ANNEX C CONSULTATION ON THE CASE MANAGEMENT OF FAMILY AND CIVIL PARTNERSHIP ACTIONS IN THE SHERIFF COURT

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. **Recommendation 1: The scope of application of new provisions for case management**

"The sub-committee recommends that the existing Chapter 33AA should be removed from the Ordinary Cause Rules. It recommends that the new provisions for case management proposed in this report should be applied to all family and civil partnership actions in the sheriff court, not just those with a crave for an order under section 11 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995."

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 1?

☒ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Not sure

(Please tick as appropriate and give reasons for your answer)

Pro-active case management, with a greater interaction with child welfare hearings than Chapter 33AA currently provides, is required in actions with a crave for an order under section 11 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995 to prevent drift caused by an open-ended series of child welfare hearings and to offer children certainty at the earliest possible opportunity while maintaining the paramount importance of the child's best interests and their right to a voice.

All family and civil partnership actions in the sheriff court could potentially benefit from greater judicial case management. Family actions are adversarial in nature. However, any new provisions should not lose sight of the fact that family and civil partnership actions deal with the personally sensitive details of people's lives and the curbing of self-determination at a time when the parties are at their most vulnerable. Mature pro-active use of the provisions should aim to lead to expeditious judicial settlement of legal matters while maintaining an awareness of the motivation of and the dynamic between the parties, their agents and others involved.

2. **Recommendation 2: The structure of hearings in family and civil partnership actions**

"The sub-committee recommends that:

(a) On the lodging of a notice of intention to defend in every family and civil partnership action, the sheriff clerk will intimate to the parties a timetable

containing (i) the last date for lodging defences and (ii) the date of an "initial" case management hearing. An options hearing will no longer be held in family and civil partnership actions.

(b) *Defences should be lodged within 14 days of the expiry of the period of notice. The initial case management hearing should take place no earlier than 4 weeks and no later than 8 weeks after the expiry of the period of notice.*

(c) *Only the initial writ and defences are required for the initial case management hearing, and only agents will need to attend, unless a party is not represented. The sheriff may conduct the hearing by conference call, in chambers, or in a court room, as appropriate.*

(d) *The initial case management hearing may be continued once, on cause shown, for a period not exceeding 28 days.*

(e) *Where on the lodging of a notice of intention to defend the defender opposes a section 11 crave, or seeks a section 11 order which is not craved by the pursuer, a child welfare hearing will not normally be fixed until the initial case management hearing has taken place. An earlier child welfare hearing – i.e. before the initial case management hearing – may be fixed on the motion of any party or on the sheriff's own motion.*

(f) *The initial case management hearing will function as a triage hearing. The sheriff will seek to establish whether the case is (i) of a complex, or potentially high-conflict, nature which will require proactive judicial case management leading up to a proof ("the proof track"); or (ii) a more straightforward case where the issues in dispute appear to be capable of being resolved by a series of child welfare hearings without the need for a proof ("the fast track").*

(g) *In a case allocated to the proof track, the sheriff will fix a full case management hearing to take place as close as possible to 28 days after the initial case management hearing (or continued initial case management hearing). The interlocutor fixing the full case management hearing could give the last date for adjustment; the last date for the lodging of any note of the basis of preliminary pleas; and the last date for the lodging of a certified copy of the record. The sheriff may order parties to take such other steps prior to the full case management hearing as considered necessary. In some cases, this may include a pre-hearing conference and the preparation of a joint minute. There may of course be some cases allocated to the proof track which will also require child welfare hearings. This will still be possible.*

(h) In a case allocated to the fast track, the sheriff will fix a date for the child welfare wearing and a date for a full case management hearing. The child welfare hearing will be fixed on the first suitable court day after the initial case management hearing, unless one has already been fixed. The full case management hearing will be fixed for a date no later than 6 months after the initial case management hearing. It may become apparent, in the course of the series of child welfare hearings, that matters are not likely to be resolved by that means. In those cases, it will be open to the sheriff to bring forward the full case management hearing to an earlier date, so that time is not lost.

(i) On the sheriff's own motion, or on the motion of any party, a case may move between the two tracks where necessary.

(j) The rules should allow for the full case management hearing to be continued. It is quite possible that some cases will require more than one case management hearing to ensure that the parties are ready for proof.

(k) The "initial" or "full" case management hearing should not be combined with the child welfare hearing. The two hearings have distinct purposes which should not be merged. The child welfare hearing should be retained as a separate hearing that focusses solely on what is best for the child.

(l) Where a proof or proof before answer is allowed, the date should not be fixed until the sheriff, at a case management hearing, is fully satisfied that the matter is ready to proceed.

(m) Pre-proof hearings should not be fixed in family and civil partnership actions as they come too late to be an effective case management tool. Their purpose will now be fulfilled by the case management hearing. As noted at paragraph 4.7 [of the report], pre-proof hearings will be swept away by the deletion of the existing provisions in Chapter 33AA.

(n) The rules should provide that a case management hearing can only ever be discharged when an action is being sisted, to prevent the risk of actions drifting."

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 2?

☒ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Not sure

(Please tick as appropriate and give reasons for your answer)

Recommendation 2 lays out a framework of procedure and time by which there is enough flexibility to allow the majority of actions to pass through the system unhindered by unnecessary procedural steps but, once identified, allows for pro-active case management where required to progress the action.

Agents, sheriffs and sheriff clerks should all be supported with the necessary training/learning and development in the new procedure to also allow a refresh of current procedure in the context of and as it is relevant to the new procedure.

3. **Recommendation 3: The pre-hearing conference and joint minute**

"The sub-committee recommends that the pre-hearing conference and joint minute currently required in terms of Chapter 33AA should no longer form a mandatory step before the full case management hearing in the new case management structure. Although this is of value in more complex cases, it may be unnecessary in cases where the only matters in dispute relate to a crave for an order under section 11 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995 or are narrow in scope. However, the sheriff should still have the option to order a pre-hearing conference (or "case management conference") and joint minute in appropriate cases."

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 3?

☐ Agree ☒ Not sure ☐ Not sure

(Please tick as appropriate and give reasons for your answer)

It might be better to do it the other way around. The pre-hearing conference and joint minute remain part of the procedure unless the sheriff orders that they are dispensed with. The logic behind this suggestion is that this (33AA.3) is a step by which complex actions are positively progressed; and this provision is a trigger by which the parties are encouraged to focus on what is actually in dispute. It may be more expeditious if the provision is present and able to be dispensed with rather than it not being there and the necessary trigger for the benefit of complex cases being removed. Provision for the pre-hearing conference to be held by telephone or video call could be considered to aid facilitation.

4. **Recommendation 4: Keeping the number of child welfare hearings under review**

"The majority of actions involving a section 11 crave do not proceed to proof and are managed by way of child welfare hearings. The sub-committee considers that the rules should not allow for a potentially open-ended series of child welfare hearings in such cases because of the risk of drift and delay. Accordingly, the sub-committee recommends that:

(a) An initial case management hearing is required in all cases to allow the sheriff (i) to decide if it is appropriate for the case to proceed down the "fast track" and, if so, (ii) to fix a full case management hearing for no later than 6 months later so that cases which have not settled by that point can be "called in" for a judicial check on where the action is headed.

(b) At a "full" case management hearing on the fast track, the sheriff may make such case management orders as appropriate (e.g. orders relating to the pleadings, a case management conference and joint minute, or allowing a proof and setting the case down the proof track).

(c) The sheriff may also decide to allow the case to proceed by way of a further series of child welfare hearings. Where this happens, the rules should require a second full case management hearing to be fixed, again for no more than 6 months later, so that the case can be "called in" for a second time if it has still not resolved by that point.

(d) Rules could also place an obligation on the parties to tell the court at the full case management hearing how many child welfare hearings there have been to date, and to provide an explanation if there have been more than perhaps four or five."

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 4?

☒ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Not sure

(Please tick as appropriate and give reasons for your answer)

This recommendation will keep all concerned mindful of the fact that child welfare hearings, although less formal than other hearings, are an element of the judicial procedure by which the action is expected to reach a timely final decision. Keeping "Fast Track" cases under a review framework will help to prevent drift. However, comments made at question 1 above should be borne in mind and the mind-set of less = good and more = bad should be avoided. That having been said, the current proposal seems reasonable.

5. **Recommendation 5: Sisting family and civil partnership actions**

"The sub-committee recommends that:

(a) The rules should state that family and civil partnership actions cannot be sisted indefinitely. The sheriff should have discretion to decide on a suitable duration, taking the particular circumstances into account. For example, a sist to monitor contact or to allow a party to obtain legal aid would not need to be as long as a sist to allow the parties to attend mediation or to sell an asset.

(b) Sisted cases should be subject to a mandatory review by way of an administrative hearing, called a "review of sist", which only agents would need to attend. Where a case involves a party litigant, it should be made clear to the party litigant that the hearing is administrative in nature, so that they know substantive issues will not be considered. Operationally, the sub-committee acknowledged there is a limit to how far in advance the court programme will allow hearings to be fixed. This may have an impact on the duration of sist that can be granted initially.

(c) The interlocutor sisting the case must specify the reason for the sist, and fix a date for the review of sist hearing. This will provide a procedural focus for parties, and prevent any delay around fixing and intimating the date administratively at the expiry of the sist.

(d) At the review of sist hearing, the sheriff should have the following options:

(i) extend the sist for a defined period and fix a further review of sist hearing;

(ii) recall the sist and fix either an initial case management hearing or full case management hearing (depending on the stage at which the action was initially sisted); or

(iii) recall the sist and make case management orders if the case requires it.

The sub-committee noted that the choice between (ii) and (iii) would depend to an extent on the state of readiness of the parties, as well as the time available to the court at the review of sist hearing."

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 5?

☒ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Not sure

(Please tick as appropriate and give reasons for your answer)

Agreed on the assumption that provision will remain in place for the parties to move the court to recall the sist earlier if there is a material change in circumstances.

6. **Recommendation 6: Abbreviated pleadings**

"The sub-committee recommends that:

(a) Abbreviated pleadings, rather than forms, should be adopted in family and civil partnership actions. This accords with the approach taken by the Rules Rewrite Project. The use of forms could be revisited in future years, when family and civil partnership actions come to be added to the Civil Online portal.

(b) Lengthy narratives should be discouraged in family and civil partnership actions, so that pleadings are more concise – along the lines of what happens in commercial actions. For example, the sub-committee noted that Practice Note No.1 of 2017 on commercial actions in the Sheriffdom of Tayside, Central and Fife states at paragraph 10 that "pleadings in traditional form are not normally required or encouraged in a commercial action, and lengthy narrative is discouraged". Similar wording is included in the Court of Session Practice Note on Commercial Actions (No 1 of 2017).

However, the sub-committee noted that in commercial actions, the parties will have given each other 'fair notice' of their case before proceedings are commenced. The commercial Practice Notes contain provisions about pre-litigation communications, which are not generally exchanged in family actions. If the Committee approves this recommendation, some thought will need to be given to how best to frame any rule relating to it."

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 6?

☒ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Not sure

(Please tick as appropriate and give reasons for your answer)

There has long been a tendency to 'tell the whole story' in family pleadings and to lose sight of what is fact and what is evidence. Good guidance and practice notes on abbreviated pleadings could help to bring about a culture change. For all the reasons discussed in the report, this is not the appropriate time to adopt forms.

7. **Recommendation 7: Witness lists**

"The sub-committee recommends that parties should be asked to state (in brief general terms) on the witness list what each witness is going to speak to. This would enable the sheriff to consider whether the witnesses will all speak to issues that remain in dispute (i.e. are relevant) and whether there would be scope to agree some of the evidence. This would give the sheriff greater control

over the point at which a date for proof should be fixed, and for how long it should be scheduled."

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 7?

☐ Agree ☐ Not sure ☒ Not sure

(Please tick as appropriate and give reasons for your answer)

The concern here would be that brief general terms may not provide the necessary clarity to demonstrate lack of relevance to issues that remain in dispute and valuable evidence may be lost. .

8. **Recommendation 8: Judicial continuity**

"The sub-committee notes that the Fatal Accident Inquiry Rules make provision about judicial continuity. In particular, rule 2.5 provides that, where possible, the same sheriff is to deal with the inquiry from beginning to end. The sub-committee recommends that a similar provision should be applied to family and civil partnership actions. The sub-committee notes that insofar as practicable and feasible, the Sheriffs Principal all encourage judicial continuity in their courts."

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 8?

☒ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Not sure

(Please tick as appropriate and give reasons for your answer)

Yes. A similar provision should be made.

9. **Recommendation 9: Alternative Dispute Resolution**

"The sub-committee accepts that in principle, the sheriff's power to refer an action to mediation should be widened to apply to all family and civil partnership actions, rather than being restricted to cases involving a crave for a section 11 order. This recommendation is subject to two caveats.

Firstly, there is a need to ensure that the rule is not inadvertently applied to a type of action that is not listed in section 1(2) of the Civil Evidence (Family Mediation) (Scotland) Act 1995 (inadmissibility in civil proceedings of information as to what occurred during family mediation). That appears unlikely, as the list is very broadly framed.

Secondly, the sub-committee understands that Scottish Women's Aid has expressed concerns to the Scottish Government about the appropriateness of mediation in cases with a domestic abuse background. The sub-committee noted two points which may address this concern: (i) mediation is a voluntary process, and if a party is unwilling to participate the mediator will not allow it to go ahead; (ii) in the proposed new case management structure, it will be open to parties to move for a proof – or at least raise concerns about the appropriateness of mediation – at the initial case management hearing, which will take place at a very early stage in proceedings, often before there has been a child welfare hearing."

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 9?

X☐ Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Not sure

(Please tick as appropriate and give reasons for your answer)

Comments

Abused Men in Scotland (AMIS) is an organisation which supports male victims of domestic abuse. Given the impact that domestic abuse can have on the power dynamic between partners and former partners in relationships, we would agree with Scottish Women's Aid that concerns about the inappropriateness of mediation in some cases is reasonable. At the end of an abusive relationship any victim, regardless of gender, can be left with such high levels of fear and trauma that it may be several years (if ever) before they are able to give up the self-protection mechanism of submitting entirely to the will of their abuser and learn to determine and express their own preferences. Another way in which this issue may manifest itself is in a form of abusive behaviour where the abuser devises and presents a contrived narrative to legal and administrative systems and procedures to control their victim and attempt to control the way legal and administrative systems respond to and interact with their victim. This may lead to the victim agreeing to mediation with no intention or ability to state their preference or negotiate; or to them being made to look like an unreasonable, self-serving individual with no real interest in the wellbeing of the children if they refuse to enter in to mediation. That being said, in the majority of cases, mediation should be encouraged as a means by which matters can be settled amicably with the positive investment of both parties. There should be awareness training for all involved to help identify any inappropriate cases, regardless of gender of the victim, and to allow appropriate management of the actions to which they are a party.

10. **Recommendation 10: Expert witnesses**

"The sub-committee notes that recommendation 117 of the SCCR states:

'The provisions in relation to expert evidence which apply to adoption proceedings should be extended to all family actions and children's referrals.'

The SCCR cites paragraph 4.3.3.2 of Practice Note No 1 of 2006 of the Sheriffdom of North Strathclyde as an example. This states:

'The sheriff should discourage the unnecessary use of expert witnesses. If expert evidence is essential, the sheriff should encourage the joint instruction of a single expert by all parties. If one party instructs an expert report, it should be disclosed to the other parties with a view to the agreement of as much of its contents as possible.'

This paragraph was incorporated into near identical Practice Notes on the Adoption and Children (Scotland) Act 2007 issued in each sheriffdom in 2009.

The sub-committee recommends that these points should be added as matters about which the sheriff may make orders at a full case management hearing."

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 10?

☒ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Not sure

(Please tick as appropriate and give reasons for your answer)

Unnecessary use of expert witnesses should always be discouraged. Early agreement of as much of the contents of an expert report as possible could save time and money should the case come to proof. All experts in any discipline do not necessarily hold the same views or come to the same conclusions. For this reason it may prove difficult to get an undisputed determinative expert opinion. However, there may still be some scope to agree issues in expert reports which come to different conclusions on the same facts.

11. **Recommendation 11: Minutes of variation**

"The sub-committee recommends that minutes of variation should be dealt with under a similar procedure to that which is proposed for the principal proceedings. The sub-committee proposes that when a minute is lodged, the clerk will fix an initial case management hearing and specify the last date for lodging answers. An alternative would be to fix an initial case management hearing only where answers are lodged. The sub-committee does not favour this alternative approach, because it is considered that some sheriffs would be reluctant to grant the application without hearing the parties. Further, the procedure could become complicated in cases where there were applications for permission to lodge answers late.

The initial case management hearing will determine if the issue can be addressed by way of a child welfare hearing, or if a more formal case

management process leading to an evidential hearing on the minute and answers will be required.

It is proposed that Chapter 14 (applications by minute) should no longer apply to family or civil partnership actions, and that it would be preferable to insert bespoke provisions into Chapters 33 and 33A."

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 11?

X☐ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Not sure

(Please tick as appropriate and give reasons for your answer)

It makes sense for the procedure for minutes to vary to follow a similar procedure to that for the principal proceedings with the clerk fixing an initial case management hearing and speciying the last date for lodging answers. Bespoke provisions should be made.

12. **Recommendation 12: Training**

"The sub-committee recommends that formal training for judiciary and court staff should be delivered, by the Judicial Institute and SCTS respectively, in relation to its proposed new case management structure for family and civil partnership actions."

This recommendation has been endorsed by both the Committee and the SCJC and the SCJC secretariat will liaise with the Judicial Institute and SCTS once the scope of any rules changes is clearer.

13. **Recommendation 13: Legal Aid**

"The sub-committee recommends that the Committee should liaise with the Scottish Government and the Scottish Legal Aid Board once the scope of any rules changes is clearer."

This recommendation has been endorsed by both the Committee and the SCJC and the SCJC secretariat will liaise with the Scottish Government and the Scottish Legal Aid Board once the scope of any rules changes is clearer.

14. **Cases without a crave for an order under section 11 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995**

The sub-committee proposes that where the only matter in dispute is a crave for an order under Section 11 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995, cases could be allocated to a "fast track". The aim of the "fast track" is for the case to be managed to early resolution by means of a child welfare hearing or series of child welfare hearings. It is recognised that the initial case management hearing would be a procedural formality for cases without a crave for a section 11 order unless such cases could be allocated to a separate "fast track" not involving child welfare hearings.

Do you have any comments on:

(i) whether there should be a "fast track" for cases without a crave for an order under section 11 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995?

(ii) the nature of the hearings or procedure that should apply in a "fast track" for cases without a crave for an order under section 11 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995?

Comments in relation to (I) and (ii) above and the appropriateness of a fast track would reflect the comments made at question 9 in relation to the appropriateness of mediation.

15. **Do you have any additional comments?**

Comments