

IN THE MATTER OF SHARIF

Skeleton Argument on behalf of Surrey County Council
9th January 2025

A. Overview

1. This is an appeal against a Reporting Restriction Order made by Williams J on 11 December 2024 which provided at paragraph 15(g) that:

“[...] no person may publish any information arising from the disclosure of the documents from these proceedings to the public, or a section of it, which [i]ncludes [...] The name of any third parties referred to in the historic proceedings for the avoidance of doubt including social worker, guardian other named professionals and experts instructed in the proceedings and any Judge who heard the historic proceedings (save for Mr Justice Williams).”

2. The appeal, made by the Media parties (Ms Tickle and Ms Summers supported by BBC, the Press Association and others) is against that part of the order which prohibits the naming of “*any Judge*” involved in the historic proceedings. In reality this concerns two Circuit Judges and one District Judge who determined applications between 2011 and 2019. The local authority initially took no position on the appeal. Having considered the written Judgment of Williams J, handed down after permission to appeal against the order was granted against the order by King LJ on 19 December 2024, the local authority considers that the appeal should be allowed.
3. For the avoidance of doubt the local authority in the event of challenge seeks to uphold §15(g) of the RRO specifically as it relates to the social worker and team manager and will seek to address this further if it is in issue.

4. This document addresses the following matters which are relevant to the determination of this appeal:
 - a. The context within which the Court made the RRO in the currency of wardship proceedings;
 - b. The focus and scope of the hearing on 9 December 2024 at which the RRO was made;
 - c. The Grounds of Appeal.

Position of the Local Authority

5. The local authority recognises that this case attracts a high level of public interest and that the press has a particular responsibility to discharge its role as public watchdog. The local authority accepts that the question of how it discharged its statutory duties to Sara Sharif is to be scrutinised by way of a Serious Case Review. There is a legitimate press interest in reviewing the court documents from historic proceedings to understand what decisions were taken in respect of Sara and her siblings. In so far as the local authority has sought to limit disclosure or publication of any material it has done so *only* on the basis that it was necessary *at the relevant time* to protect the Article 8 rights of the siblings of Sarah Sharif, who were either the subjects of the wardship applications or Z who is in local authority care. The local authority has kept its own position on publication under review as evidenced by the change in its position after the conclusion of the criminal trial.
6. The local authority considers that the appeal should be allowed on the basis of procedural irregularity, broadly within the parameters of Ground 1. The local authority takes that position because it was not within the contemplation of the parties or the media parties, at the hearing on 9th December 2024, that the Court was considering making an order within the RRO to prohibit the publication of the names of any or all of the judges from the historical proceedings. At no point was that made clear by the Court. Once the decision was announced by Williams J, and it included such a consequential provision, on which the Court had not heard submissions from the media parties in particular, the procedurally flawed process was not remedied by providing the parties with an opportunity to make written submissions on a matter which the Court had already determined.

7. By Ground 2 the appellants seek to persuade the Court the demands of open justice dictate that no court could prohibit the publication of the name of a judge who determined a case. The local authority submits that as a matter of principle that cannot be right and that first instance judges retain a narrow and limited discretion within the balancing exercise undertaken between competing Convention rights under Articles 8 and 10 to make such an order.

B. The wider context of the RRO

(I) The wardship proceedings

8. The order which is the subject of this appeal was made within the currency of complex Wardship proceedings concerning the five siblings of Sara Sharif. As the Court is aware Sara died in August 2023. On 9 August 2023 her five siblings were removed from the jurisdiction by their father Urfan Sharif and Beinash Batool, who is the birth mother of the three younger children. Those children are known in these proceedings as U, V, W, X and Y.¹
9. On 18 August 2023, having been notified by Surrey Police that the children had been removed, the Local Authority made urgent ‘hot pursuit’ applications within wardship. The local authority sought the return of the children and as such applied for collection orders, passport orders, and directions requiring the disclosure of the children’s whereabouts. Those orders were made without notice to the children’s parents because of information then available about the circumstances of Sara’s death, and the fact that the parents sought to conceal the children’s whereabouts. The Court was persuaded that notice to the parents – or any publicity – would undermine the purpose of the orders sought. It was the local authority’s case that the five children were at risk of significant harm in the parents’ care owing to the likelihood that they had caused her death and that some or all of the children would have been aware of and possibly exposed to the circumstances of her death.

¹ A sixth child, referred to as Z, was joined as a party to the wardship proceedings only after applications were made by the appellants for the disclosure and publication of information about Z. Z was not living with Mr Sharif and Ms Batool at the time of Sara’s death; [REDACTED]

10. On 18 August 2023 [REDACTED] made a range of orders. On 5 September 2023 orders were continued by [REDACTED]. The local authority made applications on 19 September 2023 to the High Court in Pakistan to effect these orders. Since 15 September 2023 the proceedings have been allocated to Williams J who is the Family Liaison Judge for the Surrey area.
11. Mr Sharif and Ms Batoool returned to the UK on 13 September 2023. They were arrested and charged with Sara's murder. The children have remained in Pakistan and the local authority has pursued applications in that jurisdiction, which are ongoing, seeking the return of those children to England. The children were initially in the care of the paternal family and were later removed to state care in Pakistan, they were later returned to the care of the paternal grandfather and family.
12. It was and is the local authority case that the paternal family were complicit in the removal and concealment of the children in Pakistan. Given the complexity of those concerns and the imperative of returning the children, permission was granted by Williams J on 15 September 2023 not to serve the parents with the applications and the Court documents. The reporting restriction order of 18 August 2023 was continued on 15 September 2023.
13. The High Court in Pakistan continues to be seised of the local authority applications. The paternal grandfather issued applications in the Jhelum Family Court seeking private law orders for custody of the children. The latter applications have been dismissed and that decision is the subject of an appeal which is pending before the High Court in Pakistan. The local authority applications for the return of the children are yet to be determined by that Court. It is possible that a final decision could be made by the Court in Pakistan at a hearing currently listed on 29 January 2025.
14. The local authority has made repeat applications to the English Court to seek ancillary orders where necessary in its objective of effecting the High Court's orders in Pakistan. There have been 15 hearings before Williams J. On 8 March 2024 Williams J, having heard legal argument from the parties continued the wardship and he handed down a detailed judgment setting out his reasons for doing so.

15. Williams J is therefore fully versed in the complex legal issues and the factual evidence in respect of the five siblings.
16. The Court will be aware that running alongside these proceedings in the High Court have been the criminal prosecution of the parents and the paternal uncle which concluded in December 2024 with their convictions.

(II) The disclosure and publication issues

17. Because Sara Sharif and her siblings were the subjects of three sets of historical proceedings in the Family Court in 2011, 2015 and 2019, the involvement of the local authority with the family and the way in which it discharged its statutory functions has been a matter of press interest and public interest.
18. Williams J has managed heard and determined applications made by the media parties which have included the appellants' and other press organisations' applications for the disclosure of, and permission to publish information from those documents, both from the ongoing wardship proceedings and the historic proceedings related to the family of Sara Sharif. These have included:
 - a. a C66 application of the appellants dated 29 September 2023;
 - b. the C2 application of the BBC dated 31 October 2023 by the BBC;
 - c. an application from the Press Association from its representative Tom Pilgrim in his written submissions dated 26 October 2023;
 - d. the application issued by RPC legal on behalf of further media parties dated 13 November 2024.
19. Since the initial C66 application on 29 September 2023 press representatives have attended hearings in the wardship proceedings and have sought directions for and/or substantive decisions about their own applications when doing so. Orders have been made under separate cover relating to wardship and within the same hearings in respect of the disclosure and publication.

20. Understandably given the sensitive issues around the international proceedings and the criminal prosecutions, issues around disclosure and publication in this case have been unusually complicated. From November 2023 Williams J, with considerable input from the local authority, the guardian and the media parties, gave careful directions for the organisation of materials from the historical proceedings to enable him to determine the press applications, including:

- a. Orders requiring the local authority to produce itemised schedules and analyses of the documents related to historic proceedings, indicating what could, in its view be disclosed and any arguments against disclosure;
- b. Orders requiring all parties to consider the schedules to narrow the issues and seek agreement around disclosure where possible – including the timing of disclosure;
- c. Orders directing that welfare analyses be filed by local authority and the guardian as to the impact on the subject children of disclosure and publication, from both their allocated social workers and the children’s guardian. This included consideration of the position of Z, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- d. Orders providing for significant interim disclosure of documents without the need to return the matter to Court subject to redaction to be applied by the local authority.

21. On 20, 21 and 22 March 2024 Williams J listed the media parties’ applications for disclosure of material related to the previous proceedings as a discrete and separate hearing. Williams J determined the applications and set out his detailed judgment dated **7 June 2024** setting out his reasons for permitting limited disclosure, of Court documents to the media parties. That judgment was not appealed.

22. On any view, against a backdrop of complex wardship applications, the media parties’ applications for disclosure of documents and permission to publish the documents have been determined with diligence and care by Williams J over 14 months and multiple hearings, often at short notice. It is recognised that this has been a challenging exercise for

the media parties. Understandably the burden of organising material and assisting the Court has fallen to the local authority.

The Hearing on 9th December 2024

23. In October 2024 the media parties, including the appellants made further applications for disclosure and permission to publish the details of Court documents. Williams J subsequently made directions for the substantive determination of those applications, including for further skeleton arguments and itemised schedules and further interim disclosure to assist the making of arguments. These directions were given on paper following correspondence between the media parties and the Court.
24. The applications were listed for a hearing on 3 and 4 December 2024. On 29 November 2024 the parties agreed that the hearing on 3 and 4 December should be adjourned because the jury had not completed their deliberations in the criminal trial. When considering the parties' proposal to adjourn Williams J made clear that if the application was adjourned and relisted to 9 December 2024 (the only alternative date available) that the time estimate could only be two hours, and that as such Williams J would not be in a position to deliver judgment until January 2025 owing to his professional commitments. Williams J notified the parties that he was to be on vacation out of the jurisdiction from 14 December 2024.
25. The focus of the hearing on 9 December 2024 was on the issues of disclosure and publication. These were manifold. Counsel for the children's guardian helpfully identified in her oral submissions that the media parties' applications were now five in number:
 - a. Application to direct the local authority to remove existing redactions to material from historic proceedings already disclosed;
 - b. Application for the further disclosure of up to 61 additional documents related to historic proceedings;
 - c. Permission for all media to publish information from previous proceedings (including the names of third parties);

- d. Permission for all media to publish information from publish material from ongoing wardship proceedings;
 - e. An issue about the timing of publication of historical proceedings; whether it should be granted immediately, or whether it should be contingent on verdicts being delivered in the criminal trial (and therefore there being no prospect of re-trials).
26. The focus of the hearing on the day was on aspects (a) and (b), being the media parties' applications for further disclosure of documents from the historical proceedings. In addition, the media parties sought permission to publish the full detail of the historical documents following the verdicts in the criminal trial. Detailed written and oral submissions on the issues that had been anticipated were provided by all parties. The majority of the Court time was utilised by counsel for the appellants and the BBC on the issue of redaction of documents and a draft order which had been in circulation before the hearing and was largely agreed. The local authority's position at that hearing on the wider issues was that the balance between the Article 8 rights of the children and the Article 10 rights of the press and public leaned decisively in favour of further disclosure and publication.
27. As noted above it was only *after* the Court had heard submissions that it expressed its decision as to the prohibition of the publication of the names of the judges. The parties' written documents and oral submissions prior to this had not addressed this issue.

C. **Grounds of Appeal**

(1) Procedural irregularity

28. It was therefore not clear that the Court was considering a prohibition on the publication of the names of Judges involved in the historical proceedings. The Court itself did not raise with the issue with the parties in oral submissions and it was not therefore addressed before it was announced by Williams J towards the end of the hearing.

29. It appears that Williams J may have considered that the Guardian was raising a concern about the naming of judges. The first objection to the publication of the names of third parties was raised in the position statement of the Guardian dated 6 December 2024 at §23:

“Finally, the CG notes that the BBC’s schedule makes reference to a number of third parties by name (highlighted on the attached for ease of reference). None of these individuals have been put on notice that they may be named by the press in the context of their roles in historical private family law proceedings concerning SS and the court is invited to consider whether the naming of these individuals is necessary and/or should be permitted before notification to them has been given.”

30. The Guardian’s schedule, which highlighted the names of individuals, on which basis the Guardian argued such individuals should not be published, did not highlight the names of judges. Williams J’s judgment of 20 December 2024 says at §15:

“The Guardian’s team also took the point that third parties should not be identified without notice being given to them and had gone through the BBC’s Annex to highlight the names of third parties which should be withheld. I note now – although I had not at the hearing on 9th December – that this does highlight only social workers, experts, guardians and other child protection professionals or similar NOT the judiciary.”

31. When it became clear towards the end of the hearing that the issue of prohibition on the names of third parties was live, the media parties, the local authority and the guardian did make brief oral submissions on the issue of third parties but that did not include any particular submissions on the naming of judges. The local authority invited the Court to restrict publication of the names of the author of the s.7 report produced on 2 October 2019 in the context of the private law proceedings, and that author’s team manager. There were three reasons for making that submission. Firstly, that the social worker was at the time of the report was recently qualified and was less than 9 months in post. Secondly, she had been receiving pastoral support from the local authority during the criminal trial. Thirdly as she was no longer in the employ of the local authority and that she had not been made aware that her name could be in the public domain and her position was therefore unknown.

32. As noted above the local authority recognises that the level of press interest in this case is high. The role of any and all public bodies in decisions which effected Sara Sharif's placement with Mr Sharif and Ms Batool, must be the subject of scrutiny, in light of their convictions for her murder. In that context, if the Court were contemplating an order prohibiting the publication of the names of judges, as a matter of procedural fairness, that issue ought to have specifically been brought to the attention of the appellants in particular but all parties should have been afforded a proper opportunity to address the Court.
33. Once the decision was announced counsel for the appellants made brief submissions and sought permission to appeal the decision to prohibit the naming of the Judges. Williams J indicated that he would permit the parties to submit written submissions about these issues within 24 hours. The local authority made no submissions on the point or as to the terms of the RRO itself. The local authority was required by paragraphs 10 and 11 of the RRO to ensure immediate disclosure of documents from previous proceedings and the local authority was occupied by the time-consuming exercise of ensuring compliance with that order which was the immediate focus of the local authority's legal team.
34. When reviewing the process in this case, it is, with respect to Williams J, who has conducted the proceedings with great care, insufficient in this particular regard. The permission granted to the parties to file written submissions on the issue within a short timeframe did not afford an opportunity for considered argument on the point commensurate with the significance of the principle at issue in the circumstances of this case.
35. Moreover, it was only after the judgment was handed down that the range of issues which informed the Court's analysis was made clear. It was not possible for counsel to address the issues raised in paragraphs 42-89 of the judgment without having had forewarning of them. In reality, the bulk of the substantive matters which were set out by Williams J were not and could not have been addressed by counsel for the appellants or the other parties.
36. The procedural deficit in the approach of Williams J is well illustrated by paragraphs 76 – 81 of the judgment. These paragraphs are detailed and include a range of matters identified by him as relevant to the question of whether there should be a prohibition on the naming of the judges. These were simply not canvassed with the parties. They include specific

issues around recent safety concerns about a family judge and wider issues arising from the pastoral role of a leadership judge. There is a conflation by Williams J of the position of social workers and that of judges. There is limited consideration of the difference between those two professionals and the public duties of each.

37. At paragraph 83 Williams J concludes that there was a ‘clear and imminent risk’ to all third parties including the judges and notes that ‘*I do not accept the submission that evidence needs to be individual specific*’. Again, no opportunity was afforded to the parties to address him on this point. At no point did he identify what were referred to as ‘risks’. The question of risk and whether it should be individual specific is a highly relevant one in the context of this case and more generally in respect of anonymity orders for the judiciary.
38. The accountability of the judiciary is an issue of considerable constitutional importance to which is protected by Article 10 is well established. Moreover, Williams J was obviously familiar with the legal exercise of balancing Articles 10 and 8 as set out in the judgment of 7 June 2024. He was thus well aware that, for example as noted by Peter Jackson LJ in **In Re F (A Child) (Placement Order: Proportionality) [2018] EWCA Civ 2761; [2019] 1 FLR 779**, a prohibition on publication requires the Court to balance Article 10 and Article 8 rights (as it does here) requires that,

“[§24] [...] *there must be [...] an intense focus on the type of risk that is involved, how likely it is to happen, and what the likely consequences might then be. Only by carrying out this exercise is it possible to know what weight to give to the risks before setting them alongside other relevant factors.*”

39. The local authority acknowledge that it is difficult to see that this exercise of ‘intense focus’ can have been achieved in a proper procedural framework in the absence of the court having heard any argument on the point before forming a view. While recognising that Williams J was operating under significant time pressure and dealing with a range of complex issues on the 9 December and this was reflected by the fact that the Court had listed a longer hearing on 3 and 4 December 2024 which was vacated by the consent of all parties, including the media parties’ representatives, the failure to alert the parties to the prohibition on the publication of the names of the judges was, nonetheless, procedurally irregular.

40. The local authority submits that the consequences of this procedural irregularity was as follows:

- i. The Court did not alert the parties to the fact that it considered judges to be included in ‘third party’ anonymity orders despite there being no reported case on such an outcome and it being a departure from the norm.
- ii. The Court did not provide the parties with the reasons why it would be appropriate in the circumstances of this case to make highly unusual orders prohibiting the names of the relevant judges.
- iii. The parties were not aware of any issues particular to the relevant judges which may have informed the Court’s own approach to the issues and as such were unable to address those concerns [paragraph 77-81]/
- iv. The parties were not aware of any general issues about the risk to judges which informed the Court’s thinking and which were later set out in the judgment [paragraph 77].
- v. The parties were not given sufficient opportunity to consider and to address the conclusion of Williams J that a ‘*clear and imminent risk of serious infringement of the Article 8 rights of all the third parties including the judiciary*’ was sufficient to justify a prohibition on naming judges. This was as against any suggestion that there needed to be individual specific evidence [see paragraph 81].

41. The approach of Williams J simply did not allow any proper opportunity for the media parties in particular to address the complex issues raised subsequently in his judgment. The issue of anonymity for judges has not been the subject of any other reported decision of the Family Court. They could not reasonably have been within the contemplation of the media parties or the parties to the Wardship in circumstances where the naming of a judge is the norm.

42. When looked at carefully the procedure was simply not sufficiently fair to allow proper legal argument. On that basis the appeal should be allowed.

(II) Ground of appeal 2(c): that “the demands of the Open Justice principle mean anonymity for a Judge cannot be justified within the framework of balancing Article 8 and Article 10”

43. The local authority does not advance a case in support of the substantive decision made by Williams J to prohibit the naming of members of the judiciary in this case.

44. However the local authority does not align itself with the submissions of the appellants that there can be never be a justification for prohibiting the publication of the names of members of the judiciary; neither Article 10 nor Article 8 require or permit such a conclusion.

45. It is axiomatic that neither Article 10 nor Article 8 are absolute, and neither trumps the other. Article 8 provides:

*1. **Everyone** has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.*

2. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.” [emphasis added]

46. No group is expected or required to tolerate an exclusion from the protections afforded by Article 8, but the balancing exercise, both under Article 8 (2) and as against Article 10, will obviously lean heavily against a prohibition of the publication of the names of any judge.

47. The wording of Article 10 (2) provides:

*“2. The exercise of these freedoms, since it carries with it duties and responsibilities, **may be subject to such formalities, conditions, restrictions or***

penalties as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society, in the interests of national security, territorial integrity or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, for the protection of the reputation or rights of others, for preventing the disclosure of information received in confidence, or for maintaining the authority and impartiality of the judiciary.” (emphasis added)

48. It is the function of any Court carefully to consider the interplay of Articles 8 and 10 where these are potentially in conflict; this permits no assumptions as to who may be excluded from the protections but requires boundaries to be drawn depending where the balance falls. That rationale underpins the four well-known propositions set out by Lord Steyn in **In Re S (A Child) (Identification: Restrictions on Publication) [2004] UKHL 47, [2005] 1 AC 593:**

“First, neither article has as such precedence over the other. Secondly, where the values under the two articles are in conflict, an intense focus on the comparative importance of the specific rights being claimed in the individual case is necessary. Thirdly, the justifications for interfering with or restricting each right must be taken into account. Finally, the proportionality test must be applied to each. For convenience I will call this the ultimate balancing test. This is how I will approach the present case.” (§17)

49. To assert, as the appellants do, that *“the demands of the Open Justice principle mean anonymity for a Judge cannot be justified within the framework of balancing Article 8 and Article 10”* is at odds with the balancing exercise itself.

50. Nor is ‘open justice’ a cart-blanc for the publication of all aspects of court proceedings; exceptions can and do exist both in domestic statute and in ECHR jurisprudence. In **Dring v Cape Intermediate Holdings Ltd [2019] UKSC 38, [2019] 3 WLR 429** Baroness Hale, giving the judgment of the court, said,

“[1] As Lord Hewart CJ famously declared, in R v Sussex Magistrates, Ex p McCarthy [1924] 1 KB 256, 259, “... it is not merely of some importance but is of fundamental importance that justice should not only be done, but should

*manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done”. That was in the context of an appearance of bias, but the principle is of broader application. **With only a few exceptions**, our courts sit in public, not only that justice be done but that justice may be seen to be done....” [emphasis added]*

51. In **Newman v A Local Authority and others [2021] EWCA 437** at §42, in the context of a decision about the disclosure of documents to an applicant, King LJ noted that:

*“Ms Rogers QC, on behalf of SCC, drew the court’s attention to the remitted hearing in Dring heard before Picken J ([2020] EWHC 1873 QB), when he summarised the position following the Supreme Court’s decision, saying at para.[80] & [81] that the open justice principle **is not the equivalent of ‘open sesame’** and that the court must carry out the balancing exercise giving appropriate weight to the relevant factors.” [emphasis added]*

52. The local authority acknowledges that the circumstance in which such prohibition would be justified must be limited and it follows that such an order would be exceedingly rare. The compelling arguments around accountability of the judiciary which have been set out by Lieven J in **Derbyshire v Marsden [2023] EWHC 1892 (Fam)** and by Nicklin J in **PMC v A Local Health Board [2024] EWHC 2969 (KB)** make it clear that such orders are not to be the norm. Notably the researches of counsel could not identify a case in which a rationale for such an order was articulated.

53. The local authority submit that it is not necessary for this Court in the context of this case to set out what those ‘relevant factors’ identified by King LJ in Newman. It may well be that the personal circumstances of the individual judge, and any personal characteristics that may make the judge more vulnerable to harm as a result of publication but that is a question best addressed if and when it may arise.

Deirdre Fottrell KC

Marlene Cayoun

8 January 2025

ANNEDIX 1 - Note on the documents

1. There have at various times throughout the case been a number of separate bundles in existence as follows.
2. The '**wardship bundle**' is a comprehensive collection of all documents related to the wardship proceedings, including the media parties' applications made in the context of the wardship proceedings. It includes for example monthly welfare reports about the children. It is regularly updated and available to the parties to the wardship proceedings the judge(s) before whom the case has come. It is administered on the Caselines platform and the local authority grants access electronically to those who ought to have it. It has not been made available to the media parties. It has not been made available to the Court of Appeal because there is no appeal against any wardship or welfare decision.
3. The '**media bundle**' is a bundle that has been produced in various iterations either by the appellants or by the BBC for hearings specifically concerned with the media parties' own applications. It does not contain documents which are strictly within the wardship proceedings (to which the media do not have access) and for example does not include monthly welfare reports about the children. It has typically been provided to the judge(s) and parties to those proceedings in PDF form in advance of each hearing. It is a version of this bundle which is before the Court in this appeal.
4. The '**previous proceedings bundle**' is a bundle of documents which were produced during the historic proceedings concerning the families of the subject children (the two sets of public law proceedings commencing in 2011 and 2014 and the private law application of 2019). This is the bundle that Williams J considered in the context of his decisions about disclosure of historic documents in March 2024 and November 2024. It is administered by the local authority on the Caselines platform and the local authority grants access electronically to those who ought to have it (which, in the event, has been Williams J, Mr Sharif, and the Guardian – Ms Batool received those documents related on to the private law application of 2019 to which she was a party). It has not been made available to the media parties and is not before the Court of Appeal because there is no appeal against any disclosure decision.
5. The '**documents disclosed to the media bundle**' is a collection of the documents which Williams J has directed over time to be disclosed to accredited media representatives pursuant to the latter's' applications. It includes for example some of the documents from previous proceedings, and relevant judgments and statements that have been directed to be disclosed. It is administered by the local authority on the Caselines platform and the local authority grants access electronically to those who ought to have it, pursuant to a process regulated by order of Williams J of 12 December 2024 which avails of the assistance of the Judicial Press Office for confirmation of the relevant accreditation. It has not been made available to the media parties and is not before the Court of Appeal because there is no appeal against any disclosure decision.