

RCJ Advice Bureau

ANNUAL REPORT
2003 - 2004

RCJ Advice Bureau - Annual Report 2003-2004

Contents

Mission Statement	1
Chair's Report	2
Bureau Director's Report	4
Access to Justice	5
Legal Case Studies	6
Generalist Advice Case Studies	8
The Miscarriages of Justice Project	9
Case Studies	10
User Feedback	11
Statistics of Service Take up	12
Treasurer's Report	13
Statement of Financial Activities	13
Key Events	14
Trustee Board Members	115
Acknowledgements	16

Mission Statement

To provide access to justice to un-represented litigants and potential litigants in the Royal Courts of Justice and the Principal Registry of the Family Division, through the provision of legal and other advice services.

Strategic Aims

- ❖ To ensure that individuals do not suffer through lack of knowledge of their rights and responsibilities, or of the services available to them through their inability to express their needs effectively;
- ❖ To develop an effective and efficient service through partnership working with the Voluntary sector, pro bono providers, court services, government bodies and funders;
- ❖ To exercise a responsible influence on the development of social policies and services, both locally and nationally.

The CAB service is independent and provides free, confidential and impartial advice to everyone regardless of race, gender, sexuality or disability.

Foreword by the Lord Chancellor

It gives me great pleasure to introduce this year's Annual Report.

I recently had the pleasure to visit the Bureau. I was tremendously impressed by the work that the Bureau does. It has established very successful partnerships with solicitors, barristers and others involved in pro bono work, including the judiciary. The consequence of this is that the Bureau provides a very high quality service in response to the 11,000 plus enquiries it receives each year. This is all more impressive because its work covers such a wide range of areas of the law. Given that the Bureau staff often have to advise in very tricky situations and under pressure of time, its customer satisfaction rate of more than 90% speaks for itself.

I strongly support the Bureau's work and wish the Bureau well and much success for many years to come.

The Rt Hon Lord Falconer of Thoroton

Chair's Report

At the end of 2003 I was asked to succeed Brenda Hale as chair of the trustees of the RCJ Advice Bureau. It was an honour to be asked and I was delighted to accept the invitation. For the last 25 years I have been interested in the work of charities in general and of Legal Advice Centres in particular, having helped in a local centre on one evening a week for over 12 years. I hope that when I retire I shall find enough time and energy to help with free legal advice again.

I know that all those who worked with Brenda Hale during her time as chair from 2001 to 2003 join with me in thanking her for the hard work and for the valuable time which she devoted to the interests of the Bureau, its staff and volunteers, to improving the quality of the service available to the increasing numbers of users and to launching the 25th Anniversary Appeal. We also send her warm congratulations on her elevation to the House of Lords from where she will continue to support the work of the Bureau.

I would also like to thank David Mackie QC, who resigned as Vice-Chairman on his appointment to the Circuit Bench. The Bureau is indebted to him for his unstinting service in that office over the last 6 years and congratulates him both on his appointment and on his award of the CBE for pro bono work. I welcome Jonathan Rushworth as his successor. Michael Smyth, for the supporting role of Company Secretary of the Bureau.

2004 has been an eventful year

In February Lord Falconer, the Secretary of State for Constitutional Affairs and Lord Chancellor, spent a morning first at the Bureau's offices in the RCJ and then with the family law advisers at First Avenue House. He met staff and discussed the organisation and activities of the Bureau. He later wrote to the Director saying that he strongly supported the work of the Bureau and that he was tremendously impressed by the work that the Bureau does, involving solicitors and barristers in pro bono work and also involving the judiciary in supporting its activities.

In May the Times Law Section published a full page article on the work of the Bureau (with photos of the staff), which was a boost to the fund raising appeal launched last year.

On 13th July the Opera in the Temple evening was held in the Inner Temple Gardens. Thanks to the magnificent efforts of all concerned, especially John Hine, the tickets for the Garden Opera Company's performance of Don Giovanni were a sell out. Over £37,000 was raised. There was strong support for the evening from many solicitors and barristers. There was also a good turn out by the judiciary and the Law Officers. The Lord Chief Justice and the Master of the Rolls attended, as did the Solicitor General.

The 25th Anniversary Appeal raised a total of £55,000 in 2004, mainly thanks to very generous donations from City law firms. Fund raising activities will continue into 2005 with an appeal to the Bar, a sponsored walk and the Annual Christmas Carol Concert in the Great Hall of the RCJ. I hope that it will be possible to arrange some other events to raise more funds and enhance the profile of the Bureau. Any ideas are welcome.

For the third time running the Bureau passed the Citizens Advice Membership Audit outright and with flying colours. Many congratulations are due on a good team effort.

There have been some important staff changes. Amarjit Kaur, the Deputy Director, left in August 2004 to take up an appointment as director of a national charity concerned with tackling homelessness, poverty and exclusion issues. We wish her well in her new role and thank her for her good work for the Bureau, particularly during the Director's period of leave.

There has been a significant staff turnover in 2004. Staff shortages mean that it will be necessary to make more staff appointments in the coming year. They will include new positions for a volunteer coordinator, with the support of a Community Fund Grant, and a bankruptcy adviser, with funding from the Law Society Charity and the Tudor Trust.

Sadly, the Bureau will be losing Joy Julien, the Director, at the end of March 2005, when she leaves to devote more time to her public duties and to develop her own consultancy business. I express the gratitude of all concerned for her valuable contribution to the development of the Bureau since she started to work for it in 1996 and since her appointment as Director in 1997. We wish her good luck in her new venture.

Work continues on the Bureau's Miscarriages of Justice Project, which, with the help of Home Office funding, assists victims of miscarriages of justice to re-settle in the community, on co-operation with the Bar pro bono unit and on developing a new link with the South Eastern Circuit Advocacy Course.

Without the continuing support of the staff, the Honorary Legal Advisers, all those involved in the management of the Bureau and everyone who gives much appreciated financial support, it would be impossible for the Bureau to provide the valuable service that it does every year to thousands of unrepresented litigants. As we look forward to another year may I take this opportunity of thanking all of you for your enthusiasm and commitment. Long may the Bureau continue to expand and improve its service to the public.

The Rt. Hon Lord Justice Mummery

Bureau Director's Report

Growth and Sustainability

I am pleased to announce that this has been a year of growth and sustainability in the following key areas:

Funding:

Volunteer Co-ordinator - The Big Lottery Fund (formerly the Community Fund) has provided us with a grant to recruit a Volunteer Co-ordinator. This key role will help us to recruit and train a diverse team of volunteers to assist us in expanding the service.

Bankruptcy Adviser -We have received funding from the EDF Trust, The Law Society and the Tudor Trust to recruit a Bankruptcy Adviser who will provide support to un-represented litigants through the daunting and complex bankruptcy process.

Opera in the Temple -The incredible efforts of the Fundraising Sub-committee and in particular John Hine for raising a substantial amount of money through such an innovative and entertaining event.

Partnerships

We have consolidated our successful relationships with our stake holders to provide quality advice and assistance where it is most needed. The Court of Appeal Representation Scheme (run in partnership with the Bar Pro Bono Unit), the Honorary Legal Adviser, Student and Secretarial pro bono schemes and the Miscarriages of Justice Project are a sample of the partnerships which have developed beyond our expectations.

Quality

We continue to monitor and evaluate our service against the highest quality assurance measures. The highlight of the year was the passing of the Citizens Advice Membership Audit outright, with no non-compliances or observations, making that a 'Hat trick', three outright audit passes in a row. We understand this to be a record achievement!

The Future - CASE

Improving our service through information technology

The Bureau has embarked on an exciting development, the implementation of a Case Management system called CASE in January 2005. CASE is a computer based application that replaces the current paper based recording of the advice giving process. It is used to record, retrieve and update all client and enquiry information that is stored and updated on the Citizens Advice central computer system. CASE supports all stages of the advice giving process and acts as an interface between Bureaux and the National Citizens Advice service to assist in the process of producing a detailed analysis of our data, which will assist us in influencing social policy and consequently improve access to justice.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following for their financial support during 2003-2004:

Association of London Government Legal Services Commission

Citizens Advice The Home Office

The RCJ Trust The Big Lottery

The Law Society The EDF Trust

The Tudor Trust and all our individual donors.

Joy Julien
Bureau Director

Access to Justice

We are concerned about the massive inflation in Court fees that has occurred over the last 10 years. It can now cost up to £1,000 to issue a Claim Form in the Court, whereas 10 years the fee was just £100. In addition many Court applications (particularly those that are made over the course of a case) that were formerly free now require payment of a fee and the trend is constantly for these fees to increase at rates well above inflation.

The underlying cause for the inflation in Court fees was the decision made a few years ago (with practically no public discussion) that the Court Service should be self financing, the philosophy being that Court users are also "Court customers" and should be charged accordingly. Needless to say this inflation in Court fees impacts most heavily on those who are in low paid work, who cannot therefore obtain a fee exemption or remission, and who often simply cannot afford the cost of these fees. This adds to the already exorbitant cost of taking a case to Court, which has been aggravated by the decline in public funding provision, and represents for many a denial of access to the Courts and a denial of justice.

If (as seems likely) the cost of setting up the new Supreme Court (including the cost of its building) will also be funded by the Court Service out of the income it receives from Court fees then this problem can only get worse. In the case of the funding of the new Supreme Court this seems particularly harsh since the number of litigants who will have to use the services of the Court is bound to be very small and many of these will of course be large and wealthy companies and individuals that are unaffected by increases in fees. We are therefore concerned that the cost of setting up this Court may be borne by the tens of thousands of individuals who will never have access to this Court and who have cases that are decided at a far lower level of the Court hierarchy.

We believe that the administration of the system of justice is a fundamental responsibility of the State that should be borne by the State and paid for out of general taxation that is paid by the whole community. We think that expecting the civil justice system to pay for itself derogates from this principle and reinforces the trend to make justice available only to those who can afford it.

Legal Case Studies - A

Client Congolese national claiming asylum on the basis of persecution due to membership of political group.

Client spoke French and could not speak English. Client had had her claim for asylum rejected by the Immigration Tribunal, the Immigration Appeal Tribunal and the Court of Appeal. The basis for rejecting the claim for asylum was that the tribunal found her to lack credibility on the basis of a single discrepancy in her statement regarding the number of children she had.

The client's barrister had only consulted with the client for a short time before the hearing and had not questioned her regarding this discrepancy. He also had not understood her given the language barrier. She was also not given an opportunity to comment on the discrepancy or correct it before or during the hearing.

Client attended Bureau with a friend who interpreted. Bureau staff prepared judicial review claim which was the client's only remaining option prior to deportation. Bureau made an application to the Bar Pro Bono Unit who agreed to provide the client with representation at the forthcoming judicial review hearing. Prior to the hearing, the Home Office conceded there was an arguable error of law and Lord Justice Carnwath agreed, quashing the decision of the Immigration Appeal Tribunal and referring the matter back to the tribunal for reconsideration. In light of this decision, we have now managed to get the client a specialist immigration solicitor to present her case at the tribunal hearing.

Legal Case Studies - B

Our client is a leaseholder of residential premises. She had a dispute with her landlord over the amount of the landlord's service charges. The Leasehold Valuation Tribunal decided the dispute in the client's favour. The landlord was dissatisfied with the result and sought to appeal the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal's Judgment to the Lands Tribunal. The Lands Tribunal however refused to grant the landlord permission to appeal the decision of the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal.

The landlord remained dissatisfied with the decision. However the landlord was unable to pursue the matter by way of a further appeal since statute precludes a further appeal to the Court of Appeal where the Lands Tribunal has refused permission to itself. The landlord however sought to challenge the decision of the Lands Tribunal by bringing an application to the High Court for a Judicial Review of the decision of the Lands Tribunal to refuse permission to appeal to itself. In doing so the landlord identified what it said were various serious procedural defects in the way in which the Lands Tribunal had dealt with the matter specifically that the decision of the Lands Tribunal to refuse permission to appeal had been made by an officer of the Tribunal who was not a lawyer, was made without a hearing and without proper consideration of the evidence in the case. The landlord also argued that the decision of the Lands Tribunal to refuse permission to appeal was perverse in that the decision of the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal was obviously wrong in law as it was made contrary to certain decisions of the Court of Appeal.

In making its application to the High Court the landlord also argued that the matter was of considerable public importance in that the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal and the Lands Tribunal hear many such cases and that the defects in the process identified in this case are in fact systemic to the way in which the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal and the Lands Tribunal normally operate and that has been the cause of many obviously wrong decisions and of much injustice. On that basis the landlord sought to argue that it was right and appropriate that the High Court should preserve a wide jurisdiction to entertain challenges by way of Judicial Review of decisions of the Lands Tribunal in cases such as this where recourse to the Court of Appeal was not available.

The High Court decided that the matter was indeed of some importance and referred the tenant (who is unrepresented) to the Bureau for help and advice. The Lands Tribunal, which was the nominal defendant in the case, informed the Court that it was not minded to make any submissions in the case, which would have left the landlord's application for Judicial Review in effect unopposed. In the event that the High Court were to grant a Judicial Review of the decision of the Lands Tribunal this could however have re opened the whole matter. This would have had very serious implications for our client in terms of costs.

The Bureau advised the client that in our opinion the landlord's attempt to challenge the decision of the Lands Tribunal by way of Judicial Review should be opposed since whilst the High Court undoubtedly does have jurisdiction to entertain a Judicial Review of a decision of the Lands Tribunal the High Court can only do so in the context of a statutory appeal process that has been established by Parliament. This process specifies that appeals from the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal should be made to the Lands Tribunal and thereafter to the Court of Appeal in cases where permission to appeal has been granted. In setting up this process Parliament intended that it should be straightforward and informal and decisions should be taken in a practical way. In setting up such a process Parliament clearly did not intend that a dissatisfied party should as a matter of routine be able to challenge any decision of the Lands Tribunal that it did not like by way of Judicial Review. The power to hold a Judicial Review was one that the High Court should therefore only exercise very sparingly and in exceptional circumstances where the fundamental error of process or error, which did not seem to be the case in this case since to do otherwise would subvert the very process that Parliament had established. As to the argument that many wrong decisions are made by the Lands Tribunal that the High Court should have the power to correct it seemed to us that in reality this was an argument that would disproportionately favour landlords who are normally in a far stronger financial position than tenants and who would therefore be far more capable than tenants of pursuing applications to the High Court to challenge decisions that they did not like. We felt that the larger interest of tenants would be better served by ensuring the finality of the decisions originating from the simple process that Parliament had established, which was what Parliament had anyway intended.

After obtaining advice from one of our Honorary Legal Adviser firms we put these arguments to the High Court in the form of a witness statement that we prepared for the client. The landlord (which was represented by solicitors and Counsel) put its case in a lengthy skeleton argument in which it repeated its points.

The High Court considered both the arguments in our client's witness statement and those made by the landlord in its skeleton argument. Purely on the basis of these documents and without a hearing the High Court found in our client's favour and refused the landlord's application for a Judicial Review. In a lengthy Judgment the High Court endorsed every point that our witness statement had made whilst rejecting those points made by the landlord.

In this case in collaboration with one of our Honorary Legal Adviser firms we were able to help one of our clients (who would have been in serious financial difficulty had the decision gone the other way) by ensuring that her case was properly presented. We also exercised our social policy function by taking a stand that protects the interests of residential tenants by arguing for the integrity of a procedure that Parliament has established in large measure to protect their interests.

Generalist Advice Case Studies

We have recently had two cases in which we represented clients at social security tribunals where the Department for Work and Pensions were trying to recover large amounts of money for overpaid Income Support spanning the last 10 years. One client had died of Leukaemia after many years of suffering and they were trying to recover £13,000 from his estate. The other is a pensioner and was faced with having to repay £12,000 from his pension credit.

We won both appeals for the clients on the basis that the DWP had failed to make the decisions regarding the overpayments correctly. Two recent Commissioners decisions have set out the way in which the DWP must review each decision awarding benefit where an overpayment spans a number of years. Only then can they issue overpayment decisions for each period of benefit. They had failed to do this in both cases and the overpayment decisions were deemed invalid by the tribunal.

In both cases, the tribunal chairmen were not aware of this case law and would have found in favour of the DWP were it not for our intervention.

Miscarriages of Justice Project

This innovative project aims to assist victims of miscarriages of justice by providing practical advice and assistance on diverse issues including benefits, housing, employment and money management.

In the past year we have worked in partnership with mental health professionals, specialist housing advice agencies, the Benefits Agency and Prison Service and financial advisers to provide a holistic support network to victims of miscarriages of justice. Below is an example of the type of assistance we have been able to provide.

JDM was sponsored to attend the South Eastern Circuit Advanced International Advocacy Course, which was a five-day residential course at Keble College, Oxford (31/8/2004-5/9/2004). Joy Julien and Tim Dutton QC of Fountain Court Chambers kindly arranged this. JDM chose the crime and medical options. A panel of real experts was brought in and JDM had to master medical terminology quickly in conference with the expert and then cross-examine the other sides' expert. One of the rules on cross examination is not to ask a question to which you do not know the answer and this was not more apparent than with an expert. As experts were only offering their opinion they could disagree and both be right. It was tricky ground, especially if you did not understand the answer.

The criminal case (involved opening & closing speeches, interlocutory applications, examination in chief, cross examination, re- examination and) culminated in JDM conducting with a partner a full trial on Saturday in which a jury was brought in from Oxford. There were two counts on the indictment and JDM represented the crown. The jury's verdict was not guilty on the first count but guilty on count two. Video feedback will soon be provided by the jury on how each Barrister performed. JDM found the course excellent and constructive and has enabled her to use her skills in constructing appeals for MJP clients in the most persuasive way possible to achieve maximum results.

The Project is assisted in developing its work by a Steering Group made up of individuals with a special interest in the area of miscarriages of Justice.

They are:

Ms Marolyn Burgess -Citizens Advice

Ms Kulvinder Gill,

Dr Adrian Grounds -Cambridge University

Mr John Hine -RCJ Advice Bureau Trustee Board

Dr James MacKeith -Bethlem Royal and Maudsley Hospitals

Cllr Sally Mulready -London Borough of Hackney Council

Dame Ruth Runciman -Central and NW London Mental Health NHS Trust

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Steering Group for their support during the first year of the Project.

Miscarriages of Justice Case Studies

1. The Court of Appeal quashed the client's conviction in 2003. The client had been wrongfully detained in prison for 14 years. The Project attended his appeal hearing and offered him advice and assistance, however he believed he would be able to cope and manage his own affairs once released.

A month later the client contacted the Project as he was experiencing great difficulty in receiving benefit. The client was bewildered as to why he had not received any benefit to date despite having followed the correct procedure and claimed income support the day after he was released. When he did contact the benefit agency 2 weeks later regarding his claim he was told that his application must have been lost and he would have to fill out another form. The Bureau contacted the relevant benefit agencies regarding his income support claim and as a result of the projects intervention his income support claim was found and processed straight away. The client is now in receipt of income support.

2. The Court of Appeal quashed the client's conviction in 2003. The client had been wrongfully detained in prison for 24 years. We attended his appeal hearing and arranged an appointment to visit the client at home.

We liaised with the pension service regarding his application for his state retirement pension, putting forward a case for him to have his pension backdated for seven years. The pension departments policy unit after much deliberation agreed to award him 7 years arrears of pension in addition to his present pension. We arranged for the client to collect the arrears at his local benefit office. The amount of arrears he received was just over £19,000.00. The client will now be drawing his pension weekly.

User Feedback

"We are lucky to have you. Many thanks". "... have decided to withdraw and have made me an offer

"I got help, which I could not have got from CRE, with large staff and more resources. The Government should abolish CRE and fund RCJ Advice Bureau to expand and hire more staff".

"A note of thanks for all the hard working advisors and staff at this CAB. The fact that it does exist to help in just so many ways and aspects of law for us that have to go to law without the benefit of legal representation. Please do pass on my thanks to the lady who gave me the forms for the Bar Pro Bono Unit. One meeting a week later the Barrister spoke to the Defendant's solicitors, which brought a speedy solution of a new offer. At last a 'conclusion' was achieved. Thank you all very much for your time and consideration and patience in dealing with such a workload. My sincere best wishes to the Unit".

"To the legal advisor on duty 9th March 2004, I would first like to pass on my thanks for your speedy and expertly drafted defence which, I did just manage to lodge at 15.59 this afternoon. I very much appreciate your assistance.

"I cannot thank you enough for your tremendous help. Many thanks also for your professionalism, kindness and readiness to accommodate (setting time for appointments)".

for a reduced settlement. I came to you requesting a Costs Draftsman. This is just to inform you that thanks to your help the matter is to be settled out of court and I no longer require a Costs Draftsman. Thank you very much for all your help".

"Thank you for all of your help. I know it has taken me 12 months to get my head around going bankrupt but it was the only way to go. You were right! And we beat them to it, which makes it all the sweeter. Thank you again".

"I write to thank you and your staff and the Honorary Legal Adviser for your help in preparing the bundle for the Appeal Court. It was very nice of you and I cannot thank you enough. Please kindly convey my thanks to your staff, the Honorary Legal Adviser and everyone that assisted".

76 % = Very satisfied

9.5% = Quite satisfied

14% = Not satisfied

Statistics of Service Take-up

The Bureau maintains statistical records detailing service take-up. The statistics are analysed in terms of the

numbers of clients seen, borough of origin and the nature of the enquiries.

Client contact -Total

Personal	5708
Telephone	2141
Letters	1561
Total	9751

Clients seen by Honorary Legal Advisers (HLAs) -Total

2347

Breakdown of enquiries -Total

Benefits	1083
Consumer	497
Employment	155
Housing	442
Legal	6307
Family	451
Tax	71
Utilities	27
Immigration	43
Misc	463
Total	9139

Treasurer's Report

Alan Carpenter/Raj Parker

The work of the Bureau continues to expand and the rising number of clients continues to put a strain on the resources of the Bureau. A small loss of £17,708.00 was posted in the accounting year 2003/2004 partly as a result of the withdrawal of funding by the London Borough Grants Committee.

Efforts to raise additional funds on behalf of the Bureau have continued with even greater urgency. A fundraising committee was formed and as a result the 25th Anniversary Appeal was launched in January 2004. The sum raised at the year-end was £27,130.00 with further amounts to be received in the 2004/2005 accounting year. The Bureau also successfully staged an opera on the 13th of July 2004; this proved to be a great success thanks in the main to the efforts John Hine and all the members of the Bureau staff.

Our core funders, National Association of Citizens Advice Bureau, Legal Services Commission, the RCJ Charitable Trust and the Home Office continued to finance our cash requirements particularly employee expenses during the year.

The Bureau's accounts have been audited and approved for the year 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2004.

Statement of Financial Activities for the year ended 31st March 2004

Incoming Resources	Total 2004 £
Grants	451,479
Fees for services provided	
Donations	3,873
Gross deposit interest	1,363
Other income	967
Total incoming resources	457,682
Resources Expended	
Direct charitable expenditure	396,208
Operating expenses	52,516
Total resources expended	448,724
Net Incoming resources for the year	8,958
Fund balances brought forward	72,108
Fund balances carried forward	81,066

Key Events

October 2003

- ❖ Woman of the Year Lunch & Assembly. Joy Julien, Bureau Director receives a Woman of the Year Award from Good Housekeeping.
- ❖ HLA appointment scheme expanded to include specialist advice ranging from clinical negligence to consumer advice.

November 2003

- ❖ Delegation from Malta visit the Bureau with a view to setting up a project to assist prisoners and their families, based on our Miscarriages of Justice Project.
- ❖ Miscarriages of Justice Project - Paul Goggins (Prisons Minister) visits the Bureau and expresses his appreciation of the excellent work of the project.
- ❖ Florence Terry, partner at The Family Law in Partnership is recorded to volunteer at the Bureau for two days per week to assist with quality control.

December 2003

- ❖ Fundraising Appeal launched - the Bureau receives funds from Big Lottery Fund, Law Society and individual donors - Opera fundraising event scheduled for June 2004.
- ❖ Chinese Ministry of Justice representative visits the Bureau with a view to setting up their own litigants in person project.

January 2004

- ❖ The Guardian publishes a letter from the Bureau, which raises social policy issues about the increase in Court fees and the financing of the Court Service.

February 2004

- ❖ British Council holds a Conference in Hong Kong on access to Justice issues and the Bureau is described by the South China Morning Post as 'a model for providing free legal services'.
- ❖ Margaret Ng (member of the legislative Council for Hong Kong pays a surprise visit.
- ❖ The Lord Chancellor visits the Bureau and states : "a customer satisfaction rate of 90% speaks for itself. I strongly support your work".

March 2004

- ❖ The Bureau passes the Citizens Advice membership audit (outright). The auditor states: "the quality of the evidence provided by the Bureau was exemplary!"

May 2004

- ❖ Lisa Avalos commences work at the Bureau as an intern specialising in social policy under an arrangement with New York University Law School.
- ❖ Litigation crisis? This way to the Casualty Department'. Our Chair, Lord Justice Mummery, launches our publicity campaign in the Times.

July 2004

- ❖ A Gala Opera performance of Don Giovanni in Inner Temple Gardens takes place to raise funds for the Bureau.

August 2004

- ❖ Jeanette Daly Mathias, advisor on the Miscarriages of Justice Project is sponsored by the South Eastern Bar Circuit to attend an Advanced International Advocacy Course.

September 2004

- ❖ The Bureau responses to the Department of Constitutional Affairs Consultation Paper on 'Tackling Debt' -calling for a shift towards non-adversarial litigation.

Trustee Board

Trustee Board Members

Lord Justice Mummery -Chair
Mona Vaswani
Jonathan Rushworth -Secretary
Florence Campbell
Graham Huntley
Kevin Perry
Peter Williamson
Alan Walls
Robin Knowles QC
Bob Nightingale MBE
Jonn Hine
Michael Smyth
Louise Coubrough
Alan Carpenter -Assistant Treasurer
Joy Julien -Bureau Director

Service Delivery Sub-Committee Members

Mona Vaswani - Chair
David Smythe
Alan Walls
Maggie Rae
Sunil Gadhia
Michael Barnett
David Mackie QC
Valerie Davies
Ann Robson
John Hine
Joy Julien -Bureau Director
Laura Franklin

Employment & Finance Sub-Committee Members

Nick Atkins -Chair (Lovells)
Paula Hodges (Herbert Smith)
Raj Parker (Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer)
Kevin Perry (Kendall Freeman)
Alex Carruthers (Hughes, Fowler & Carruthers)
Filicity Kirk (White Case)
Alan Carpenter
Mark Elvy (Ashurst Morris Crisp)
Fiona Turner (Family Law in Partnership)
Louise Coubrough (Bindman & Partners)
Joy Julien -Bureau Director

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following who have donated their precious time to the Bureau during 2002/2004:

CIVIL LITIGATION

Allen & Overy
Anderson & Co
Ashurst
Baker & McKenzie
Balsara & Co
Barlow Lyde & Gilbert
Clifford Chance LLP
Clyde & Co
Davies Arnold Cooper
Dechert
Denton Wilde Sapte
Kendall Freeman
DLA
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer
Herbert Smith
Kennedys Solicitors
Kingsley Napley
Linklaters & Alliance
Lovells
Marclay Murray & Spens
Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw
Norton Rose
Simmons & Simmons
S J Berwin
Slaughter and May
Stephenson Harwood
Weil Gotshal Manges
West London Law Sol.
White Case

FAMILY LAW

Aitken Kelly Associates
Anthony Gold Lerman Muirhead
Barnett Sampson
Campbell Hooper
Charles Russell
Clintons
Collyer Bristow
Creighton & Partners
Davenport Lyons
Dawsons Solicitors
Evans, Butler and Wade
Family Law in Partnership
Fahri Jacob
Farrer & Co
Gordon Dadds
Harter & Loveless
Hodge, Jones & Allen
Hughes, Fowler & Carruthers

Hunters Solicitors
J B Wheatley & Co
Jennings Son & Ash
Kingsley Napley
Lass Salt Garvin
Leigh Williams
Manches & Co
Michael Fisher Solicitors
Miles Preston & Co
Pedro Emanuel
Reynolds Porter Chamberlain
Robert Blackford and Co.
Roberta Tish Solicitors
Venters
William Sturges
Withers
WPF Glasner Gerber Shapiro
YVA

We would also like to express our gratitude to the following funders for their financial support:

Association of London Government
The Big Lottery
Legal Services Commission
Citizens Advice
The Home Office
The RCJ Trust
The Law Society
The EDF Trust
The Tudor Trust
and all our individual donors.

The RCJ Advice Bureau is run by lawyers in conjunction with the Citizens Advice Bureau and is independent of the court.

We Provide

Free, Confidential, Impartial legal & procedural advice & assistance to everyone regardless of their race, gender, sexuality or disability.

Location

We have two branches:

Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London WC2A 2LL

Monday to Friday 10.00am - 1.00pm & 2.00pm - 4.30pm

All civil cases are dealt with at this branch e.g. Procedural Advice and Preparation of Court of Appeal Documents

Principal Registry of the Family Division, Fourth Floor, First Avenue House, 42 49 High Holborn, London WC1V 6NP

Monday to Friday 10.00am - 1.00pm & 2.00pm - 4.30pm

All matrimonial matters and general advice e.g. Consumer, Debt, Employment, Housing, Immigration and Welfare Benefits cases are dealt with at this branch.

Lawyers specialising in Family Law will be available on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays to provide advice and assistance in:

Adoption, Abduction, Care Proceedings, Children, Court Procedure, Divorce, Domestic Violence, Mediation and Property.

Telephone Advice Line

Legal advice is available on Wednesdays between 11.00am 1.00pm

Legal Advice Monday, Wednesday and Friday 11.00am 12.00pm