

Admin Court User Group Meeting Minutes

Wednesday 24th June 2026, via Teams

Present:

Mr Justice Chamberlain, Amy Tschobotko, Charles Bishop, Christina Parkinson, Elizabeth Mackie, Gavin John, Georgina Surry, Greg O Ceallaigh, Jamie Beagent, Jawaid Luqmani, John Crowley, Lee Marsons, Michael Smith, Natalie Stevens, Nusrat Zar, Paul Clarke , Rakesh Singh, Serena Fasso, Steve Broach, Moshe Bordon, Shalini Patel, Ruth Buckland, Sahil Kher, Samantha Pullin, Timothy Baldwin, Shu Shin Luh, A Ni Chuinn, Geraint Evans, Philip Shearer, Oludotun Onasanya, Monika Patel, Ben Power

Apologies:

Ben Wood, Jyoti Gill, David May, Sarah Christou, Emma Alloah

Meeting started at 4.15pm

1. Opening remarks- Mr Justice Chamberlain

CJ thanked all for joining and announced that the meeting would be recorded to assist with minute-taking and that the meeting had been changed to be heard via Teams as a result of the hot weather and would be short as a result

2. Previous User Group minutes-Mr Justice Chamberlain

CJ invited comments on the minutes of the previous meeting. No objections were made and the minutes were duly agreed

3. Administrative Court Performance-Mr Justice Chamberlain

CJ commented that performance was similar to what had been discussed at the previous Court User Group. Paper applications and renewals were both below target but performance for substantive hearings has improved

CJ drew the meeting's attention to the Court statistics which showed a significant increase in the amount of claims received by the ACO. There had been approximately 5,500 receipts over the previous year, up from just under 4,000.

CJ said the Court suspects that the explanation behind this is that Litigants in Person are now filing claims with the assistance of artificial intelligence (AI). Consideration would be given as to whether the Court administration could utilise AI itself, and discussions were being undertaken regarding this.

CJ invited comments on performance. No issues were raised.

4. ACO Phones- John Crowley

JC raised a concern about reaching the Case Progression Team by telephone as transfers from the switchboard were routinely going to voicemail. This had an impact in situations where urgent hearings had been listed at short notice so email would not be appropriate

CJ asked Monika Patel (**MP**) for comment, **MP** said that the Case Progression team managers had confirmed that a member of staff was on phone duty daily. Numerous queries are being received by phone and Court users should persist.

CJ suggested that the idea of separate phone lines, one for Litigants in Person and another for legal representatives, may have merit as it was recognised that legal representatives were experiencing difficulties.

CJ recognised that Litigants in Person were taking up a lot of Case Progression Officer time and this was impacting elsewhere

Geraint Evans (**GE**) explained that the ACO was exploring staffing issues. One idea is to create a bespoke team of different grades covering phones and emails but this was still a work in progress

CJ said that the Court would this take away and revert back

5. Electronic Bundles- Rakesh Singh

RS raised a query about electronic bundles and that the Administrative Court Guide states that users must file a core and supplementary bundle when a bundle being filed exceeds 20mb upon issuing a claim

RS stated there was a practice direction on CE-file allows up to 100mb bundle being filed unless the Court says otherwise and whether those requirements had now developed

CJ suspected there may be different limits between filing bundles on CE-file or over email

Philip Shearer (**PS**) explained that the ACO's previous digital system had size restrictions prior to CE-file implementation and that the guidance may need to be reviewed

PS said he would review the Practice Directions but it seemed larger documents could now be submitted by efilng

CJ asked for this to be taken forward quickly as Sheldon and Coppel JJ were editing the ACO Guide at present and acknowledged that 20mb was not a significant amount and that one bundle was regularly preferred to separate core and supplementary bundles

RS also said now that E-filing limit was 100mb it was not clear whether core bundle needed to be capped at 20mb with everything else within the supplementary bundles

CJ said receipt of bundles would be looked into and made clear in the next edition of the Administrative Court Guide and asked PS to take away

RS asked whether upload limit for emailing bundles had increased to 25mb as per Jyoti Gill (**JG**) comments in June 2025 meeting

CJ referred to **PS** who said he would investigate

RS referenced a link in the Administrative Court Guide to a video by St Philips Chambers on guidance regarding preparation of bundles in Adobe Acrobat pro regarding a fictional County Court claim. The video was viewed and seems not to comply with Administrative Court bundling requirements. The ACO was asked to review this.

6. Permission Decisions- Moshe Bordon

MB brought to **CJ's** attention that several DHCJ's were not providing reasons in orders for granting permission

CJ stated it was not invariable practice to provide reasons for granting permission other than stating that the grounds were arguable as the Judge would not be required to decide anything further at that stage

CJ advised that Judges were generally advised not to provide additional detail other than the grounds were arguable. However, judge has liberty to make observations if it is felt that there is merit in a specific part of a ground.

CJ said judges would naturally need to provide reasons for refusing permission

MB mentioned a costs decision where reasons were not provided for refusal. **CJ** acknowledged that this should not have occurred, including in cases where a judge decided to make no order as to costs where a defendant would normally expect to recover costs under *Mount Cook*

7. Embargoed Judgments - Moshe Bordon

MB asked for clarification about sharing an embargoed judgment with those not included within an embargoed list and advice to check with Judge's clerk.

CJ confirms as per the guidance in the meeting from October 2025, that the official guidance was promulgated, that practitioners should check with the individual judge as to whether they could share information such as the date of the hand-down of the judgment.

CJ said this should be referenced in the next edition of the Guide

8. Anonymity orders- Sasha Rozansky

SR asked firstly about standard anonymity order stating party needs to file redacted/anonymised versions, would that apply to the whole bundle needing to be refiled or just apply to the statement of case and, secondly, when anonymity orders are pending will the court use initial ciphers? This was raised at a previous meeting and the minutes noted that a protocol would be worked out

CJ said second point had not been done. Regarding the first point, **CJ** felt pretty clear that it is useful to have a separate document as non-parties were entitled to access under CPR 5.4C to the statements of case and nothing further

If the Press ask for statements of case, it would therefore be easier for the court office to handle if they had a separate redacted document

PS said that an already redacted document would be easier given the risk of jigsaw identification and helps focus minds.

CJ agreed and stated that the standard anonymity order has various different parts, one part was submission of redacted documents and other was a restricted reporting order,

preventing individuals reporting on identities or anything likely to identify them so the onus was then on people publishing

9. Listing involving Litigants in Person- Natalie Stevens

NS raised a point about the Listing team requesting mutually agreed dates for claims involving uncooperative Litigants in Person.

Benjamin Power (**BP**) requested **NS** provide specific case references and that this would be taken forward and assured **CJ** and the UG that this has previously been raised with the Listing team

10. Rejection of claims by non lawyers for legal reasons- Charles Bishop

CB asked for an update about non-lawyers inappropriately rejecting claims for legal reasons. This had been previously recognised as errors by court staff and he asked whether guidance had been implemented to avoid a repeat

CJ apologised and Olu Onasanya (**OO**) said this had been previously raised with members of staff and requested further details to take forward

11. AOB

GE confirmed that current size limits on bundles presently stood at 20mb for email, 100mb for E-filing and unlimited for Document Upload Centre

CJ asked **GE** to see whether 20mb limit could be increased to 25mb and whether it was possible to E-file a single bundle for 100mb or whether it needed to be filed separately

CJ thanked UG for kind words about his Court of Appeal elevation and that he would continue as Judge in Charge of the ACO likely until the end of the calendar year. Once his successor is chosen in the Autumn, there would be a further UG with both him and the next JIC in attendance

Meeting concluded at 5.02pm