invited to respond and resulting in urgent applications being filed to discharge the granted orders, creating a lot of extra work for all parties and the court. Both applications to discharge were granted late evening, one at 11pm in a case which the interim order relief application had been lodged during working hours and granted *ex parte* at 18:50.

MB said that this leads to his second point of GLD having no knowledge of who is staffing the Immediates inbox and whether applications and submissions are received by the judge. There is often a lack in communication from the Immediates team which requires urgent thought.

CJ responded by saying that resources were an issue for the court. **CJ** noted that the submissions **MB** mentioned were filed around 18:00 but that there would be nobody looking at the Immediates inbox after working hours.

Jyoti Gill (**JG**) confirmed that 4:30pm is the cut off point for Immediates. Any communication received after 4:30 won't be picked up.

CJ noted that **MB** had brought attention to the gap between the point where the Immediates system ends and that where the Out of Hours system starts. Work would be done to devise a system ensure that all parties know who to contact and how.

JG advised an easy fix for this would be for the duty Immediates duty lawyer to email parties the details of Immediates judges' clerk as a point of contact.

- **New system for Immediates**

CJ advised that the plan is to have one Full Time HCJ and one DHCJ on each working day dealing with Immediates. Applications for example, abridgment of time, will go to a duty DHCJ.

- **Practice Statement: Opposed applications for extensions of time (6 March 2026)**

CJ advised that there is now a system where opposed applications for Extension of Time are referred to a duty lawyer. "EOTObjection" should be written in the subject line of the email opposing the application and will be dealt with by the duty lawyer under delegated powers where possible. The practice statement is available online: [Administrative Court Practice Statement: Opposed applications for extensions of time - Courts and Tribunals Judiciary](#)

- **Broadcasting cases in the Admin Court**

CJ said the intention was to have this operational by the end of the year. We are working on draft protocol to work out how parties will be able to object to cases being broadcast. There may be cases which are not suitable to be broadcast. We will be asking the CUG for help developing the protocol. Cases won't be live-streamed and will be similar to what we see in the Court of Appeal Criminal Division.

- **Parole referrals**

CJ advised that we have had our first Parole referral case. This is a new stream of work for the Admin Court. It is not a Judicial Review. Judges are re-taking essential decisions on high risk cases.

- **Embargoed judgments**

CJ said at the Nominated Judges meeting held yesterday, judges were reminded to be aware of difficulties caused to practitioners where they receive a judgment requesting corrections etc being required very quickly, and hopes that judges will be more tolerant.

- **Q & A**

There were no questions.

5. **AOB/ next meeting - All**

There was no AOB

CJ thanked all for attending and advised that the next meeting will be in June and will be in-person.

Meeting ended 10:00am