Company Number: 3216897 Charity Number: 1058580 Scottish Charity Number: SC43518

# JUSTICE

Report and financial statements For the year ended 31 March 2022



# Contents

# For the year ended 31 March 2022

Reference and administrative information	1
Trustees' annual report	3
An introduction from our Chair of the JUSTICE Board, Peter Binning	3
Objectives and activities	5
Achievements and performance	10
Plans for the future from JUSTICE Chief Executive, Fiona Rutherford	39
Structure, governance and management	42
Independent auditor's report	48
Statement of financial activities (incorporating an income and expenditure account)	53
Balance sheet	54
Statement of cash flows	55
Notes to the financial statements	56

#### Reference and administrative information

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

Company Number	3216897
Country of incorporation	United Kingdom
Charity Number	1058580
Country of registration	England and Wales
Scottish Charity Number	SC43518 registered in Scotland
Registered office and Operational address	2nd Floor, Lincoln House 296–302 High Holborn London WC1V 7JH

**Board members** Board members, who are also directors under company law and the charity trustees as defined by section 177 of the Charities Act 2011, who served during the year and up to the date of this report were as follows:

	Peter Binning Rachel Sexton	Chair from 10 November 2020
	Liz Campbell Alexandra Carr Patrick Corr	(to 4 November 2021)
	Dr. Naomi Creutzfeldt	
	Deba Das N. Lynn Hiestand	(to 4 November 2021)
	Theodore Huckle KC Christina Liciaga	(to 31 December 2021)
	Alastair Livesey Jennifer MacLeod Kate Saunders	(from 4 November 2021)
	Dame Alison Saunders CB Sir Michael Tugendhat	
Key management personnel	Fiona Rutherford Samantha Burridge	Chief Executive (from 1 February 2022) Director of Operations
	Amanda Miller	Director of Development
	Stephanie Needleman Jane Collier	Legal Director (from 30 August 2021) Interim Director of Development (Maternity Cover from 30 August 2021)
	Andrea Coomber KC (Hon) Jodie Blackstock	Director/Chief Executive (to 15 October 2021) Legal Director (to 27 August 2021)

# Reference and administrative information

# For the year ended 31 March 2022

Bankers	Lloyds Bank plc 222 Strand London WC2R 1BB CAFCash Ltd PO Box 289
	West Malling Kent, ME19 4TA
Investment managers	BlackRock 33 King William St London EC4R 9AS
	CCLA Investment Management Ltd 80 Cheapside London EC2V 6DZ
Auditor	Sayer Vincent LLP Chartered Accountants and Statutory Auditor Invicta House 108–114 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0TL

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

# An introduction from our Chair of the JUSTICE Board, Peter Binning

Welcome to JUSTICE's Trustees' Annual Report and Financial statements. I hope this provides you with an overview of our achievements and the challenges we have faced across the past year, which has been a period of great change for JUSTICE.

After eight and a half years with us, our Director Andrea Coomber KC (Hon) left in September 2021 to take up the role of Chief Executive at the Howard League for Penal Reform. Andrea's time at JUSTICE saw a revitalisation of the charity, and a significant increase in its profile and punch. Andrea built a tremendous team and network of supporters to continue the work, for which we are hugely grateful. Our new Chief Executive, Fiona Rutherford, arrived in February 2022 and hit the ground running, proving to be a remarkable leader of JUSTICE and is opening up a challenging new chapter in JUSTICE's history. Fiona joins us from the Ministry of Justice and has worked in the justice sector for her entire career, including for 15 years as a criminal barrister. This was not the only staff change JUSTICE had to adjust to, as Jodie Blackstock, Legal Director, also left JUSTICE after 12 years to return to the Bar and Amanda Miller, our Director of Development, went on Maternity leave. I am extremely grateful to the JUSTICE team who kept the charity running and continued to deliver their usual high standard of work during the period without a Director / Chief Executive, special thanks to the Senior Management Team and also to Liz Campbell, our previous Board member for their additional support to the Board and the JUSTICE team during this period.

In addition to the staff changes, 2021 also bought about issues with our freehold building at 59 Carter Lane, a building survey completed in late 2021 highlighted significant problems relating to the boiler, accessibility issues, and health and safety. These issues meant that the Board had to make a decision that staff could not return to working from Carter Lane until these issues were resolved. The Board formed a sub-group of Board members, property and financial consultants to review the options and make a decision on next steps. Following a huge amount of research and analysis, the Board made the difficult but pragmatic decision to sell. The JUSTICE staff have spent the last few months sorting through the contents of Carter Lane, in preparation for the sale, The property was sold in October 2022 for £2.1m (before fees) and the Senior Management Team and Board will spend the next few months considering how to best use the proceeds. We are extremely grateful to Charles Russell Speechlys, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP, Linklaters LLP, and Karyl Nairn KC, who provide desk space, allowing the staff to get together on a weekly and monthly basis.

Despite these challenges the work has continued apace and in the last year we have produced three working party reports; <u>A Parole System Fit for Purpose</u>; <u>Reforming the Windrush Compensation</u> <u>Scheme</u>; and <u>Reforming Benefits Decision-Making</u>. These working parties have engaged our membership and the wider legal community to identify issues and solutions and have led to recommendations which we are working to implement. There has also been an unprecedented amount of time spent researching, drafting, and delivering briefings to Parliamentarians in both houses. This work has been extensive, due to the heavy Parliamentary legislative programme.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

We have continued to hold virtual events, including our Annual Human Rights and Student Conferences, a series of career conversation events with our members, as well as events for our donors. We also trialled a series of Working Parties at Work events, to showcase their impact.

Like many charities, funding is always a focus and we have continued to suffer financially with the pandemic still impacting on our fundraising abilities and wider economic uncertainty impacting donations and membership. We have had some success in broadening our income streams and attracting new Trust and Foundation and Corporate funders but the 2021–22 financial year has been a difficult one for JUSTICE, we have ended the financial year with a deficit and our reserves have dropped below our reserves policy. The Finance Committee and Board are monitoring this closely and are optimistic that we have the plans in place to weather the storm. With the sale of our building we have the opportunity to consider how the charity needs to work to be most effective and to best deliver the aims of the charity and to design a new business model for JUSTICE which may include a 'JUSTICE hub' a place (virtual and real) to foster innovation and encourage collaboration across the justice sector and beyond. It might also provide a useful 'touchdown' location for our out of London members and a place to meet and work with our team and find out more about our work. This offer may be particularly timely given our work to expand our membership base and raise awareness of JUSTICE's work across the UK. All in all, very exciting times for JUSTICE.

I hope that you enjoy reading this report. There is a great deal for us to do in the next few years and so much that JUSTICE can achieve with your help.

I am so grateful to all who work on behalf of JUSTICE and to you, our supporters. Thank you.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

The JUSTICE Board present their report and the audited financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2022.

Reference and administrative information, set out on pages 1 and 2, forms part of this report. The financial statements comply with current statutory requirements, the memorandum, articles of association, and the Statement of Recommended Practice – Accounting and Reporting by Charities: SORP applicable to charities preparing their accounts in accordance with FRS 102.

# Objectives and activities

#### Purposes and aims

JUSTICE is an all-party membership organisation, drawn primarily from the legal profession with a common commitment to the rule of law and the fair administration of justice.

As reflected in our governing documents:

JUSTICE was established to promote the sound development and administration of the law for the benefit of the public in the following ways:

(a) By promoting education and conducting research into the law, including current and proposed practice and administration and reform of the law, as the JUSTICE Board thinks fit, and by publishing the useful results of such research;

(b) By providing specialist legal advice in relation to the law and legal procedures particularly in cases where it is apprehended that a miscarriage of justice has taken place;

(c) By providing legal representation for those who are unable to obtain legal representation from their own resources, particularly in cases where it is apprehended that a miscarriage of justice has taken place;

(d) and for such other purposes for the benefit of the community as shall be exclusively charitable.

Our primary focus is on overcoming institutional and procedural barriers to access to justice and fairness for people using the system. We put their experiences at the heart of our work, and we recognise that many aspects of the existing structure and practises within the justice system compound exclusion for disadvantaged people.

Across all our work we address:

**Institutional weakness:** considering ways to strengthen the operation of key institutions and frameworks in the justice system, testing them for fairness, accessibility and efficiency.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

**Procedural deficiency:** identifying and challenging unfair, inaccessible and inefficient legal procedures. We will examine the potential of technology and innovation in delivering justice – including alternatives to traditional justice processes – and consider its emerging impact on the system.

**Biases in the justice system:** exploring and confronting the ways in which the justice system adversely treats and impacts upon individuals and groups based on their status and/or protected characteristics including race, gender, disability and/or socio-economic status

In recent years, JUSTICE has moved away from providing legal advice and representation. In part, this has been the assumption of JUSTICE's previous work on miscarriages of justice by the establishment of the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC). We continue to be involved in how miscarriages of justice are handled, both in the courts and by the CCRC.

# The focus of our work

JUSTICE's strategic plan for 2021–24 continues to see our work span administrative, civil, family and criminal justice in the United Kingdom.

We have four intersecting core areas of activity:

- We use working parties of our members and other experts to identify and address areas ripe for reform. Supported by our staff, the working parties provide evidence-based analysis and propose practical solutions by drawing on leading academic research, international and comparative material, and lived experiences of people interacting with the justice system in different ways. We work towards implementing our working party recommendations, and use our reports to inform, influence and collaborate with decision-makers and other key actors.
- We act as a bridge between law and lawmakers, briefing politicians from all parties on draft legislation relevant to the justice system in the UK and devolved Parliaments. We also respond to consultations from Government, parliamentary committees and other significant bodies within our areas of expertise.
- We hold informative events on our work and related issues, and on access to the legal profession for our members and other interested parties.
- Finally, we submit third-party interventions before the UK Supreme Court and the European Court of Human Rights in cases that raise critical points of law in our areas of expertise.

JUSTICE also provides the Secretariat for the Administrative Justice Council (the AJC). We will continue to work closely with the AJC, strengthening both our own capacity and that of the administrative justice system.

#### Trustees' annual report

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### Public benefit

Since its formation in 1957, JUSTICE has been at the cutting edge of the debate on legal reform and is widely respected for the breadth, depth and quality of its analysis. Today, more than ever, JUSTICE is involved in the issues that will shape the future legal landscape.

Direct beneficiaries of our work include practising lawyers, judges, law students and policy-makers interested in the development and protection of the rule of law and human rights, in addition to the public at large, who benefit from a robust justice system that protects their rights.

The benefits of our work is demonstrated through: the adoption of our recommendations in government law reform initiatives; the referencing of our contributions to government consultations; the adoption by parliamentarians of our suggested amendments to legislation; and the acceptance of our arguments in third-party interventions in court judgments. Our third-party interventions in the United Kingdom's Supreme Court and in the European Court of Human Rights are submitted 'in the interests of justice' and not on behalf of particular parties. When adopted, our arguments strengthen legal protection for all people beyond those directly involved in the proceedings.

The Board has referred to the guidance contained in the Charity Commission's general guidance on public benefit when reviewing the charity's aims and objectives and in planning its future activities. In particular, the Board considers how planned activities will contribute to the aims and objectives that have been set. While some activities are available only to members, these are in the minority and the vast majority of our work is available to the public free of charge. The JUSTICE website provides accessible information on our work to the public at large.

The Trustees confirm that they have paid due regard to the public benefit guidance published by the Charity Commission in deciding the aims, objectives and activities of the charity.

The Board considers that JUSTICE's activities are of public benefit in at least the following ways:

- provision of independent research and analysis to external bodies, including the senior judiciary, government and politicians across the political spectrum to assist in formulating law, policy and practice related to justice matters, which can have significant benefit for people in the UK;
- dissemination of research and information about justice system reform directly to JUSTICE members, including: judges, barristers, solicitors, chartered legal executives, students, advisers to governments and corporations and non-governmental organisations, who are then better able to advise public and private bodies accurately about justice issues. This is frequently available to the public at large via social media platforms and our website; and,
- offering conferences, lectures and other events on contemporary justice issues that are open to the general public to attend, to inform them about important issues which may affect their daily lives.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### **Principal Activities**

#### Policy

More than ever, during this strategy period, we will strive to tackle urgent and important issues within the constraints of the social, economic and political climate indicated above. To achieve this, our working parties, briefings and interventions will focus on the following themes.

#### Reform of courts and the impact of COVID-19:

We will continue to monitor the HMCTS Reform Programme, urging that it increase access and fairness in the courts and tribunals. We will explore and evaluate ways in which the integrity of the courts and justice process can be maintained as they adapt to the impact of COVID-19. We will lead thinking on which aspects of the COVID-19 response should remain, be revised or be discarded as courts 'return to normal'.

#### User-centred justice:

The justice system must be comprehensible to all its users so that they can effectively participate and have confidence in it. Building on our 2019 Working Party Report Understanding Courts, we will focus on improving the experience and involvement of specific cohorts of users, such as children, victims of crime and vulnerable people to enable fair outcomes.

In 2021, our working party 'Improving Access to Justice for Separating Families' will undertake a child-centred review of what families need from the Family Court when they seek help with child arrangements, with particular emphasis on domestic abuse victims and unrepresented litigants.

#### Effective routes of redress:

Routes of redress are becoming increasingly uncertain or unavailable as a result of shifting State powers and responsibilities.

We will focus on ensuring privatisation, automation, and civil orders with criminal consequences do not inhibit effective challenge to decision-making through courts, tribunals and other complaints mechanisms.

#### Challenges to the courts and Constitution:

Independent and impartial courts are a central feature of the UK constitution. Safeguarding their integrity and remit amidst proposed reforms is crucial to the rule of law and ensuring access to justice.

We will pursue projects addressing proposed reforms to the operation of the Supreme Court, the role of judicial review and amendment of the Human Rights Act. We will continue to examine judicial appointments, with a view to increasing judicial diversity.

#### Trustees' annual report

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### Non-judicial decision-making:

At the start and end of court and tribunal processes, many public bodies and officials make significant decisions concerning individual rights and freedoms. Given the impact of these decisions on people's lives, these require careful scrutiny.

In the first part of the strategy period, we will consider the processes for release from imprisonment through the Parole Board and Criminal Cases Review Commission.

#### Other work:

We will continue to follow up on past reports and policy work by capturing whether our activities and interventions have paved the way for desired outcomes.

We will continue to collaborate and establish constructive relationships with diverse stakeholders within the justice system as we evidence, elaborate, and implement our work.

We will seek opportunities to expand our work in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales in line with our above priorities, as relevant to those jurisdictions.

We will look to engage more closely with the International Commission of Jurists, using its network to strengthen our work, and supporting it as appropriate.

#### Development

The key to successful fundraising is multifaceted and meaningful relationships, especially given the political and economic climate outlined at the beginning of this strategy. To this end, developing even stronger and deeper bonds with our donors, supporters and members through thoughtful engagement opportunities will be the foundation of the Development team's work over this strategy period. The Development priorities from our strategic plan are detailed below.

## Membership

JUSTICE is a membership organisation, and our members are among our greatest assets. Our members span law students, through the ranks of the profession, to retired lawyers and judges. They include practitioners of all different types of law and all branches of the profession. While our members cover the spectrum of politics, they share a common concern in maintaining the integrity of the justice system in the United Kingdom.

#### Strengthening and increasing our membership programme

Membership plays a crucial role in shaping our work, as well as a source of unrestricted and sustainable funding. We plan to develop and create lasting relationships and multifaceted journeys for our members, especially those in the highest-level categories and corporate members, to ensure better acquisition and retention.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

# We will improve our engagement communications through segmentation and strategic messaging and streamline our administrative communications to make the membership experience easier.

Events are the cornerstone of our membership programme. We will continue to provide thought-provoking and topical events to our current members and to attract new members. We will maximize our reach through virtual events, allowing us to expand our membership beyond England by attracting new members from Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

#### Fundraising

#### Broadening our current income streams and attracting new funders:

We plan to attract new funders and increase support from existing donors by developing opportunities for them to support us beyond a single project and investing in our longer-term growth, especially trusts and foundations. We will focus on unrestricted, multi-year funding and increasing our network of donors of all sizes and from varied industries.

We will continue to improve the experience of our JUSTICE60, Friends and major donors by working with the Development Board to ensure this transformational group remains engaged in our work and invested in our impacts. We are committed to providing bespoke events and networking opportunities and will look to diversify its growth by increasing corporate donors and approaching lawyers and leaders of industry from a wider audience.

We will enhance our external communications and cement our reputation as sector leaders, by focusing on more accessible content, targeted events, demonstrating our impact and encouraging wider audiences to engage with and support our work.

# Achievements and performance

The charity's main activities and beneficiaries for 2021–22 are described below. All its charitable activities focus on strengthening the justice system and are undertaken to further JUSTICE'S charitable purposes for the public benefit.

# Policy

## Working Parties

Over the past year, we have published three reports, which have engaged our membership and the wider legal community. These reports were produced through working parties of our membership and invited experts, meeting in committees over the life of the project to identify issues and solutions and taking evidence from relevant sources. We made a series of recommendations relating to each area of the legal system, which we are working to implement. This work sits alongside the continuing implementation work on our previously reported work and working parties that are still in progress.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### Reports published in 2021-22

#### <u>A Parole System Fit for Purpose</u> (Strategy theme: non-judicial decision-making)

In April 2021, JUSTICE launched its a Parole System fit for Purpose Working Party, which examined the role, powers, and procedures of the Parole Board and wider system. The report was published in January 2022 and makes 22 practical, achievable, and well-evidenced recommendations which explore and show how the parole system could be truly fit for purpose for those in prison, victims, and the general public. We hope it will help inform the Government's own 'root and branch' review and its recommendations for reform.

A parole hearing can be a life-changing moment. For many, it is the turning point between lengthy periods of incarceration and the start of a new life in the community – a second chance. Those detained by the State must be afforded appropriate access to justice to enforce their rights. At the head of this process is the Parole Board, whose members make difficult and sometimes controversial decisions. It is right that its role remains subject to regular scrutiny, which has been the case since the Parole Board's creation over fifty years ago.

Backlogs and delays have plagued the parole system in recent years, which in turn delay a person's release from prison. In particular, recalls of prisoners on licence have surged in the last decade – individuals who have been recalled now make up 14% of the prison population. Moreover, the parole process can be particularly difficult to navigate and raises a multitude of human rights concerns around effective participation and procedural fairness. There is often a disregard for how the process impacts on prisoners and their ability to participate in the process. Studies which have looked at prisoners' understanding, and experience have indicated feelings of anxiety, powerlessness, voicelessness, frustration, disengagement, and a deep sense of irrational justice.

The report explores parole through each stage of the process. Our findings show that it is not working as effectively as it should. This has significant consequences, not only for those prisoners who could be released, but also for victims, whose assailants too often lack the opportunity for any meaningful rehabilitation and therefore risk reoffending upon release, and taxpayers, who are entitled to expect public money to be utilised in a way that delivers results.

Key recommendations include:

**Replacing the Parole Board with a Parole Tribunal**, which will have the necessary powers, respect from third parties (such as police and probation), and authority to make fully independent decisions without Government interference.

**Requiring that the State, rather than the individual in prison, justify any continued detention beyond the minimum term,** so that the responsibility for demonstrating the (un)manageability of risk is properly allocated.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

**Reforming the recall process,** which would require that facts of an alleged breach of a licence condition are established in a magistrates' court before the recall takes place, after which the case can go to the Parole Tribunal to consider the issue of risk and whether re-incarceration is appropriate.

**Placing rehabilitation at the heart of the parole process,** by giving the Parole Tribunal oversight of an individual's progression through prison, including of executive decisions which impact their chance to be released.

**Greater accessibility of information** for those in prison, their families, and victims, so that everyone is given the tools they need to properly participate in the parole process. This includes creating a duty for the newly-established Parole Tribunal to update those in prison and, where relevant, victims, on the progression of the case, as well as providing general information about the parole process.

**Enhancing the Parole Board's programme of training** to include areas such as sentencing, procedure, prison law and policy, critical analyses of offending behaviour programmes and risk management tools, equality and diversity, cultural awareness, vulnerable people (including those with mental health and neurodiverse conditions and children).

**Greater rigour when imposing licence conditions**, requiring that the Probation Service only be able to request that the Parole Tribunal impose licence conditions where it has demonstrated, with clear written explanations, how they are reasonable and proportionate, and their impact on an individual's chances of successful rehabilitation.

Significantly expanding the provision of accommodation for those released from prison, so as to guarantee that nobody is released homeless. The Ministry of Justice should also review the provision of accommodation for particular categories of prisoners, such as women, older prisoners, and those with complex health needs.

Hogan Lovells International LLP supported this work with pro bono support and a donation of  $\pm 2,500$ , along with an individual donor who donated  $\pm 5,000$ . The rest of the staff time spent on this work was funded from JUSTICE's designated funds.

# <u>Reforming the Windrush Compensation Scheme</u> (Strategy themes: non-judicial decision-making; effective routes of redress)

In 2018, news of the Windrush scandal reached the public domain, when it emerged that hundreds of Commonwealth citizens had been detained, deported and denied legal rights after wrongly being classified as illegal and/or undocumented immigrants. Hundreds of individuals were placed in immigration detention, lost their jobs and homes and were threatened with removal, with many others deported to countries they hadn't resided in since childhood.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

The Windrush Compensation Scheme was launched in April 2019 by the Home Office to compensate members of the Windrush generation and their families for the losses and hardships they suffered as a result of not being able to demonstrate their lawful immigration status. Despite the initial estimate of around 15,000 people being eligible for compensation, as of the end of September 2021 only 864 people have received compensation payments.

In November 2021, JUSTICE published its Report 'Reforming the Windrush Compensation Scheme'. It makes 27 recommendations to improve the process for those seeking compensation from the Home Office. The Report finds that the Scheme suffers from a lack of independence (it is administered by the department responsible for Claimants' considerable losses); there are delays and inconsistencies in decision-making; awards do not accurately reflect claimants' losses; and caseworkers lack experience and cultural understanding. The claim process is complex and many claimants require legal assistance to complete their claim; however there is no provision of free legal representation. Claimants who instruct solicitors are typically paying between 20% and 30% of their award in legal fees. It was further found that the Scheme does not have an effective appeals process.

Key recommendations of the Report, prepared by an independent JUSTICE working group Chaired by Professor Robert Thomas, Professor of Public Law at the University of Manchester, include:

**The need for independence and accountability:** including the Scheme being moved from the Home Office, preferably to an organisation independent of the government; and greater accountability and transparency of the publication of findings from independent reviewers.

**Funded legal representation for Claimants:** funding should be made available for legal representation for all eligible Claimants via Legal Aid and/or funding provided under the Scheme.

**Training and quality assurance for caseworkers**: further training and guidance should be provided to caseworkers on decision-making, communication with vulnerable people, mental health, and cultural understanding of people from different communities. In addition, better quality assurance is required to prevent errors.

**Improved communication with Claimants:** including use of video guides, correspondence which is easier to understand, regular reports on the progress of a claim, and Claimants always being treated with humanity, dignity and respect.

**Calculation of losses:** the Scheme Rules should be amended to ensure that the compensation received by Claimants reflects all the losses they have suffered. In particular: pension losses should be included in the loss of earnings category; compensation for homelessness should be increased; and an additional level for the impact on life tariff should be considered.

**Raising awareness of the scheme:** a targeted publicity campaign to reach out to affected communities and grass roots organisations should be commissioned to raise awareness of the Scheme and help build trust with claimants.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

A more coherent and efficient appeals and complaints system: this should include the right of appeal against compensation decisions to a Tribunal; a complaints mechanism to the Independent Case Examiner; and powers to enable the Ombudsman to investigate maladministration by the Home Office.

Dechert LLP supported this work with a donation of £5,000, who also provided pro bono support. The rest of the staff time on spent on this work was funded from JUSTICE's designated funds.

#### **<u>Reforming Benefits Decision-Making</u>** (Strategy theme: non-judicial decision-making)

Reforming Benefits Decision-Making is our joint working party with the Administrative Justice Council, chaired by Lord Low of Dalston CBE. The Working Party was launched in April 2020 and the report was published in July 2021. It makes makes recommendations aimed at creating a benefits system that prioritises dignity and respect and places the user at its heart.

The benefits decision-making system forms a huge part of the administrative justice landscape in the United Kingdom. However, the system is performing poorly, and can have devastating impacts on peoples' lives. Individuals often lack knowledge as to their possible entitlements; the application process can be inaccessible and confusing; and many are incorrectly denied benefits to which they are entitled or have their benefits terminated or suspended when they are wrongly sanctioned. Challenging incorrectly made decisions is often stressful and lengthy and many individuals give up when faced with a long fight for their entitlement.

The report makes 44 recommendations aimed at improving the administrative and procedural aspects of the benefits system. It considers initial decisionmaking, through to appeals, to ensure that the system works well for everyone, regardless of their digital capability, their health, their disabilities, or their vulnerabilities. The report was launched at time when unemployment was rising and the full economic impact of the pandemic was yet to be realised and now we face unprecedented cost of living crisis. In these circumstances the need to ensure a fair benefits system that is accessible and makes timely and accurate decisions is greater than ever.

Key recommendations include:

**Changes to improve the quality of the health and disability assessment** process including: opt-in audio recording of assessments; greater clarity over who will obtain medical evidence; claimants being assessed by assessors with specialist knowledge of their condition and an end to the outsourcing of assessments to private companies.

**Better data collection and evaluation**, including on protected characteristics of claimants, the setting of claimant commitments, the use of easements and sanctions.

**Clear structures and rules to prevent the inconsistent and unfair application of discretion**, including a statutory list of 'good reasons' for failure to comply with the claimant commitment.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

**Greater transparency on the use of automation** and how it feeds into decisions and the technological constraints of computers systems.

The establishment of clear, public performance standards and an independent reviewer or regulator for welfare benefits.

The removal of the mandatory reconsideration stage so that claimants are able to appeal directly to the Social Security Tribunal, but with an automatic internal review required by the DWP once an appeal has been lodged.

**Streamlining the appeals process** to reduce the need for appellants to repeatedly provide the same information and **greater use of tribunal caseworkers to reduce adjournments.** 

The adoption of a 'no wrong door' approach to applying for Universal Credit and managing a claim, including meaningful alternative channels of engagement.

An **advice portal which provides information on organisations providing welfare benefits advice** and which should be clearly signposted to on all webpages providing information on benefits, all paper-based forms, decision letters and mandatory reconsideration notices.

BlackRock, Weil, Gotshal and Manges LLP and abrdn Financial Fairness Trust (formerly known as Standard Life Foundation) are supporting our working party on Reforming Benefits Decision–Making, with BlackRock donating £4,799, in this financial year as well as providing pro bono support; abrdn with a three-year grant of £70,000, with £45,000 received in this financial year; and Weil, Gotshal and Manges LLP through their JUSTICE60 membership donation of £10,000 in this financial year and by providing pro bono support.

#### Working Parties in progress 2021-22

#### Improving Access to Justice for Separating Families (Strategy theme: user-centred justice)

The Improving Access to Justice for Separating Families working party commenced in January 2021, chaired by Professor Gillian Douglas. Since the legal aid cuts of 2013, private children's cases in England and Wales have become the site of numerous, interrelated, access to justice problems. The proliferation of litigants in person has not only introduced new challenges, such as the proper advice, support, and case management of so many unrepresented litigants, but also exacerbated pre-existing issues, such as the treatment of domestic abuse by the court and the child's voice being heard within proceedings.

When barriers prevent effective access to justice in these cases, there can be detrimental consequences: not only to the litigants, usually parents, but also to the child in the middle of proceedings. Furthermore, and most importantly of all, it can undermine the court's ability to make a decision in the best interests of the child.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

This Working Party convenes at a time of appetite for significant change. Responses to the Private Law Working Group, set up by the President of the Family Division in 2019, called for radical structural reform. The Ministry of Justice's June 2020 report concluded that several systemic barriers prevent the Family Court from dealing effectively with domestic abuse in private law cases. And in December 2020, the Family Justice Board confirmed "lon[g]-term reforms are needed to ensure the most vulnerable children and families are prioritised and the future system is designed around their needs and runs smoothly." The task of innovating, piloting and evaluating that long-term reform coincides with the digitisation of private children processes by HMCTS in 2021, whilst the Family Court tries to recover from the Covid-19 pandemic and learn lessons from its impact on access to justice.

The aim of our Working Party is to consider how access to justice can be improved for separating families in private family proceedings. This is with particular regard to the effective participation of parents and children; the effect that underlying or co-existing problems may have on what each family member needs from the court; and the principle that the court experience should not cause or exacerbate harm. In pursuing this aim the Working Party will set out what a future private family court should look like and how the court's processes should adapt to the families within it.

The Working Party report will be published in October 2022.

Mishcon de Reya LLP, The Treebeard Trust, The Clifford Chance Foundation and The Eleanor Rathbone Charitable Trust are supporting our working party on Improving Access to Justice for Separating Families. With The Treebeard Trust providing a two-year grant of  $\pm 50,000$  with  $\pm 25,000$  received in this financial year; The Clifford Chance Foundation with a donation of  $\pm 4,328$ ; The Eleanor Rathbone Charitable Trust with a grant of  $\pm 2,000$  in 2020-21; and Mishcon de Reya LLP through their JUSTICE60 membership donation of  $\pm 10,000$  in this financial year, as well as providing pro bono support.

# *The function and operation of Hybrid Orders* (Strategy themes: effective routes of redress; user-centred justice)

The function and operation of Hybrid Orders Working Party is chaired by George Lubega, Partner at CMS. It is examining Hybrid Orders, defined as orders obtained by a civil procedure, that seek to restrict a person's behaviour and have criminal consequences if breached. The Working Party will examine the way hybrid orders operate in practice, in particular whether they are issued and enforced in a fair and consistent manner that respects human rights and whether they are effective in achieving their specified purposes. The Working Party plans to report in Spring/Summer 2023.

# Administrative decision-making in prisons (Strategy themes: non-judicial decision-making; effective routes of redress)

The Administrative decision-making in prisons working party is still in its scoping stage. While an individual is in prison, they remain subject to a number of rules and processes that can serve to unduly delay their release. The Working Party will examine these rules and processes to ensure that individuals do not remain in prison unlawfully or any longer than is necessary. Sidley Austin LLP are supporting this work through pro bono support.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### *Outsourcing* (Strategy themes: non-judicial decision making; effective routes of redress)

The **Outsourcing working party** is still in its scoping phase. It will examine the impact of outsourcing of public services on administrative justice. In particular, it will focus on the outsourcing of decision-making around entitlement to public services, for example in respect of welfare benefits, local authority homelessness decisions and social care. Simmons & Simmons are supporting this work with a £10,000 donation and pro bono support.

#### Working Party implementation work in 2021-22

#### Tackling Racial Injustice: Children and the Youth Justice System

In February 2021 we published Tackling Racial Injustice, chaired by Sandra Paul and with the assistance of Travers Smith LLP. At most stages of the youth justice system – from arrest to custody – the proportion of Black and Minority Ethnic young people is higher than the proportion of white young people. This Working Party examined the causes of racial disproportionality in the Youth Justice System (YJS) of England and Wales and made recommendations to ensure that children are not needlessly criminalised by improving the attitudes, processes and procedures in the YJS.

JUSTICE provided evidence for the Criminal Justice Alliance's super-complaint regarding the use of section 60 stop and search powers. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, the College of Policing and the IOPC has assessed the super-complaint as eligible and will investigate the use of the power and whether there is enough independent scrutiny of stop and search more broadly.

We attended two roundtables organised by the Crown Prosecution Service to provide expertise in respect of potential guidance for prosecutors on the use of drill music as evidence, the use of experts on such evidence, and ancillary orders used to restrict the creation of and participation in drill music. During the roundtable, we presented the report and its recommendations. We were invited to provide further comments on the guidance, and will be involved in its development.

Implementation over this reporting period has also taken the form of briefing and advocacy to parliamentarians on several pieces of legislation. This includes the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022, for which we referred continuously to the report's evidence and recommendations and which has served to support our positions and highlight the damaging and potentially discriminatory impact that many of the Bill's measures would have, particularly on ethnic minorities. For example, we have produced an analysis of the impact and human rights implications of the proposed 'Serious Violence Reduction Orders', which would give the police the power to stop and search anybody subject to this order without the need for reasonable grounds to suspect them of having committed a crime. We also sat on a panel of experts for a briefing for members of the House of Lords, organised by the Alliance for Youth Justice, to address the implications of the new Serious Violence Duty in the PCSC Act on children.

In addition, the report's recommendations and analysis were referenced in our briefings on the criminal provisions of the Judicial Review and Courts Act 2022. Furthermore, JUSTICE drew on the report in submitting evidence in relation to a number of consultations, including to the Commission

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

on Young Lives (December 2021) and the Ministry of Justice's consultation 'Delivering Justice for Victims' (February 2022).

We continue to consider additional avenues for the implementation of the report's recommendations, with further meetings or research projects envisioned over the coming months. We have engaged our corporate partner, Travers Smith LLP, to undertake further research in support of this, particularly with respect to the issues faced by BAME women and girls in the criminal justice system.

In this financial year, the Barrow Cadbury Trust has contributed £14,000 of a three-year grant totalling £46,350 (£14,000 in 2020-21; £10,000 in 2019-20) and The Blagrave Trust has contributed £7,500 of a £30,000 grant (£7,500 in 2020-21; £15,000 in 2019-20) over the same period to support the Working Party and its implementation. Travers Smith LLP contributed £10,000 in 2019-20 and are also providing pro bono assistance to support the Working Party.

#### Immigration and Asylum Appeals – a Fresh Look

The Immigration and Asylum: a Fresh Look working party was chaired by Professor Sir Ross Cranston and published in July 2018. Since then, JUSTICE has been working to ensure that the recommendations from the report are implemented.

Having audited our progress on this project, almost all recommendations are either partially or fully implemented (45 out of 49). Those remaining relate to digital support services for appellants using the online appeal process, as the digital support service (initially a pilot and now a Government contract awarded to We Are Digital) does not yet extend to immigration and asylum appeals. We continue to engage with HMCTS about the importance of digital support through this and our *Preventing Digital Exclusion* work, and can confirm that paper appeal routes have been maintained. Much of the successful adoption of our recommendations has been due to excellent engagement with the Immigration and Asylum Chamber staff, judges and the HMCTS Reform Team and their willingness to meet to discuss how to implement our proposals.

A notable achievement towards our aim of reducing the volume of cases on appeal has been the introduction of a mandatory reconsideration stage in the online appeals process, before the case comes before a judge. This initially saw a reduction of appeals proceeding due to Home Office withdrawals of up to 30% of all appeals. However, recent statistics from the past year have shown a trend downwards to pre-reform levels of withdrawals. Consultations with stakeholders have identified that the reconsideration stage itself continues to be a sound design feature, but it is only of value if there is meaningful engagement in the review, rather than surface level compliance from the Home Office, and to a lesser extent legal representatives. An update to the 2018 report setting out the progress on implementation is three-quarters completed but was paused to focus capacity on more immediate deadlines including the Nationality and Borders Bill. It is anticipated to be completed by the end of 2022.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

JUSTICE was invited to sit on the "First Tier Tribunal IAC Advisory Group meeting", which includes the judiciary, practitioners and other NGOs.

We held an event featuring working party members Sonali Naik KC and Jawaid Luqmani, alongside Bella Sankey, Detention Action, and Alison Pickup, Asylum Aid. The event included an update on implementation of the 2018 report and integrated the access to justice issues raised in that report with the problems being briefed on in the Nationality and Borders Bill.

The Leri Charitable Trust supported our work on immigration and asylum with a two-year grant of  $\pm 20,000$ ,  $\pm 10,000$  in 2019-20 and 2020-21. The rest of the staff time on implementation was funded from JUSTICE's designated funds.

#### When Things Go Wrong

The When Things Go Wrong Working Party was chaired by Sir Robert Owen and published in August 2020. It made recommendations aimed at addressing the erosion of public trust in the response of the justice system to deaths giving rise to public concern.

The report called for non-means tested public funding for legal representation for bereaved families. The Government recently removed the means test for applications for Exceptional Case Funding in relation to legal representation and advice for inquests – a positive step towards our recommendation, but more work remains to be done. We worked with INQUEST on the Judicial Review and Courts Bill to seek to get this funding included in the Bill, however we were unfortunately unsuccessful.

We also met with Chief Coroner, HHJ Thomas Teague KC to discuss our Report's recommendations.

In June, we held an event "the COVID-19 Inquiry: ensuring justice for bereaved people and survivors" to discuss how the Working Party's recommendations could be utilised to set up the Covid-19 inquiry, which received front page coverage from the Guardian. JUSTICE responded to the consultation on the terms of reference of the inquiry (something we had called for in a letter from Sir Robert Owen to the Prime Minister). We highlighted the steps the Inquiry should take to ensure that the voices of bereaved people and survivors are heard. A number of these were reflected in changes to the terms of reference.

Whilst we did not cover the issue of racial injustice specifically in our Working Party, we are particularly concerned about the disproportionate number of people from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds, particularly those of African descent, who die in contentious circumstances where the State may have played a role. Despite this, during inquests racial discrimination and bias are rarely, if ever, raised as an issue and are therefore not considered. We will be working with INQUEST and the Howard League for Penal Reform to produce a guide for practitioners to assist them in making submissions about the role of racism in deaths in State custody. The guide will also provide practical considerations for how to be an anti-racist advocate. This work will be funded by the Matrix Causes Fund, who provided a grant of  $\pounds$ 5,440 in 2021–22.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

This implementation work on this Working Party was funded by JUSTICE's designated funds.

#### Solving Housing Disputes

The Solving Housing Disputes working party report, was launched in March 2020 and chaired by Andrew Arden KC.

Thanks to Therium Access who provided a grant of £30,000, we were able to appoint a new dedicated civil lawyer who commenced in May 2021. This has meant that we have been able to better progress the implementation of this work this year. We have been monitoring the progress of housing mediation pilots set up in response to the Covid-19 pandemic, in particular a possession mediation pilot run jointly by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government and the Ministry of Justice as well as a 'Conciliation pilot' run by the Tenancy Deposit Scheme, a free-to-use service which covers all types of housing disputes (not just those concerning deposits). We were also involved in the evaluation of the possession mediation pilot. These pilots tie in with JUSTICE's recommendation that alternative dispute resolution play a greater role within the housing dispute landscape and are a step towards JUSTICE's long-term proposal for a new model for dispute resolution for housing: the Housing Dispute Service, which would integrate alternative dispute resolution at an early stage. We met with these bodies to discuss the progress of their pilots and to share the findings and recommendations from our Report with them, with a view to influencing how the pilots are run going forward and ensuring they are properly evaluated. We also contributed to the update report by the Master of the Rolls Working Group on Possession, much of which touched on recommendations made in Solving Housing Disputes, including the use of pre-action protocols in the private rented sector, the need for early legal advice for possession proceedings, and the introduction of legal aid to tackle 'cluster issues' in housing. We have shared the report with senior officials in the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and have discussed JUSTICE's work on housing with a number of members of the department. We responded to two consultations - the Civil Justice Council's Consultation on Pre-Action Protocols and the Ministry of Justice's Consultation on Legal Aid within the Housing Duty Scheme, highlighting the findings of the Solving Housing Disputes report on these two topics.

#### Challenging School Exclusions

The Challenging School Exclusions working party was chaired by Professor Richard de Friend and was published in November 2019.

The pandemic as well as staff capacity has impacted the pace of work in this area. Implementation this year largely took the form of our response to the Department for Education's long awaited consultation on Revised Behaviour in Schools Guidance and Suspension and Permanent Exclusion Guidance. Our response was informed by the Working Party recommendations and highlighted the further clarity on schools' legal duties required in both behaviour and exclusion guidance documents; better guidance needed to create procedurally fair exclusion review processes; the necessity of more accessible guidance for parents and children; the importance of effective child participation in the process; and the full extent of data which should be collected and monitored. We also used our response to draw attention to the root and branch reform that the Working Party deemed necessary to ensure exclusions in England were fair, reasonable and lawful, drawing

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

attention to the fact that changes to the guidance documents could not address the more fundamental problems with the system.

Matrix Chambers supported our working party on Challenging School Exclusions with a £3,000 grant in 2018–19 and provided pro bono support. The Society of the Holy Child Jesus (£7,000 in 2019– 20 and £5,000 in 2021–22); Peter Stebbings Memorial Charity (£2,500 2020–21); and The Schroder Charity Trust (£4,000 in 2021–22) contributed towards implementation of the report's recommendations.

#### Prosecuting Sexual Offences

Recommendations from our 2019 *Prosecuting Sexual Offences* report continue to be worked on. We attended a number of meetings to discuss the report's findings and recommendations. For example, we are a member of the Organisational Support and Services for Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation Meeting, chaired by Chief Constable Simon Bailey (The National Police Chiefs' Council's lead for Child Protection and Abuse Investigations). JUSTICE continues to interact with the Home Office regarding the Government's new Child Sexual Abuse strategy launch. During this period we were also preparing briefing materials for the upcoming Online Safety Bill, which could see a number of JUSTICE's key recommendations placed into law.

The Dawes Trust is supporting the implementation work of our Prosecuting Sexual Offences working party, with a two-year grant of  $\pounds 21,275$  from October 2020, with  $\pounds 8,218$  received in this financial year.

#### Preventing Digital Exclusion from Online Justice

We continue to work on implementing recommendations from our report Preventing Digital Exclusions which was chaired by Amanda Finlay CBE.

The Judicial Review and Courts Act 2022 establishes a framework for Online Procedure Rules, made by a new Online Procedure Rule Committee, to enable parties to civil, family or tribunal proceedings to use the online procedure. The provisions are similar to those contained in the Courts and Tribunals (Online Procedure) Bill which did not complete its passage through Parliament. We briefed Parliamentarians on the Bill highlighting the need for sufficient safeguards to ensure those who are digitally excluded can initiate and participate in proceedings. Although we were not successful in securing changes to the Act, we will continue to work to ensuring that the new Online Procedure Rules do not result in digital exclusion and that individuals who may be excluded are able to access the support they need to engage with them.

The Government contract for providing Digital Support services to online justice processes was awarded to 'We Are Digital' at the start of the 2022. JUSTICE has been keeping track of information as it has become available since February, and provided input where possible, for example on a proposed triage flowchart for the scheme in February 2022.

This implementation work was funded by JUSTICE's designated funds.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### Understanding Courts

We continue to promote the principles from our Understanding Courts Working Party, chaired by Sir Nicholas Blake, across all our work streams. JUSTICE lawyers also continue to attend the Litigants in Person Engagement Group and to monitor developments by HMCTS.

One key theme that emerged from *Understanding Courts* is an apparent disconnect between professionals and lay users in court. JUSTICE is keen to understand the role that training providers play in ensuring that professionals (solicitor, barristers, advocates) engage with lay users in a way that ensures they can effectively participate in the legal process. To that end, JUSTICE convened an online roundtable looking at 'training legal professionals to communicate effectively with lay users' which was chaired by Sir Robin Knowles CBE in his capacity as Chair of the Litigants in Person Engagement Group. The roundtable was attended by representatives from regulators and training providers (for both law students and established legal professionals) including universities, CILEX, the Advocates Gateway amongst others. Attendees discussed various aspects of training and professional competence. Drawing on the roundtable, JUSTICE responded to the Legal Services Board (LSB) Consultation on its statement of policy on ongoing competence, focusing on how to ensure that the needs of lay users are best identified and addressed by members of the profession.

Work is also ongoing in terms of identifying means to implement relevant findings from the Understanding Courts report to Scotland. We have worked closely with Brodies LLP to present recommendations to the Scottish Court and Tribunal Service to improve the way information is provided on their websites to make it accessible. We are also working to improve the training that is provided to legal professionals in Scotland to ensure that they are able to communicate effectively with lay court users and to identify those in vulnerable circumstances.

This implementation work was funded by a grant from Therium Access which enabled us to recruit a Civil Justice Lawyer.

#### Mental Health and Fair Trials

Nearly two thirds of the recommendations from our Mental Health and Fair Trials working party, chaired by Sir David Latham, have been put in train. However, there is much yet to still be achieved and wee continue work on implementing the reamaining recommendations of the report.

JUSTICE met with the Head of the National Appropriate Adult Network (NAAN) to discuss avenues for implementation of the MHFT report's recommendations. We separately met with Ivan Trethewey (National Liaison & Diversion, Police & Courts healthcare team, NHS England) and Glyn Thomas (NHS England) to discuss the current state of play with respect to Mental Health liaison and diversion services, in the context of our recommendations.

JUSTICE continues to work with Edmore Masendeke, Early-Stage Researcher and a PhD student on the DARE (Disability Advocacy Research in Europe) Project, based at the University of Leeds. The research project focuses on the communication support that is available to defendants with mental health conditions or learning disabilities during criminal proceedings in England and Ireland,

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

including organising a roundtable meeting between communications support professionals in connection with this work.

We were awarded a collaborative PhD in relation to the treatment of suspects in police custody in Scotland (see below) which will include an examination of whether similar issues exist as regards to mental health in this context.

This implementation work was funded by JUSTICE's designated funds.

#### Legal Assistance in the Police Station

Our first Working Party report in Scotland was published in June 2018, chaired by the Rt. Hon. Lord Eassie. It looked at the reasons for the high level of suspects waiving the right to a solicitor and the quality of advice and support provided to individuals. Despite a number of the recommendations from this report being adopted, we have since continued low levels of uptake of legal advice by suspects in police custody. We are continuing work to understand why this is and remedy it.

To that end this year, JUSTICE held a panel event on legal assistance in the police station at the Law Society of Scotland's Annual Conference. The event was chaired by JUSTICE Scotland Chair Shelagh McCall KC and the panel consisted of Julia McPartlin, President of the Edinburgh Bar Association, Liam McAllister, Partner at Lefevre Litigation and JUSTICE Legal Director Jodie Blackstock. The event highlighted the importance of protecting the rights of vulnerable people in custody. We also met with Police Scotland officers to discuss the statistics relating to uptake of legal asistances and progress regarding the 'Letter of Rights'.

In August, Katherine Case at the Scottish Government provided an update on the Scottish Government's Working Group on the Letter of Rights, which will be delivering its recommendations in the Autumn. She also provided details of contacts at Police Scotland who could advise on the development of a video version of the Letter.

We were also successful in an application for a collaborative PhD with Professor Jacqueline Hodgson of Warwick University which will look at the treatment of suspects in police custody in Scotland. The PhD will start in Autumn 2023. The PhD will investigate the practical reality of what it means to be a suspect during a police interview in Scotland, including how the suspect's right to a fair trial is accommodated in custody e.g., via their right to legal representation and other safeguards before and during questioning. It is intended that the PhD will provide new data that can be used to further push for the recommendations contained in Legal Assistance in the Police Station to be implemented. It is also envisaged that the PhD might shine light on new developments / new learning that, in turn, can be used to update the recommendations contained within JUSTICE's report.

This implementation work was funded by JUSTICE's designated funds.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### Other projects

#### Remand Decision-Making in the Magistrates' Court

Magistrates' courts deal with the vast majority of criminal cases in the UK. However, very little data is available to understand how magistrates and district judges in the magistrates' courts make their decisions. In particular, there is a distinct lack of information available on how decision-makers in the magistrates' courts determine bail. Whilst decision-makers are required to give reasons for their decisions with respect to bail, this information is not made publicly available. It is therefore difficult to assess whether the law is being properly applied. Moreover, this lack of information undermines efforts to identify and address any concerning trends that might exist.

To better understand decision making in the magistrates' courts JUSTICE is undertaking observational research of remand hearings. We are being assisted by students at University College London, Newcastle University, Nottingham Trent University and Exeter University and lawyers at Reed Smith LLP and Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP. The aim is to gather data to understand if there are any problematic patterns of decision making in respect of remand issues and possible systemic issues, particularly around racial and gender bias.

We will use the outcomes of this research to help understand how to improve the processes and outcomes in respect of powers to remand individuals in custody in the magistrates' courts. Improving decision-making in the magistrates' courts with regard to their powers to remand in custody is crucially important given the large number of individuals imprisoned under them and the lengthy delays in standing trial. Improving decision-making should result in a greater proportion of defendants being remanded on bail rather than in custody, allowing them to retain their community involvement, family life, and employment – important factors in reducing future offending. It will also benefit ethnic minority defendants, who are far more likely to be remanded in custody than their White counterparts.

# Delivering Administrative Justice After the Pandemic: What can we learn about digitalisation and vulnerable groups?

Heidi Bancroft, the Secretary to the AJC has been working on a separate Nuffield Foundation funded <u>research project</u> with a group of academics from University of Westminster, UCL and LSE. The research team have been examining the effect of rapid digitalisation on the delivery of justice, identifying the effects on access for marginalised groups and exploring how trust can be built and sustained in parts of the justice system affected by the pandemic. The project focuses on Special Educational Needs (SEND) and Disability; and housing and looks at the overlap in ombudsman scheme and tribunals in four institutions: the local government and social care ombudsman and the SEND tribunal; and the housing ombudsman and the property chamber.

The University of Westminster has been awarded a grant to administer this project and have subcontracted Heidi Bancroft of JUSTICE to support the project through an administrative and research role, as a Research Assistant (RA). The project started in September 2021 and will complete in February 2023, the total funding for this project for JUSTICE is £32,834 with £12,681 received in

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

this financial year. Heidi has worked with the research team to produce surveys for users of the institutions, advice service organisations and case handlers at the four institutions; conduct interviews of service users and service providers and produce two user guide videos on the pursing of an appeal/complaint into two specific housing and SEND problems. An interim report has also been published on the overlap between ombudsman schemes and tribunals in the two jurisdictions and mapping the pathways to justice.

## Briefing on legislation and public consultation

JUSTICE continues to disseminate detailed submissions on relevant legislation and respond to consultations of Government, select committees and the judiciary that are relevant to our priorities. These are reasoned memoranda that include discussion of relevant law. They are designed to assist parliamentarians of all parties in scrutinising legislation and Government and other bodies in their considerations of the reform of their processes. This year has seen JUSTICE engage in a significant amount of briefing and consultation work due to the heavy legislative agenda and the significant threat that many of these proposals pose to access to justice, the rule of law and human rights. We briefed on four significant pieces of legislation – the Overseas Operations (service Personnel and Veterans) Act 2021, the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022, the Nationality and Borders Act 2022 and the Judicial Review and Courts Act 2022 (JRCA) – and responded to 14 consultations, covering a range of access to justice, rule of law and human rights issues.

In particular, work on rule of law and constitutional issues raised by the PCSC Act, judicial review reforms and proposed Human Rights Act reforms took a considerable amount of time this year. Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust supported this work with a with a three-year grant of £71,597, of which £23,864 has been received in this financial year.

Following our work last year on the Independent Review of Administrative Law (IRAL), we responded to the Government's consultation on judicial review reform. We opposed the majority of the proposals which would have severely limited judicial review and therefore Government accountability. We were therefore pleased that the majority were not taken forward in the JRCA. One of the proposals that was taken forward was suspended quashing orders – something we had suggested in our response to the IRAL. The JRCA also introduced prospective only quashing orders, which we opposed on the basis that they will deny redress to claimants and other impacted by unlawful measures. Whilst we were not successful in removing them from the Bill, we did get the Government to remove a presumption in favour of their use.

This year, the Government also published a consultation on proposals to repeal the Human Rights Act and replace it with a Bill of Rights. We reconvened our expert Adivsory Group, chaired by Sir Michael Tugendhat, which was originally set up to inform our response to the Independent Human Rights Act Review (IHRAR). We submitted a detailed response to the consultation, drawing on the exepertise of the Advisory Group, our response to the Independent Human Rights Act Review and additional research and evidence. We were particularly concerned with the lack of evidence put forward by the Consultation to justify the proposed changes. In our view the Human Rights Act is working well and the proposals will reduce rights protection in the UK, increase uncertainty and

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

litigation, contravene the UK's international obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights and have a significant impact on the devolved settlements. In February we hosted an online event exploring the proposals. The event was chaired by Sir Michael Tugendhat and the panel comprised Professor Alison Young (Sir David Williams Professor of Public Law at the University of Cambridge), Raza Husain QC (Matrix Chambers), Guglielmo Verdirame QC (Twenty Essex Chambers), and Deok Joo Rhee QC (39 Essex Chambers).

We were supported with pro bono assistance by Clifford Chance LLP, King & Spalding LLP, Herbert Smith Freehils LLP and Reed Smith LLP.

Our responses over the financial year can be found at: <u>https://justice.org.uk/our-work/bcr/</u>

#### Third Party Interventions

#### Nealon and Hallam v UK

We filed written submissions with the European Court of Human Rights at the end of the last financial year, having been given permission to intervene in this long-running case concerning compensation for miscarriage of justice. The Government and the appellants filed their observations. We are still awaiting directions from the Court.

## Administrative Justice Council

The Administrative Justice Council (AJC) was set up to ensure that the administrative justice system is more accessible, fair and effective by improving administrative decision-making, simplifying appeals, complaints procedures and redress mechanisms, and ensuring access to justice for some of the most vulnerable people in society. The AJC is funded by the Ministry of Justice (£20,000 this financial year) and Trust for London (£15,000 this financial year). JUSTICE provides office space, line management and covers any costs not covered by these grants from unrestricted funding.

In July 2021, the Administrative Justice Council appointed a new Chair, the current Senior President of Tribunals, Sir Keith Lindblom, who took over from his predecessor, Sir Ernest Ryder. It also appointed a deputy chair, Rosemary Agnew, the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman. In addition, the AJC re-elected existing members and recruited new members for the second term.

Details of the work carried out by the Administrative Justice Council are outlined in the JUSTICE annual review (p20-21).

#### Events

Due to the restrictions related to the global pandemic most of our events in 2021-22 have continued to be virtual. We had 1,281 people attend our events during the 2021-22 financial year. Below is a list of the free events we held, the majority of which were open to the public:

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

- The COVID-19 Inquiry: ensuring justice for bereaved people and survivors, 23 June 2021
- Reforming Benefits Decision-Making report launch, 8 July 2021
- Tom Sargant Memorial Lecture 2021 with Sir Geoffrey Vos, 4 November 2021
- Reforming the Windrush Compensation Scheme report launch, 15 November 2021
- Barriers and Threats to Access to Justice in the Immigration and Asylum System, 7 December 2021
- Releasing people from prison: the parole system of England and Wales report launch, 20 January 2022

We continued to host our Annual Human Rights Law Conference (11–12 October 2021) which was again held remotely, this time over two days. This year we heard keynote addresses from Harold Hongju Koh, Sterling Professor of International Law at Yale Law School, Maya Lester KC, Brick Court Chambers and Professor Leslie Thomas KC, Garden Court Chambers and Professor of Law at Gresham College. The engaging cross-party political panel discussed *Covid–19 and Human Rights*. We also held an additional session on *The Afghanistan crisis and the UK's legal obligations to the Afghan people* delivered by Samantha Knights KC, Matrix Chambers.

The Human Rights Conference attracts professionals from across the legal profession. Managing it in-house means that we are able to charge a much more affordable fee and offer discounted rates to members, which gives us a more diverse audience.

We also hosted our Student Conference (9–10 March 2022) remotely across two evenings. We had a keynote address from Zehrah Hasan, Garden Court Chambers, and a panel discussion on the Russian/Ukraine conflict and the Rule of Law with James Onalaja, 187 Chambers, and Sultana Tafadar KC, No5 Barristers Chambers. As well as workshops from the JUSTICE staff on *Protecting access to justice in an age of outsourcing, Anti–social orders? A review of preventative behaviour orders in the UK, Access to justice and the Nationality and Borders Bill, and Releasing people from prison: the parole system of England and Wales.* 

In addition to the above, JUSTICE staff members attended and spoke at a wide range of virtual conferences and events.

## Development

#### Membership

Last year we set ourselves the goal of 10% growth for membership income, after reaching our highest membership to date in 2020–21. We hoped to achieve this through streamlining our membership processes and reviewing benefits to create a better membership experience; expanding our audience and reach through social and traditional media, strategic communications, and targeted messaging; and finally, continuing to host a suite of virtual and in-person events, to allow better engagement across the UK and for the international supporters we gained during the pandemic.

Despite our efforts detailed below we have seen a decrease in members in 2021-22 and at the end of the financial year, JUSTICE had 1,825 members (down from 2,066 in 2021), this resulted in a

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

decrease in membership income with a total of £100,830 (£105,348 for 2020-21). This decrease mainly relates to student members (c70%), who we have more of a transactional relationship with; they will join to attend an event or apply for an internship but do not always continue to engage or renew, and frequently sign up with university emails which they then lose access to, so we cannot continue to contact them. We also held fewer JUSTICE member events which we know are good for recruiting and retaining members, this was due in part to leadership role changes, we had a period of four months without a Director / Chief Executive, meaning that it was harder to arrange speakers and events, as the Director had been key to this. We also believe that virtual events lost their appeal following the easing of Covid-19 restrictions but we were cautious of arranging in-person events due to uncertainty with restrictions and new variants.

We continue to look at ways of growing and retaining our members and our focus in 2022–23 is to recruit more corporate members and expand our membership regionally. We are also reviewing our messaging and our website to demonstrate more clearly the benefits of being a JUSTICE member and are planning to hold a member event each quarter to continue our previous years engagement.

In 2021-22 we worked hard to streamline our membership processes in a number of ways which included:

- encouraging members to pay by Direct Debit, which reduces our administrative time and costs, 60% of members now pay by direct debit;
- segmenting our membership event emails and monthly newsletters to encourage lapsed members to renew so that they may sign up for events; so far, with some success;
- Launching a 'dropped membership' campaign to encourage re-joining resulting in five higher category members rejoining by the end of 2021-22; and
- launching a membership upgrade campaign, to encourage those in time-specific membership categories to upgrade as they progress in their careers. At the end of 2021-22, thirteen members have upgraded to a higher level of membership.

This year, we have had significant success with expanding our audience and reach through social and traditional media, strategic communications, and targeted messaging. On social media, we have focused on LinkedIn, as a platform for professionals it is uniquely placed to spread the work of JUSTICE. We have adapted our content and style to encourage organic growth, whilst also including links to our page in our post-event emails. This has resulted in an increase of 2,120 followers. We have taken a similar stance with Twitter where we increased our followers by 838 over the year, as well as having started to use more accessible language to encourage engagement and retweets. With traditional media, we have started to target our press releases, to ensure they reach relevant journalists. We have achieved wider coverage with a broader readership, including what we believe to be, JUSTICE's first reference in the Financial Times, and The Big Issue who have covered our Windrush work <u>repeatedly</u>.

We continued to host virtual events for members in 2021-22, on a number of topical issues as detailed below. We also trialled a series of Working Parties at Work events, to showcase the impact of our work so that our donors can better understand the impact their donation is having, and to encourage membership. We trialled two different virtual events, one discussing the Covid-19

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

inquiry, and one looking at the Nationality and Borders Bill in light of our immigration report; the Covid-19 event generated a <u>front page story in the Guardian</u>. These were well attended, with promotion targeted at firms and chambers specialising in the topics discussed, and whilst they did not result in new members or donors, they were useful in maintaining relationships with our existing donors. In future, we intend to revisit this concept and are considering holding events which can showcase our work, whilst linking to topical issues, therefore attracting a broader demographic of attendees. We are also discussing different ways to showcase the impact of our work through our website and communications.

In May 2021, we held a members' only event featuring a panel of experts discussing why racial diversity in the senior judiciary matters, the obstacles to the appointment of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic judges, and will explore what can be done to increase the appointment of candidates from racial minorities. Our panel included Dame Ingrid Simler (Head of Equality and Inclusion for the judiciary), Nkumbe Ekaney KC (1GC, a Deputy High Court Judge), Maya Sikand KC (Doughty Street Chambers), HHJ Anuja Dhir KC (Judicial Appointments Commission Commissioner), and I. Stephanie Boyce (President of the Law Society of England and Wales). This generated four new members.

In September 2021, we ran a series of webinars aimed at our student members. Each evening was focused on a different area of opportunities within the legal profession – the Bar, Solicitors, Government, and NGOs and the Charity Sector. The panel listed below discussed their different paths into the law and the hiring processes involved. This resulted in 44 new members.

- Emma Foubister, Matrix Chambers
- Mia Hakl-Law, Director Of Operations and Human Resources, Garden Court Chambers
- Robin White, Old Square Chambers
- Katie Everett, Trainee Solicitor, Irwin Mitchell
- Maya Grantham, Solicitor, Leigh Day
- Georgina Naylor, Early Careers Manager, Irwin Mitchell
- Alex Temple, Public Law Solicitor, Bindmans LLP
- Saira Ahmed, Lawyer, Constitutional and Social Care Public Law Team, Government Legal Department

- Michael Jennings, Principal Legal Advisor, Ministry of Justice
- Liam Evans, Joint Committee on Human Rights
- Michael Olatokun, Research Leader in Citizenship and the Rule of Law; Head of Public and Youth Engagement, Bingham Centre for Human Rights
- Anna Spencer, Trainee Solicitor, The Howard League for Penal Reform
- Alex Woolhouse, Pro Bono & Legal Strategy Coordinator, Mermaids

In February 2022, members met to discuss the proposals for a 'Modern Bill of Rights' put forward in the Government's consultation. Chaired by Sir Michael Tugendhat, this event bought together an expert panel of speakers, including Professor Alison Young (Sir David Williams Professor of Public Law at the University of Cambridge), Raza Husain KC (Matrix Chambers), Guglielmo Verdirame KC (Twenty Essex Chambers), and Deok Joo Rhee KC (39 Essex Chambers). Seven members joined to attend this event.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

We held our second virtual Annual General Meeting (AGM), in November 2021, over Zoom, ensuring that members across the country could participate. Seventy members joined us to hear reports on our work and fundraising from Peter Binning, Karyl Nairn KC, Chair of the Development Board, and Sandra Paul, who reported back on our important working party report, *Tackling Racial Injustice: Children and the Youth Justice System.* The members re-elected four Board Members for another term and appointed one new Board member and four new Council members. The AGM was followed by our annual Tom Sargant Memorial Lecture, delivered by Sir Geoffrey Vos, Master of the Rolls speaking on 'How judges work: A reappraisal for the 21st Century'.

# Fundraising

Our fundraising plan for 2021–22 was to continue to focus on diversification of our income, our membership, our donors, our supporters, and our advocates as we entered yet another year of uncertainty. We had some success in broadening our current income streams and attracting new funders with grants from seven new trusts, or corporations. We were especially gratified to receive more support from corporate foundations and corporate donors including from The Clifford Chance Foundation and Doughty Street Chambers Supported Causes Fund. We were also successful in increasing donations from existing trusts and from one-year pledges to multiyear pledges. For example, the Treebeard Trust not only increased their giving but also pledged for two years instead of one. Good stewardship also allowed us to retain many of the new donors we had attracted over the 2020–21. We were also able to secure funding from an academic funder through Westminster University.

We have worked hard improve the experience of our JUSTICE60, Friends and major donors. Working closely with the Development Board, especially Chair of the Development Board, Karyl Nairn KC and chair of the JUSTICE Board, Peter Binning to ensure that these donors remained engaged with JUSTICE and its impacts and felt confident to recruit others to support JUSTICE. While looking to diversify our audience we were particularly successful in increasing support from corporate donors, both pro bono and financial.

Unfortunately, despite the hard work detailed above and below, we saw an overall decrease in our donation income of just over 3% (£461,305 this year down from £475,926 in 2020–21). As predicted last year, corporate funding has increased and we continue to see more engagement from our corporate supporters after the uncertainty of the pandemic. Our individual donations have not been as successful and we have seen a drop in general donations and our number of Friends, as detailed below. We believe that these challenges are due to the wider economic uncertainty, and our inability to hold in-person fundraising events which we had hoped to do at the tail end of the year. Our Director has always been a key player in securing individual donors and the gap between Andrea leaving in October and Fiona joining in February certainly also had an impact on levels of individual giving. In 2020–21, we were also fortunate to have a generous anonymous donor agree to match up to £40,000 in new donations, which was reached and brought a much-needed boost to our income in a difficult year, due to this our general donations are lower in 2021–22 than they were in 2020–21.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

We had anticipated to see a larger increase in our JUSTICE60 giving group (a special group of supporters who individually pledge to donate £6,000 or corporately £10,000 a year for three years to JUSTICE) but only saw two new members join in 2021–22. That said in 2020–21, we saw seventeen members decide not to renew and this year we only lost one member. This sees us end the 2021–22 financial year with 47 JUSTICE60 members and an increase in donations (£287,430 2021–22 up from £286,000 in 2020–21).

We continued in the first half of the year to host events virtually so that people could attend from wherever the pandemic had led them. These were well attended, but we did not see the upturn in recruitment we had expected. As the pandemic continued there was an inevitable reduction in emergency giving which may well have reduced our ability to recruit supporters. Later in the year, following an increase in the appetite for face-to-face events we planned in-person events again, however these were thwarted by the rise in Covid-19 from December 2021 onwards further reducing our ability to recruit new members.

Our events during the year included a virtual Supper Club with former Chancellor of Exchequer, Alistair Darling in April and another in June with former Director General of MI5 and member of the House of Lords, Baroness Manningham-Buller.

We are extremely grateful to all our JUSTICE60 members, past and present, for their continued support during one of the most difficult fundraising years in history and especially, to our loyal and hardworking Development Board Chair, Karyl Nairn KC.

JUSTICE ended the 2021–22 financial year with 123 (129 in 2020–21) Friends of JUSTICE; these are our regular donors who donate at least £240 per year and provided us with £36,912 (£36,867 for 2020–21) of unrestricted income. This year we held a Friends recruitment event via Zoom in April 2021, with our Board member, Sir Michael Tugendhat, who spoke on our work on the Independent Human Rights Act Review. We also held our annual Friends appreciation breakfast in December 2021, where Friends heard from Professor Nicola Padfield KC on our 'A Parole Board fit for Purpose' Working Party, which she Chairs. We are hoping that our next Friends recruitment event, planned for May 2022 will be in-person and more successful in recruiting more Friends.

In June, we held our second Inspiring Women fundraising conference, which raised £3,632. Nine successful women working in different areas of practice shared their stories of careers in the law, before taking questions from the audience. Speakers included Lady Justice Rose DBE, Lisa Osofsky, Professor Nicola Lacey, HHJ Khatun Sapnara, Claire Walter, Felicity Gerry KC, Sandra Paul, Tessa Khan, and Dame Vera Baird KC DBE. The event took place over Zoom for three days; due to the relaxation of Covid–19 restrictions and the summer weather, we did not sell as many tickets as we would have liked, which could have also been due to "Zoom fatigue".

JUSTICE's Development Board, chaired by Karyl Nairn KC, continued to focus on growing our fundraising pipeline for; the JUSTICE60, major and corporate donors..

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

We are grateful to the JUSTICE Board, Council, Development Board, JUSTICE60, Friends, Members and partners that supported us with donations and introductions in this difficult and turbulent year. We would not have been able to do it without their support.

#### Trusts and foundations and corporate support

Our income from Trusts and Foundations and corporate support has increased this year, by just under 12% (£315,730 up from £282,288 in 2020-21).

We knew that Trusts and Foundations would again play an important role in our income again in 2021–22. This year, as well as applying to 32 new funders, which resulted in nine new funders for JUSTCE, we focused on repeat funding from existing funders and converting restricted funding to core through improved stewardship. Whilst good stewardship allowed us to retain many of the new donors we had attracted over 2020–21, the conversion to core funding was not entirely successful in this year, instead we saw an increase in restricted funding of just under 40% and a decrease in core funding of just over 35%. We believe that this may be due to funders becoming more cautious coming out of the pandemic, having given (mostly) unrestricted emergency funding throughout, we are now seeing a more relaxed approach coming to the fore again and we expect to reap rewards from our efforts in the coming financial year. The Development team also continued to focus on maintaining our relationships with Corporates and increasing the support we receive either in the form of monetary donations or pro bono support, this led to increased research requests from corporates than in previous years, including requests for help for our response to the Human Rights Act consultation in early 2022.

The work above resulted in us being awarded new grants totalling  $\pm 181,321$  ( $\pm 126,168$  received in this financial year from Trust and Foundations), as well as  $\pm 54,980$  in new income from Corporates and other supporters. Of the funds received in 2021–22,  $\pm 42,268$  was from new funders and  $\pm 138,880$  was from new grants awarded by previous funders. Considering the continuing competitive Trust and Foundation environment, this is a significant achievement especially as several existing foundations have agreed to continue funding in the coming years.

Over the year, we have received a number of grants from Trusts and Foundations and donations from Corporates, both as restricted and unrestricted income, detailed below.

Restricted income increased by just under 40% to £247,330. We received new restricted grants or donations from:

- Blackrock (£4,799) to support Improving Benefit's Decision-making implementation.
- •
- The Clifford Chance Foundation (£4,328) to support our work on reform in our family justice system through our *Improving Access to Justice for Separating Families Working Party.*
- Dechert LLP (£5,000) to support *The 'Reforming the Windrush Compensation Scheme' Working Party.*
- Hogan Lovells International LLP (£2,500) to support our 'Parole System fit for Purpose' Working Party.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

- Matrix Causes Fund (£5,440) to support our work on Racism and state related deaths.
- The Schroder Charity Trust (£4,000) and the Society of the Holy Child Jesus (£5,000) to support implementation work from the *Challenging School Exclusions Working Party* report recommendations.
- Simmons & Simmons (£10,000) to support our Outsourcing Working Party.
- Therium Access (£30,000) towards the salary of our Civil Justice Lawyer.
- Treebeard Trust (two-year grant of £50,000, £25,000 received in this financial year) to support our work on reform in our family justice system through our *Improving Access to Justice for Separating Families Working Party.*
- The 29<sup>th</sup> May 1961 Charitable Trust (£5,000) to contribute towards our *Solving Housing Disputes* implementation work.
- Westminster University (18 month contract for £32,834, £12,681 received in this financial year) towards salary costs for staff time spent on a research project 'The court reform programme and the response to the pandemic'.

The Barrow Cadbury Trust, The Blagrave Trust, The Dawes Trust, The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, Standard Life Foundation, Trust for London and the Ministry of Justice continued to support us with restricted multi-year grants on existing projects, details of which can be found in the policy section of this report (page 8).

Unrestricted support decreased by just over 35% to £68,400 (£105,500 in 2020-21). We have received new unrestricted grants or donations from:

- The Allen & Overy Foundation (£10,000),
- The Alexander Mosley Charitable Trust (£25,000),
- The Blagrave Trust (£400),
- Doughty Street Chambers Supported Causes Fund (Three-year grant of £15,000, £5,000 received in this year)
- The Jolanta and Max Neufeld Charitable Trust (£5,000),
- The Golden Bottle Trust (£1,000),
- The Leri Charitable Trust (£10,000),
- Reed Smith LLP (£5,000),
- The Stewarts Foundation (£6,000).

The Laura Kinsella Foundation (£1,000) continued to provide unrestricted income towards our core costs.

We are very grateful to the Trust and Foundations and Corporations who have supported our work during this difficult year.

#### Approach to fundraising

JUSTICE employs a Development Director who manages our Fundraising Officer, Membership and Communications Coordinator and Development Administrator and takes the lead on our fundraising activities. Our main focus for fundraising is around major donors, Corporate support and grants

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

from Trust and Foundations. We host small events throughout the year to attract potential donors. Any fundraising events are organised by our Development team. JUSTICE does not use professional fundraisers or involve commercial participators. There have been no complaints about fundraising activity this year.

#### Beneficiaries of our services

Our system-change approach benefits all those involved in the justice system include practising lawyers, judges, students of law and policymakers interested in the development and protection of the rule of law and human rights, and the public at large, who benefit from a robust justice system that protects their rights.

#### **Financial review**

For the year ended 31 March 2022, JUSTICE recorded a net deficit, before other recognised gains and losses, of £84,180 (March 2021: £46,627 deficit). Our investments did not perform as well as in 2021 and this year they made gains of £4,655 reducing our deficit to £79,525 (March 2021: £15,159 deficit). This is a higher deficit than we anticipated but 2021–22 has thrown many a challenge at the JUSTICE team, with staff changes from our Director leaving in October 2021 and her replacement not starting until February 2022; uncertainty around in-person events with the resurgence of COVID–19 and the return of restrictions which led to cancellation/postponement of fundraising events and issues with our building at 59 Carter Lane, which has lead to unexpected costs and the loss of our long-term tenants.

#### Income

Total income received in 2021/22 decreased by just over 1% to £900,273 (2021: £911,346). Details of how this has arisen are shown below.

#### Donations and legacies

The level of donations and legacies saw a decrease in 2021-22 to £461,305 (2021: £475,926), this is mainly due to a drop in income from general donations, in 2020-21 we ran a matched funding campaign when a very generous donor offered to match donation income up to £40,000. We found it difficult to attract new funders this year as mentioned earlier in this report.

We have seen a small increase in our JUSTICE60 members, Friends and donated services donations which is the result of the hard work of our Development team, supported by the Development Board and the generousity of our supporters.

#### Charitable activities

Income towards our Research and Education activities has increased for 2021–22 (2022: £326,047, 2021: £299,483), this down to the hard work of our Fundraising Officer, Trust and Foundation Fundraiser and Development Administrator who have identified new sources of Trust and Foundation and Corporate income. This has led to several grants from new funders, to add to our existing multiyear grants.

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

Membership income has decreased by nearly 4% this year to £100,830 (2021: £105,348), this is detailed above under membership.

### **Trading activities**

Income for our trading activities has decreased by over 84%. This is mainly due to our tenants moving out in 2021 and us having to refund rental payments due to issues with our building that made it unsafe to occupy. We were able to host a virtual fundraising event this year but it did not produce as much income as our in-person events.

### Investments

Investment income was £8,386 (2021: £8,805). We will be carrying out a review of our investment holdings in 2022-23.

### Expenditure

Total expenditure in 2021/22 showed an increase of just under 3% (2022: £984,453 v 2021: £957,973).

### Staff costs

Staff costs account for nearly 86% of the total costs of the organisation and have increased by just over 3% from 2020/21. This increase mainly relates to staff recruitment for our new Chief Executive, and consultancy relating to the review of Carter Lane and whether to sell or retain and refurbish the building. During the year the total average FTE headcount decreased to 16.1 (2021: 16.3), and the employed number decreased to 19 (2021: 20). Further details of staff costs and staffing levels can be found in notes 6 & 7 to the accounts and the staffing and volunteers section of this report.

### Costs of generating funds

The cost of generating funds which makes up just under 11% of our overall expenditure, has increased this year from £98,223 to £107,973. This includes fundraising salary costs, costs associated with fundraising materials and publicity expenditure plus an allocation of salary and overhead costs based on staff time attributable to the fundraising function, more details can be found in note 1 (j) of the accounts.

### **Endowment Fund**

JUSTICE holds the freehold property on Carter Lane, which was purchased as part on an appeal back in the 1990's, and some listed investments (Charishare) which are held as part of an expendable endowment fund. During the year in question, the endowment was used to fund depreciation on fixed assets. These investments form part of our reserves.

### **Designated Fund**

Designated funds have been set aside by the Trustees to fund staff time spent on our Working Parties, which are not always attractive to funders but form an essential part of JUSTICE's work and the Administrative Justice Council.

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

The charity has sufficient resources to settle its liabilities as they fall due in the foreseeable future.

The Finance Committee reviews our investments at every meeting. We have not needed to draw down on these during the year. This year our investments made a gain: the value at 31 March 2022 was £290,548, up from £285,893 at 31 March 2021.

### Principal risks and uncertainties

JUSTICE's risk management strategy, includes a Strategic risk register which details the external risks to JUSTICE which are identified as important but outside of our control, with the effects mitigated through response plans and management actions. Risks associated with our operations and projects continue to be managed through our operational risk register. See below for a summary of the risks covered in the Strategic risk register.

These risks are overseen by the relevant staff members and the Finance Committee. Our Finance Committee is now developing an assurance framework to test that internal controls are working properly, and they will provide regular updates to the Board on the outcome of these.

The main strategic risks for JUSTICE are as follows.

1. External influences: A decline in funding and donations due to external influences such as Covid-19, Brexit or resultant economic downturn, which increases our risk of financial instability and could impact the security of our funding streams.

**This risk is mitigated through:** A diverse funding base which includes members, Trusts and Foundations, Corporates, JUSTICE60 donors, Friends of JUSTICE and other regular donors, which is in line with our fundraising and organisational strategy. An engaged Development Board and Chair who are focused on identifying new sources of funding. A strong reserves position to ensure sustainability, with the added security of owning the building should we need to access additional funds in the event of financial uncertainty. A regular review of our reserves policy.

**Further management actions have been agreed which include**: development of longer financial projections, so we are more aware of funding needs for future years in addition to the current financial year; and drawing up contingency plans to handle a cut in funding at various levels.

2. Data breach: Loss of data through data breach, cyber-attack, server failure or human error. Cyber-attack is now one of the largest concerns for businesses. Despite adoption of all recommended protections and processes, the changing nature of cyber-attack means that there will still be a risk, which we will be unable to completely mitigate or manage. A data breach or cyber security incident could result in legal, contractual and/or regulatory consequences, as well as reputational damage.

**This risk is mitigated through:** having a dedicated IT supplier who ensure that we have strong IT systems in place, Firewall and antivirus software installed, software and operating systems regularly updated with security patches, and our database and email are hosted securely in the cloud. In March 2021 we upgraded our network to SharePoint so the whole network is located

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

offsite and hosted by Microsoft Azure. We have clear Data Protection, Data Breach and IT policies which staff are regularly reminded of and all staff received online GDPR and cyber security training annually. We have Cyber Essentials Plus certificate which renews annually and sees our network, policies and procedures independently audited and tested. We also have cyber security insurance in place, to insure us against an unfortunate breach.

Further management actions have been agreed which include: Develop an assurance process to ensure compliance with policies.

**3.** Demonstrating impact: As a law reform organisation working to strengthen the justice system through practical proposals for reform, it can sometimes be difficult for JUSTICE to demonstrate impact. This could lead to key funders withdrawing or significantly reducing funding, because they perceive that JUSTICE is not being effective, demonstrating impact, or is not undertaking activities that fit their funding priorities. This would increase our risk of financial instability, could impact our staff numbers and lead to a reduction in work output, with knock-on effects for management and administrative overheads. Cutting management and administration staff would reduce the charity's capacity to regrow.

This risk is mitigated through: close liaison with key funders to ensure that we understand their expectations, share and invest them in our vision and regularly update them on our work and impact; ongoing research of alternative funding sources and; monitoring the impact of our work. We have developed a Theory of Change based on our 2021–24 Strategy, which provides detailed monitoring and evaluation methods to capture evidence of our impact.

**Further management actions have been agreed which include:** A review of our monitoring and evaluation indicators outlined in the Theory of Change to ensure we are accurately capturing the impact of our working party recommendations and collecting evidence for funding reports and applications; continued research into alternative forms of funding for charitable activities and; development of contingency plans to handle a cut in funding at various levels.

### 4. Reputational: Media or other organisations publish highly critical, slanderous and/or

inflammatory opinions on our work, which could result in a loss of reputation for excellence and impartiality; confidence of Council members and/or members and/or donors of JUSTICE.

This risk is mitigated through: policy initiatives grounded in and supported by JUSTICE working party reports or external research findings and aligned with strategic aims; ongoing discussions with the Director, Board and other expert stakeholders for the duration of the project, with risk considered as part of these discussions; wherever possible evaluation, or at a minimum engagement, by academic partners; a communications plan in place around the operation of the project including the nature of the questions being tested and the release of any report; and a response plan has been developed which staff can follow plan to manage any reputational risk following negative media commentary.

**Further management actions have been agreed which include**: Maintain and develop relationships with academic partners and other experts and keep response plan under review.

**5.** Loss of building: Loss of use of the building, through flood, failure of maintenance or complete loss through fire or external event such as a terrorist attack. JUSTICE being without a base and clear working model.

### Trustees' annual report

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

This risk is mitigated through: Infrastructure in place for remote working, Covid-19 lockdown and continued remote working has demonstrated that operations can continue effectively. Good insurance coverage in place and a Business Continuity Plan. Temporary desk space and collaborative working spaces provided for staff that require it. In the process of sorting through contents of Carter Lane to decide what to archive for historical purposes, destroy or keep for company archive.

**Further management actions have been agreed which include**: Review Business Continuity Plan and develop and test response plans. Review communications plan to handle such events. Review archive storage in the basement.

During 2021, our response to strategic risk five was tested when we carried out a building survey which showed that our freehold building at 59 Carter Lane was in a very poor state, with significant problems relating to the boiler, accessibility issues, and health and safety. These issues meant that the Board had to make a decision that staff could not return to working from Carter Lane and instead desk space was kindly provided by Charles Russell Speechlys, Corker Binning, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP, Linklaters LLP, and Karyl Nairn KC, allowing the staff to get together on a weekly and monthly basis. The Board formed a sub-group of Board members, property and financial consultants to review the options and make a decision on next steps. Following a huge amount of research and analysis, the Board made the difficult but pragmatic decision to sell. The staff are now in the process of sorting through the contents of Carter Lane and will begin a process of considering how we need to work to be most effective at our jobs and to best deliver the aims of the charity.

### Reserves policy and going concern

Both the Board and JUSTICE's supporters recognise that the organisation operates in a policy environment that requires a long-term commitment if it is to achieve its mission. Being a research and educational organisation, it is the work undertaken by JUSTICE's staff that forms JUSTICE's charitable activities. Therefore, it is the view of the Board that JUSTICE needs a reserves level that will enable it to continue to attract the highest level of legal expertise and, in so doing, meet its long-term commitments to its supporters and beneficiaries.

Each year the Board reviews the reserves policy, taking into consideration any major risks and the impact these could have on planned income and expenditure. Our current policy is that unrestricted reserves, on average are equivalent to at least six months' of running costs (c£566,000 based on our 2022–23 budget), are needed if JUSTICE is to deliver on its commitments, meet the long-term expectations of its supporters and beneficiaries, and continue to attract the highest level of legal expertise with which to do so.

At the close of 31 March 2022, JUSTICE had £510,136 (£477,797 2020-21) in general reserves which falls short of the Board's reserves policy. JUSTICE's reserve funds are held in a mix of deposit accounts and fixed interest and equity-based common investment funds, with the aim of achieving a combination of income and capital growth.

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

These reserves are comprised of general unrestricted funds and endowment funds that are not tangible fixed assets (general unrestricted funds of  $\pounds402,667$  less tangible fixed assets of  $\pounds7,121$  plus our expendable endowment investments of  $\pounds114,590$ ). See note 15a of the accounts for more details.

The 2021–22 financial year, has been a difficult one for JUSTICE, with increased expenditure resulting from unexpected issues with our Freehold building and changes to our Senior Management Team, which saw our Director Andrea Coomber KC (Hon) leave in October 2021, our Legal Director Jodie Blackstock leave in August 2021 and our Director of Development go on Maternity leave. These changes and the uncertain economic climate led to a drop in income for JUSTICE and led to our reserves dropping below our reserves policy. Given the 2022–23 budget also predicts a deficit of just under £120k this would mean a further decline in general unrestricted funds at the end of the 2022–23 financial year and further impact on the reserves.

The Finance Committee and Board are monitoring this closely and are optimistic that we have the plans in place to meet the fundraising targets set in 2022–23 budget. This combined with the plans to sell our building at 59 Carter Lane, launch a matched funding campaign to find a new property for what might become a 'JUSTICE hub' and provide additional income to design a new model providing a more sustainable financial position, mean the Board are confident we will weather the storm.

JUSTICE's Board will continue to review its reserves policy on an annual basis and will keep its investment and treasury management policy under regular review, particularly in the light of reduced deposit interest rates.

## Plans for the future from JUSTICE Chief Executive, Fiona Rutherford

JUSTICE has another exciting but challenging year ahead and I am looking forward to beginning my first full financial year with JUSTICE.

Whilst some of the staff and our supporters are saddened by the sale of our office at 59 Carter Lane, we are also extremely excited by the opportunity to consider how we can be most effective at our jobs, to best deliver the aims of the charity. We are also keen to identify how JUSTICE can be more sustainable, both financially and environmentally. As mentioned above, we are considering creating a JUSTICE Hub, to foster innovation and encourage collaboration across the justice sector and beyond. It might also provide a useful 'touchdown' location for our out of London members and a place to meet and work with our team and find out more about our work. I would really value views on this – please do get in touch if you have any ideas or thoughts on this.

As we complete the first year of our new strategy (2021-24), we will continue with the defined themes of work for the next three years. Across all our work we will address:

• Institutional weakness: considering ways to strengthen the operation of key institutions and frameworks in the justice system, testing them for fairness, accessibility and efficiency.

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

- Procedural deficiency: identifying and challenging unfair, inaccessible and inefficient legal procedures. We will examine the potential of technology and innovation in delivering justice - including alternatives to traditional justice processes - and consider its emerging impact on the system.
- Biases in the justice system: exploring and confronting the ways in which the justice system adversely treats and impacts upon individuals and groups based on their status and/or protected characteristics including race, gender, disability and/or socio-economic status.

More than ever, during this strategy period, we will strive to tackle urgent and important issues within the constraints of the current social, economic, and political climate. The strategy, which can be found here <u>https://justice.org.uk/about-us/our-strategy/</u>, details our main policy, development and organisational priorities for the period. Over the coming year we will investigate ways to better demonstrate our impact and how to communicate this to wider audiences and we look forward to reporting back on this in next year's report.

The strategy sees us continue to form working parties of our members and we currently have a number of projects in train:

*Improving Access to Justice for Separating Families* was due to report earlier this year, however, due to the breadth and depth of the work conducted it will now report in October 2022. It is undertaking a child-centred review of what families need from the Family Court when they seek help with child arrangements, with particular emphasis on domestic abuse victims and unrepresented litigants.

*The function and operation of Hybrid Orders*, is examining orders obtained by a civil procedure, that seek to restrict a person's behaviour and have criminal consequences if breached. The Working Party will examine the way hybrid orders operate in practice, in particular whether they are issued and enforced in a fair and consistent manner that respects human rights and whether they are effective in achieving their purpose. The Working Party plans to report in Spring/Summer 2023.

As mentioned above, we will start new Working Parties in 2022/23 on the impact of outsourcing on administrative justice and ensuring that administrative decision-making in prisons is fair and accessible and do not result in individuals remaining in prison unlawfully or any longer than is necessary. We will continue to follow up on past reports and policy work by capturing whether our activities and interventions have paved the way for desired outcomes.

We will also continue to monitor cases proceeding before the courts with a view to making third party interventions in the Supreme Court in cases significant to JUSTICE's objectives.

2022-23 will see us devoting a considerable amount of time working on legislative and policy proposals which could have a significant impact on the constitution and rule of law. This will include briefing parliamentarians on the Bill of Rights Bill and working collaboratively with our organisations

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

to prevent the worst potential impacts of that Bill coming to fruitition, monitoring the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act and briefing on the Public Order Bill. We continue to brief politicians across parties on other legislation going through Westminster and Holyrood Parliaments that relate to the justice system and respond to consultations of government and the judiciary on key justice issues. We will also continue to examine judicial appointments, with a view to increasing judicial diversity.

We continue to take lessons learned from this year to strength and grow our Development function.

We have returned to in-person events this year and plan on

takingour events to other UK legal hubs, targeting Edinburgh, Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham in the first instance. The first of these events will take plave in Manchester and Leeds in November to highlight our work and hear first-hand the legal issues that are most important in these areas. We will build on our Annual Human Rights Lecture in Scotland held in May to extend our support in Scotland. We are also planning events in

We plan to celebrate our 65<sup>th</sup> Anniversary through a number of fundraising and legal education events including an Anniversary Dinner held in October and a series of high level panel events in the New Year to discuss the likely Bill of Rights and the state of the rule of law in the UK.

We continue to seek to expand our audience through social and traditional media, strategic communications, and targeted messaging and are focusing on increasing our supporters on Twitter and LinkedIn. We are intending to revisit on our communications strategy this coming year to ensure we are reaching all audiences that we need to, to communicate our work.

And lastly, we will continue to focus on the diversification of our income, our membership, our donors, our supporters, and our advocates to ensure our sustainable and continued growth. We plan to continue the growth we have seen in multi-year funding from Trusts and Foundations and continue to look to increase core funding over restricted. We will continue to deepen our relationships with corporates, especially law firms, with the aim of increasing pro bono research offered and financial support.

We will continue to support The Administrative Justice Council (AJC) (subject to funding) in achieving its objectives as set out in its business plan through our dedicated secretariat function. If you would like to hear more about the work of the AJC you can subscribe to its newsletter, by emailing <u>ajc@justice.org.uk</u>.

Finally, I would like to thank our members, donors, funders and staff for their very warm welcome and continued support, without which none of the work in this report would be possible and we would be unable to complete our plans for the year ahead.

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

## Structure, governance and management

### Staffing and volunteers

JUSTICE has a small staff team, which changed significantly in the 2021–22 financial year. Our Director, Andrea Coomber KC (Hon) left us in October 2021 and there was a period without a Director until our new Chief Executive Fiona Rutherford joined in February 2022. Our Legal Director Jodie Blackstock left us in August 2021 and her position was filled by Stephanie Needleman, previously Senior Lawyer, with Philip Armitage joining us as Public Lawyer to pick up Steph's work. Our Director of Development Amanda Miller, went on Maternity leave, Jane Collier our Fundraising Officer, has provided cover for Amanda during this period as Interim Director of Development and Riikka Andersson was recruited on a fixed term contract as Trusts and Foundations Fundraiser to fill in for Jane. During the year we were also joined by Andrea Fraser, Lawyer based in Scotland and Alexandra Howard who replaced Holly Dickinson as Development Administrator after Holly moved on to pastures new.

In addition to our normal legal internships, we were also able to offer a Legal Fellowship to Simon Price. We are grateful to The Dulverton Trust and The Law Society who provided funding for the fellow and internships.

Our permanent staff complement at the end of March 2022 was 17 with eleven full-time and six part-time employees, this full-time equivalent (Note 7) decreases to 19 when we include staff who have left within the year and our legal interns. We are proud to pay all our interns/fellows the London Living Wage and to be a registered London Living Wage Employer.

The volume of work detailed above would not be possible without all those who volunteered their services to JUSTICE. We would like to extend our thanks to the many eminent lawyers, judges and politicians who have contributed to our reports, our conferences and seminars, and helped us to raise the profile of JUSTICE over the last year.

### Governance

The organisation is a charitable company limited by guarantee, incorporated on 26 June 1996 and registered as a charity on 10 October 1996.

The company was established under a memorandum of association, which established the objects and powers of the charitable company and is governed under its articles of association. In 2015, we amended our memorandum of association and regulations so that members of JUSTICE are members of the Company of JUSTICE, and are able to be elected, directly to the JUSTICE Board.

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

### JUSTICE Council

The JUSTICE Council is an advisory body to the Board and is asked to:

- evaluate JUSTICE's work and provide suggestions for the future direction of JUSTICE's work;
- advise on JUSTICE policy with respect to challenging issues of the day;
- assist JUSTICE staff by providing contacts, for example, for the purposes of advancing policy work, fundraising and profile raising; and
- be part of a network of support for JUSTICE and its staff.

### JUSTICE Board

JUSTICE Board Members are elected from individual members of JUSTICE and are Directors of the Charity for the purposes of the Companies Act and the charity trustees as defined by section 177 of the Charities Act and are referred to as Board members throughout this report.

All Board Members give their time voluntarily and receive no benefits from the charity.

The present Board Members and any previous Board Members for this financial year are listed on page 1 of this report.

The JUSTICE Board is responsible for the overall governance of JUSTICE. There must be a minimum of three members and a maximum of fifteen, we currently have twelve in post. The Board meet at least four times per year, where they consider overall strategy, operational performance and the financial situation.

The Chief Executive of JUSTICE, Fiona Rutherford works closely with the Board, meeting regularly with the Chair of the Board, Peter Binning, and consulting other Board members as required. JUSTICE is managed on a daily basis by the Senior Management Team, comprised of Stephanie Needleman, Legal Director; Samantha Burridge, Director of Operations; and Amanda Miller, Director of Development, maternity cover provided by Jane Collier, Interim Director of Devlopment and is headed up by the Chief Executive, Fiona Rutherford. Samantha Burridge meets regularly with the Treasurer, Rachel Sexton, to review and discuss financial reports.

### Appointment of Board Members

JUSTICE generally recruits Board members from within our membership. In order to be appointed to the Board, you need to be a JUSTICE member and be nominated by two members of JUSTICE, nominations being made in writing to the Director at least seven days before the Annual General Meeting. Board members have the power to appoint any person at any time to the Board to fill a vacancy, although this person will stand down and be re-elected at the next Annual General Meeting.

The Chair of the Board is nominated by the Board and subject to the approval of the members at the AGM.

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

In line with the recommendations of the UK Charity Governance Review 2016. Board members can only serve for two three-year terms and the Chair for one term, of four years.

### Board Members induction and training

All new Board Members are inducted by the JUSTICE Chief Executive, invited to meet with JUSTICE staff, and are provided with an induction pack which includes the Charity Commission guidance on the responsibilities of Trustees, the Charity Governance Code and copies of JUSTICE's Articles of Association, Regulations, latest strategy, annual review, accounts and organisational structure.

All staff and Board members are offered the opportunity to pair up, with the Board member providing mentoring to the staff member. This has proved valuable to both the staff and Board member.

All Board Members are encouraged to attend training sessions offered by our Auditor on the roles and responsibilities of Trustees and the dates of these training sessions are circulated on a regular basis.

### Finance Committee

JUSTICE'S Finance Committee is usually made up of JUSTICE Board Members, although membership of the Committee is also open to members of JUSTICE. The members in 2021-22 were:

Rachel Sexton (Treasurer), Peter Binning (Chair of the JUSTICE Board), Nick Benson, Liz Campbell (until November 2021), Manu Duggal and Christina Liciaga.

The Finance Committee met four times in 2021-22. Meetings were also attended by the JUSTICE Chief Executive and Director of Operations.

The Finance Committee's role is to:

- review the detailed draft annual budget and recommend its approval to the Board;
- monitor in-year financial performance via receipt of the monthly management accounts and monitor the overall financial position via regular cash and investment reports;
- review the statutory accounts and Trustees' annual report and recommend them to the Board;
- review and act upon, where appropriate, the findings from the annual audit as detailed in the post audit report;
- review the relationship with the auditor and ensure that independence and objectivity is maintained;
- review and maintain an up to date risk register;
- ensure organisational policies that are important to the financial health of the charity are relevant and up to date (e.g. reserves, trading, whistle-blowing, disaster recovery policies);
- act as a sounding board and provide advice and guidance to the Chief Executive and Director of Operations in meeting their responsibilities; and
- monitor the performance of the finance department and discuss and review any proposals for significant structural and operational changes.

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

### Remuneration policy for key management personnel

JUSTICE is committed to ensuring a proper balance between: (i) paying our staff and others who work for us fairly so that we attract and retain the best people for the job, and (ii) careful management of our charity funds. In so doing, we will ensure the greatest effectiveness in delivering our charitable objectives and meeting the needs of our beneficiaries.

JUSTICE's Remuneration Committee is a Committee of the Board of trustees and reports directly to the Board, it comprises of the Chair, Treasurer and the Senior Independent Director of JUSTICE.

Formal consideration of remuneration matters takes place annually, usually ahead of the Finance Committee's February/March meeting. However, remuneration matters may also be considered at other meetings if ad hoc issues arise during the year. The Chief Executive attends Committee meetings but leaves when his/her remuneration is discussed.

The annual formal considerations of the Finance Committee are to:

- consider and recommend to the Board any cost of living increases usually from 1 April annually which may be applicable to all staff.
- ensure that remuneration is set at a level which is appropriate for a charity that wishes to pay sufficient, to attract, retain and motivate senior managers of the necessary quality and calibre to run the charity successfully in the long-term interests of present and future beneficiaries.
- recommend to the Board the level of investment in the professional development and growth of the Chief Executive and other members of the Senior Management Team ensuring these recommendations are compatible with the training policy of the charity and are timed to feed into the budget planning cycle.
- ensure that the remuneration policy, names of members of the Remuneration Committee and outline details of remuneration are available to the general public through publications such as the trustees annual report.
- ensure there are adequate processes for reviewing the work of the Chief Executive and other members of the Senior Management Team. (Note the Remuneration Committee is not expected to carry out these reviews but to ensure these processes are in place).
- commission (either from internal professionals or external specialists) and consider regularly data gathered on salaries for comparable posts in similar organisations in the voluntary and other sectors.
- take advice from the Chief Executive, Director of Operations and independent consultants, as appropriate, on the discharge of the above responsibilities.
- take professional advice on employment issues as and when necessary.
- discuss any other relevant issue and make recommendations to the Board.

The Remuneration Committee does not have fully delegated authority in these matters and any recommendations or decisions must be ratified by the Board prior to implementation.

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

### Statement of responsibilities of Board Members

JUSTICE Board Members (who are also directors of JUSTICE for the purposes of company law and the charity trustees as defined by section 177 of the Charities Act 2011) are responsible for preparing the Trustees' annual report and the financial statements, in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

Company law requires the Board to prepare financial statements for each financial year which give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the charitable company and of the incoming resources and application of resources, including the income and expenditure, of the charitable company for that period. In preparing these financial statements, the Board are required to:

- Select suitable accounting policies and then apply them consistently;
- Observe the methods and principles in the Charities SORP;
- Make judgements and estimates that are reasonable and prudent;
- State whether applicable UK Accounting Standards and statements of recommended practice have been followed, subject to any material departures disclosed and explained in the financial statements; and
- Prepare the financial statements on the going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the charity will continue in operation.

Board Members are responsible for keeping adequate accounting records that disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the charitable company and enable them to ensure that the financial statements comply with the Companies Act 2006, the Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act 2005 and the Charities Accounts (Scotland) Regulations 2006 (as amended). They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the charitable company and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

In so far as the Board are aware:

- There is no relevant audit information of which the charitable company's auditor is unaware;
- The Board has taken all steps that they ought to have taken to make themselves aware of any relevant audit information and to establish that the auditor is aware of that information.

The Board are responsible for the maintenance and integrity of the corporate and financial information included on the charitable company's website. Legislation in the United Kingdom governing the preparation and dissemination of financial statements may differ from legislation in other jurisdictions.

Members of the charity guarantee to contribute an amount not exceeding  $\pm 1$  to the assets of the charity in the event of winding up. The total number of such guarantees at March 2022 was 1,825 (2021: 2,066). The Board are members of the charity, but this entitles them only to voting rights. The Board have no beneficial interest in the charity.

Trustees' annual report

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

### Auditor

Sayer Vincent LLP was re-appointed as the charitable company's auditor during the year and has expressed its willingness to continue in that capacity.

The Trustees' annual report has been approved by the Board on 14 December 2022 and signed on their behalf by

e k

Rachel Sexton Board Member and Treasurer

### JUSTICE

## Opinion

We have audited the financial statements of JUSTICE (the 'charitable company') for the year ended 31 March 2022 which comprise the statement of financial activities, balance sheet, statement of cash flows and notes to the financial statements, including significant accounting policies. The financial reporting framework that has been applied in their preparation is applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards, including FRS 102 *The Financial Reporting Standard applicable in the UK and Republic of Ireland* (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

In our opinion, the financial statements:

- Give a true and fair view of the state of the charitable company's affairs as at 31 March 2022 and of its incoming resources and application of resources, including its income and expenditure, for the year then ended
- Have been properly prepared in accordance with United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice
- Have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Companies Act 2006, the Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act 2005 and regulation 8 of the Charities Accounts (Scotland) Regulations 2006 (as amended)

## Basis for opinion

We conducted our audit in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (UK) (ISAs (UK)) and applicable law. Our responsibilities under those standards are further described in the Auditor's responsibilities for the audit of the financial statements section of our report. We are independent of the charitable company in accordance with the ethical requirements that are relevant to our audit of the financial statements in the UK, including the FRC's Ethical Standard and we have fulfilled our other ethical responsibilities in accordance with these requirements. We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion.

## Conclusions relating to going concern

In auditing the financial statements, we have concluded that the trustees' use of the going concern basis of accounting in the preparation of the financial statements is appropriate.

Based on the work we have performed, we have not identified any material uncertainties relating to events or conditions that, individually or collectively, may cast significant doubt on JUSTICE's ability to continue as a going concern for a period of at least twelve months from when the financial statements are authorised for issue.

Our responsibilities and the responsibilities of the trustees with respect to going concern are described in the relevant sections of this report.

### JUSTICE

## Other Information

The other information comprises the information included in the trustees' annual report, other than the financial statements and our auditor's report thereon. The trustees are responsible for the other information contained within the annual report. Our opinion on the financial statements does not cover the other information and, except to the extent otherwise explicitly stated in our report, we do not express any form of assurance conclusion thereon. Our responsibility is to read the other information and, in doing so, consider whether the other information is materially inconsistent with the financial statements or our knowledge obtained in the course of the audit, or otherwise appears to be materially misstated. If we identify such material inconsistencies or apparent material misstatements, we are required to determine whether this gives rise to a material misstatement in the financial statements themselves. If, based on the work we have performed, we conclude that there is a material misstatement of this other information, we are required to report that fact.

We have nothing to report in this regard.

## Opinions on other matters prescribed by the Companies Act 2006

In our opinion, based on the work undertaken in the course of the audit:

- The information given in the trustees' annual report for the financial year for which the financial statements are prepared is consistent with the financial statements; and
- The trustees' annual report has been prepared in accordance with applicable legal requirements

## Matters on which we are required to report by exception

In the light of the knowledge and understanding of the charitable company and its environment obtained in the course of the audit, we have not identified material misstatements in the trustees' annual report.

We have nothing to report in respect of the following matters in relation to which the Companies Act 2006 and the Charities Accounts (Scotland) Regulations 2006 (as amended) require us to report to you if, in our opinion:

- Adequate accounting records have not been kept, or returns adequate for our audit have not been received from branches not visited by us; or
- The financial statements are not in agreement with the accounting records and returns; or
- Certain disclosures of trustees' remuneration specified by law are not made; or
- We have not received all the information and explanations we require for our audit; or
- The directors were not entitled to prepare the financial statements in accordance with the small companies regime and take advantage of the small companies' exemptions in preparing the trustees' annual report and from the requirement to prepare a strategic report.

### JUSTICE

## Responsibilities of trustees

As explained more fully in the statement of trustees' responsibilities set out in the trustees' annual report, the trustees (who are also the directors of the charitable company for the purposes of company law) are responsible for the preparation of the financial statements and for being satisfied that they give a true and fair view, and for such internal control as the trustees determine is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

In preparing the financial statements, the trustees are responsible for assessing the charitable company's ability to continue as a going concern, disclosing, as applicable, matters related to going concern and using the going concern basis of accounting unless the trustees either intend to liquidate the charitable company or to cease operations, or have no realistic alternative but to do so.

## Auditor's responsibilities for the audit of the financial statements

We have been appointed as auditor under section 44(1)(c) of the Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act 2005 and under the Companies Act 2006 and report in accordance with regulations made under those Acts.

Our objectives are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, and to issue an auditor's report that includes our opinion. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance, but is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with ISAs (UK) will always detect a material misstatement when it exists. Misstatements can arise from fraud or error and are considered material if, individually or in the aggregate, they could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of these financial statements.

Irregularities, including fraud, are instances of non-compliance with laws and regulations. We design procedures in line with our responsibilities, outlined above, to detect material misstatements in respect of irregularities, including fraud. The extent to which our procedures are capable of detecting irregularities, including fraud are set out below.

## Capability of the audit in detecting irregularities

In identifying and assessing risks of material misstatement in respect of irregularities, including fraud and non-compliance with laws and regulations, our procedures included the following:

- We enquired of management, which included obtaining and reviewing supporting documentation, concerning the charity's policies and procedures relating to:
  - Identifying, evaluating, and complying with laws and regulations and whether they were aware of any instances of non-compliance;

#### JUSTICE

- Detecting and responding to the risks of fraud and whether they have knowledge of any actual, suspected, or alleged fraud;
- The internal controls established to mitigate risks related to fraud or non-compliance with laws and regulations.
- We inspected the minutes of meetings of those charged with governance.
- We obtained an understanding of the legal and regulatory framework that the charity operates in, focusing on those laws and regulations that had a material effect on the financial statements or that had a fundamental effect on the operations of the charity from our professional and sector experience.
- We communicated applicable laws and regulations throughout the audit team and remained alert to any indications of non-compliance throughout the audit.
- We reviewed any reports made to regulators.
- We reviewed the financial statement disclosures and tested these to supporting documentation to assess compliance with applicable laws and regulations.
- We performed analytical procedures to identify any unusual or unexpected relationships that may indicate risks of material misstatement due to fraud.
- In addressing the risk of fraud through management override of controls, we tested the appropriateness of journal entries and other adjustments, assessed whether the judgements made in making accounting estimates are indicative of a potential bias and tested significant transactions that are unusual or those outside the normal course of business.

Because of the inherent limitations of an audit, there is a risk that we will not detect all irregularities, including those leading to a material misstatement in the financial statements or non-compliance with regulation. This risk increases the more that compliance with a law or regulation is removed from the events and transactions reflected in the financial statements, as we will be less likely to become aware of instances of non-compliance. The risk is also greater regarding irregularities occurring due to fraud rather than error, as fraud involves intentional concealment, forgery, collusion, omission or misrepresentation.

A further description of our responsibilities is available on the Financial Reporting Council's website at: <a href="https://www.frc.org.uk/auditorsresponsibilities">www.frc.org.uk/auditorsresponsibilities</a>. This description forms part of our auditor's report.

## Use of our report

This report is made solely to the charitable company's members as a body, in accordance with Chapter 3 of Part 16 of the Companies Act 2006 and section 44(1)(c) of the Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act 2005. Our audit work has been undertaken so that we might state to the charitable company's members those matters we are required to state to them in an auditor's report and for no other purpose. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than the charitable company and the charitable

### JUSTICE

company's members as a body, for our audit work, for this report, or for the opinions we have formed.

Sayes Vicent UP

Joanna Pittman (Senior statutory auditor) 16 December 2022 for and on behalf of Sayer Vincent LLP, Statutory Auditor Invicta House, 108–114 Golden Lane, LONDON, EC1Y OTL

Sayer Vincent LLP is eligible to act as auditor in terms of section 1212 of the Companies Act 2006

#### Statement of financial activities (incorporating an income and expenditure account)

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

	Note	Endowment Fund £	Restricted Funds £	Unrestricted Funds £	2022 Total £	Endowment Fund £	Restricted Funds £	Unrestricted Funds £	2021 Total £
<b>Income from:</b> Donations and legacies Charitable activities	2	_	15,000	446,305	461,305	-	-	475,926	475,926
Research and education Membership	3 3	-	247,330	78,717 100,830	326,047 100,830	- -	176,788	122,695 105,348	299,483 105,348
Other trading activities Fundraising Rental income		- -	-	3,632 73	3,632 73	- -	-	21,784	_ 21,784
Investments		-	-	8,386	8,386		-	8,805	8,805
Total income		-	262,330	637,943	900,273	-	176,788	734,558	911,346
<b>Expenditure on:</b> Raising funds Charitable activities		698	-	107,275	107,973	601	-	97,622	98,223
Research and education Membership		2,903 378	337,976 -	478,518 56,705	819,397 57,083	2,964 414	251,344 -	539,991 65,037	794,299 65,451
Total expenditure	4a	3,979	337,976	642,498	984,453	3,979	251,344	702,650	957,973
Net (expenditure) / income before investments		(3,979)	(75,646)	(4,555)	(84,180)	(3,979)	(74,556)	31,908	(46,627)
Net gain / (loss) on investments		8,065	-	(3,410)	4,655	20,660	-	10,808	31,468
Net income / (expenditure) for the year	5	4,086	(75,646)	(7,965)	(79,525)	16,681	(74,556)	42,716	(15,159)
Transfers between funds		-	59,898	(59,898)	-	-	47,234	(47,234)	_
Net movement in funds		4,086	(15,748)	(67,863)	(79,525)	16,681	(27,322)	(4,518)	(15,159)
<b>Reconciliation of funds:</b> Total funds brought forward		416,853	17,648	560,833	995,334	400,172	44,970	565,351	1,010,493
Total funds carried forward		420,939	1,900	492,970	915,809	416,853	17,648	560,833	995,334

All of the above results are derived from continuing activities. There were no other recognised gains or losses other than those stated above. Movements in funds are disclosed in Note 14 to the financial statements.

#### Balance sheet

As at 31 March 2022

Company no. 3216897

Final and a	Note	Endowment £	Restricted £	Unrestricted £	2022 £	Endowment £	Restricted £	Unrestricted £	2021 £
<b>Fixed assets:</b> Tangible assets Investments	10 11	306,349 114,590	-	7,121 175,958	313,470 290,548	310,328 106,525	- -	14,561 179,368	324,889 285,893
Current ecceter		420,939	-	183,079	604,018	416,853	-	193,929	610,782
<b>Current assets:</b> Debtors Cash at bank and in hand	12	- -	_ 1,900	53,996 326,076	53,996 327,976	- -	_ 17,648	30,223 415,769	30,223 433,417
Liabilities:		_	1,900	380,072	381,972		17,648	445,992	463,640
Creditors: amounts falling due within one year	13	-	_	70,181	70,181	_	_	79,088	79,088
Net current assets		_	1,900	309,891	311,791		17,648	366,904	384,552
Total net assets		420,939	1,900	492,970	915,809	416,853	17,648	560,833	995,334
<b>The funds of the charity:</b> Endowment fund Restricted funds Unrestricted funds	15a	420,939 _	1,900	- -	420,939 1,900	416,853	17,648	- -	416,853 17,648
Designated funds General funds		-	-	90,304 402,666	90,304 402,666	-	-	175,000 385,833	175,000 385,833
Total unrestricted funds		-	-	492,970	492,970	_	-	560,833	560,833
Total charity funds		420,939	1,900	492,970	915,809	416,853	17,648	560,833	995,334

Approved by the trustees on 14 December 2022and signed on their behalf by

-

Rachel Sexton Treasurer

Peter Binning Chair of the JUSTICE Board

Statement of cash flows

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

Reconciliation of net income / (expenditure) to net cash flow from operating activities

			2022 £	2021 £
Net income / (expenditure) for the reporting period (as per the statement of financial activities)			(79,525)	(15,159)
(as per the statement of mancial activities) Depreciation charges (Gains)/losses on investments Dividends, interest and rent from investments (Increase)/decrease in debtors Increase/(decrease) in creditors			14,659 (4,655) (8,386) (23,773) (8,907)	14,123 (31,468) (8,805) 15,308 3,450
Net cash provided by / (used in) operating activities		=	(110,587)	(22,551)
Cash flows from operating activities	202 £	2 £	2021 £	£
Net cash provided by operating activities		(110,587)		(22,551)
<b>Cash flows from investing activities:</b> Dividends, interest and rents from investments Purchase of fixed assets	8,386 (3,240)	-	8,805 (5,292)	
Net cash provided by investing activities	_	5,146	_	3,513
Change in cash and cash equivalents in the year		(105,441)		(19,038)
Cash and cash equivalents at the beginning of the year		433,417		452,455
Cash and cash equivalents at the end of the year	-	327,976	_	433,417

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 1 Accounting policies

#### a) Statutory information

JUSTICE is a charitable company limited by guarantee and is incorporated in United Kingdom.

The registered office address is 2nd Floor Lincoln House, 296-302 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7JH

#### b) Basis of preparation

The financial statements have been prepared in accordance with Accounting and Reporting by Charities: Statement of Recommended Practice applicable to charities preparing their accounts in accordance with the Financial Reporting Standard applicable in the UK and Republic of Ireland (FRS 102) – (Charities SORP FRS 102), The Financial Reporting Standard applicable in the UK and Republic of Ireland (FRS 102) and the Companies Act 2006.

Assets and liabilities are initially recognised at historical cost or transaction value unless otherwise stated in the relevant accounting policy or note.

In applying the financial reporting framework, the trustees have made a number of subjective judgements, for example in respect of significant accounting estimates. Estimates and judgements are continually evaluated and are based on historical experience and other factors, including expectations of future events that are believed to be reasonable under the circumstances. The nature of the estimation means the actual outcomes could differ from those estimates. Any significant estimates and judgements affecting these financial statements are detailed within the relevant accounting policy below.

#### c) Public benefit entity

The charitable company meets the definition of a public benefit entity under FRS 102.

#### d) Going concern

The trustees consider that there are no material uncertainties about the charitable company's ability to continue as a going concern.

The trustees do not consider that there are any sources of estimation uncertainty at the reporting date that have a significant risk of causing a material adjustment to the carrying amounts of assets and liabilities within the next reporting period.

#### e) Income

Income is recognised when the charity has entitlement to the funds, any performance conditions attached to the income have been met, it is probable that the income will be received and that the amount can be measured reliably. Tax recoverable under the gift aid scheme is recognised when receivable to align with the original donation.

Income from government and other grants, whether 'capital' grants or 'revenue' grants, is recognised when the charity has entitlement to the funds, any performance conditions attached to the grants have been met, it is probable that the income will be received and the amount can be measured reliably and is not deferred.

For legacies, entitlement is taken as the earlier of the date on which either: the charity is aware that probate has been granted, the estate has been finalised and notification has been made by the executor(s) to the charity that a distribution will be made, or when a distribution is received from the estate. Receipt of a legacy, in whole or in part, is only considered probable when the amount can be measured reliably and the charity has been notified of the executor's intention to make a distribution. Where legacies have been notified to the charity, or the charity is aware of the granting of probate, and the criteria for income recognition have not been met, then the legacy is a treated as a contingent asset and disclosed if material.

Income received in advance of the provision of a specified service is deferred until the criteria for income recognition are met.

Income received for seminars and other similar events, including income received to sponsor events, is recognised in the statement of financial activities in the period the event takes place.

Subscription income from members is credited to the statement of financial activities when received.

Rental income is credited to the statement of financial activities in the period in which it is related to.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 1 Accounting policies (continued)

#### f) Donations of gifts, services and facilities

Donated professional services and donated facilities are recognised as income when the charity has control over the item or received the service, any conditions associated with the donation have been met, the receipt of economic benefit from the use by the charity of the item is probable and that economic benefit can be measured reliably. In accordance with the Charities SORP (FRS 102), volunteer time is not recognised so refer to the trustees' annual report for more information about their contribution.

On receipt, donated gifts, professional services and donated facilities are recognised on the basis of the value of the gift to the charity which is the amount the charity would have been willing to pay to obtain services or facilities of equivalent economic benefit on the open market; a corresponding amount is then recognised in expenditure in the period of receipt.

#### g) Interest receivable

Interest on funds held on deposit is included when receivable and the amount can be measured reliably by the charity; this is normally upon notification of the interest paid or payable by the bank.

#### h) Fund accounting

Endowment funds are amounts raised through an appeal for charitable purposes which may be retained to produce an income for the charity or may be spent on premises, equipment and development at the discretion of the Executive Board.

Restricted funds are to be used for specific purposes as laid down by the donor. Expenditure which meets these criteria is charged to the fund.

Unrestricted funds are donations and other income received or generated for the charitable purposes.

#### i) Expenditure and irrecoverable VAT

Expenditure is recognised once there is a legal or constructive obligation to make a payment to a third party, it is probable that settlement will be required and the amount of the obligation can be measured reliably. Expenditure is classified under the following activity headings:

- Costs of raising funds relate to the costs incurred by the charitable company in inducing third parties to make voluntary contributions to it, as well as the cost of any activities with a fundraising purpose
- Expenditure on charitable activities includes the costs of Research and education and Membership undertaken to further the purposes of the charity and their associated support costs
- Other expenditure represents those items not falling into any other heading

Irrecoverable VAT is charged as a cost against the activity for which the expenditure was incurred.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 1 Accounting policies (continued)

#### j) Allocation of support costs

Expenditure is allocated to the particular activity where the cost relates directly to that activity. However, the cost of overall direction and administration of each activity, comprising the salary and overhead costs of the central function, is apportioned on the following basis which is an estimate, based on staff time, of the amount attributable to each activity.

Where information about the aims, objectives and projects of the charity is provided to potential beneficiaries, the costs associated with this publicity are allocated to charitable expenditure.

Where such information about the aims, objectives and projects of the charity is also provided to potential donors, activity costs are apportioned between fundraising and charitable activities on the basis of area of literature occupied by each activity.

		2022	2021
•	Research and education	62%	64%
•	Membership	8%	9%
•	Support costs	12%	11%
•	Governance costs	3%	3%
•	Fundraising	15%	13%

Support and governance costs are re-allocated to each of the activities on the following basis which is an estimate, based on staff time, of the amount attributable to each activity

•	Research and education	73%
•	Membership	10%
•	Fundraising	17%

Governance costs are the costs associated with the governance arrangements of the charity. These costs are associated with constitutional and statutory requirements and include any costs associated with the strategic management of the charity's activities.

Rental charges are charged on a straight line basis over the term of the lease.

#### k) Tangible fixed assets

Items of equipment are capitalised where the purchase price exceeds £500. Depreciation costs are allocated to activities on the basis of the use of the related assets in those activities. Assets are reviewed for impairment if circumstances indicate their carrying value may exceed their net realisable value and value in use.

Depreciation is provided at rates calculated to write down the cost of each asset to its estimated residual value over its expected useful life. The depreciation rates in use are as follows:

•	Computer equipment	– 25% straight line
•	Database	– 20% straight line
•	Freehold buildings	– 1% straight line

The useful economic life of the freehold buildings is in excess of 50 years but as the value of the building is not impaired below its carrying amount, no adjustments have been made. The value of land is not known and it is not separately accounted for; instead, the freehold property, including land, is depreciated over 100 years.

#### I) Listed investments

Investments are a form of basic financial instrument and are initially recognised at their transaction value and subsequently measured at their fair value as at the balance sheet date using the closing quoted market price. Any change in fair value will be recognised in the statement of financial activities. Investment gains and losses, whether realised or unrealised, are combined and shown in the heading "Net gains/(losses) on investments" in the statement of financial activities. The charity does not acquire put options, derivatives or other complex financial instruments.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 1 Accounting policies (continued)

#### m) Debtors

Trade and other debtors are recognised at the settlement amount due after any trade discount offered. Prepayments are valued at the amount prepaid net of any trade discounts due.

#### n) Cash at bank and in hand

Cash at bank and cash in hand includes cash and short term highly liquid investments with a short maturity of three months or less from the date of acquisition or opening of the deposit or similar account.

#### o) Creditors and provisions

Creditors and provisions are recognised where the charity has a present obligation resulting from a past event that will probably result in the transfer of funds to a third party and the amount due to settle the obligation can be measured or estimated reliably. Creditors and provisions are normally recognised at their settlement amount after allowing for any trade discounts due.

#### p) Financial instruments

The charity only has financial assets and financial liabilities of a kind that qualify as basic financial instruments. Basic financial instruments are initially recognised at transaction value and subsequently measured at their settlement value with the exception of bank loans which are subsequently measured at amortised cost using the effective interest method.

#### Notes to the financial statements

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 2 Donations and legacies

	Restricted £	Unrestricted £	2022 Total £	Restricted £	Unrestricted £	2021 Total £
General Donations Friends JUSTICE60 Donations	15,000 _ _	102,292 36,912 287,430	117,292 36,912 287,430	-	145,141 36,867 286.000	145,141 36,867 286,000
Legacies Donated services	-	1,000 18,671	1,000 18,671	-	- 7,918	- 7,918
	15,000	446,305	461,305	-	475,926	475,926

A number of Law Firms support the work of JUSTICE. This financial year we have recognised donated services from:

- Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer, who provided Human Resources support and office space.
- Linklaters LLP who provided support relating to our tenancy agreement.
- Dechert LLP who provided governance advice on election of new Board members and recruitment of our new Chief Executive
- Charles Russell Speechlys LLP who provided office space.
- Gryphon Property Partners who provided property consultancy in relation to our building.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 3 Income from charitable activities

income from chantable activities			2022			2021
	Restricted	Unrestricted	2022 Total	Restricted	Unrestricted	Total
	£	£	fotal	f	£	f
Trust and Foundations	2	2	-	2	2	-
Existing / previous funders:						
The Alexander Mosley Charitable Trust	-	25,000	25,000	-	25,000	25,000
The Barrow Cadbury Trust	14,000	-	14,000	14,000	-	14,000
The Blagrave Trust	7,500	400	7,900	7,500	-	7,500
The Dawes Trust	8,218	-	8,218	13,057	-	13,057
The Dulverton Trust	-	-	-	36,200	-	36,200
Eleanor Rathbone Charitable Trust The Evan Cornish Foundation	-	-	-	2,000	10,000	2,000 10,000
The Jolanta and Max Neufeld	_	5,000	5,000	_	5,000	5,000
Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust	23,864	5,000	23,864	5,966	5,000	5,966
Laura Kinsella Foundation		1,000	1,000		1,000	1,000
Legal Education Foundation:	-	_	.,		,	,
21st Century Access to Justice	-	-	-	-	-	-
Administrative Justice Council	-	-	-	15,000	-	15,000
The Leri Charitable Trust	-	10,000	10,000	10,000	-	10,000
Peter Stebbings Memorial Charity	-	-	-	2,500	-	2,500
The Revilo Trust	-	-	-	-	500	500
Simmons and Simmons Charitable						
Foundation	_	-	-	-	10,000	10,000
abrdn Financial Fairness Trust	45,000	_	45,000	20,000	-	20,000
The Stewarts Foundation	-	6,000	6,000	-	6,000	6,000
Therium Access	30,000	-	30,000	-	-	-
Treebeard Trust Trust for London	25,000	-	25,000	15 000	15,000	15,000
	15,000 5,000	-	15,000 5,000	15,000 5,000	-	15,000 5,000
The 29th May 1961 Charitable Trust New funders:	5,000	_	5,000	5,000	_	5,000
The Clifford Chance Foundation	4,328	_	4,328			
Doughty Street Chambers Supported Ca		5,000	5,000	_	_	_
The Golden Bottle Trust	-	1,000	1,000	-	-	-
Matrix Causes Fund	5,440	, _	5,440	-	_	-
The Schroder Charity Trust	4,000	-	4,000	-	-	-
Other: Existing / previous funders						
Allen and Overy Foundation	_	10,000	10,000	_	10,000	10,000
Blackrock	4,799	- 10,000	4,799	7,452	- 10,000	7,452
City of London Corporation	-,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	_	-,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	-	10,000	10,000
Herbert Smith Freehills LLP	-	-	-	-	5,000	5,000
Jenner & Block LLP	-	-	-	-	5,000	5,000
Ministry of Justice	20,000	-	20,000	20,000	-	20,000
Montfort	-	-	-	-	3,000	3,000
Society of the Holy Child Jesus	5,000	-	5,000	-	-	-
University of Westminster	12,681	-	12,681	3,113	-	3,113
New funders:		-				
Dechert LLP	5,000	-	5,000	-	-	-
Hogan Lovells International LLP	2,500	-	2,500	-	-	-
Reed Smith LLP Simmons & Simmons LLP	0	5,000	5,000 10,000	-	-	-
אוווווטוא איזאווווטוא בעי	10,000	-	10,000	-	-	-
Education	-	-				
Education: Conferences	-	-	10 126		17015	17015
Publications	_	10,126 191	10,126 191	_	17,015 180	17,015 180
Other	-	- 191	- 191	-	- 180	- 180
Sub-total for research and education	247,330	78,717	326,047	176,788	122,695	299,483
Membership	-	100,830	100,830	_	105,348	105,348
Sub-total for membership	_	100,830	100,830	_	105,348	105,348
Total income from charitable activities	247,330	179,547	426,877	176,788	228,043	404,831
=						61

### Notes to the financial statements

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

### 4a Analysis of expenditure (current year)

	-	Charitable	activities				
	Cost of raising funds £	Research & education £	Membership £	Governance costs £	Support costs £	2022 Total £	2021 Total £
Staff costs (Note 6) Premises costs Office costs	73,586 5,878 6,543	657,350 24,297 56,930	39,246 3,135 3,409	14,717 1,176 1,279	58,870 4,704 5,114	843,769 39,190 73,275	822,788 12,622 93,453
Publications/printing/design Training, seminars and conferences Fundraising costs Professional fees Depreciation Other costs	 3,071  2,199 	- 39 - 9,089 -	- 300 - 1,172 -	- - 8,550 440 1,600	- - - 1,759 -	- 39 3,371 8,550 14,659 1,600	3,844 8,142 14,124 3,000
	91,277	747,705	47,262	27,762	70,447	984,453	957,973
Support costs	11,976	51,426	7,045	-	(70,447)	-	-
Governance costs	4,720	20,266	2,776	(27,762)			_
Total expenditure 2022	107,973	819,397	57,083			984,453	
Total expenditure 2021	98,223	794,299	65,451	_			957,973

### Notes to the financial statements

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

### 4b Analysis of expenditure (prior year)

	-	Charitable	activities			
	Cost of raising funds £	Research & education £	Membership £	Governance costs £	Support costs £	2021 Total £
Staff costs (Note 6) Premises costs Office costs Publications/printing/design Training, seminars and conferences Fundraising costs Professional fees Depreciation Other costs	67,299 1,641 9,286 - - 3,556 - 1,836 -	636,423 8,078 67,737 - - - 9,039 -	46,591 1,136 6,429 - - 288 - 1,271 -	15,530 379 2,143 - - - 8,142 424 3,000	56,945 1,388 7,858 - - - 1,554 -	822,788 12,622 93,453 - - 3,844 8,142 14,124 3,000
	83,618	721,277	55,715	29,618	67,745	957,973
Support costs	10,162	50,809	6,774	-	(67,745)	-
Governance costs	4,443	22,213	2,962	(29,618)		
Total expenditure 2021	98,223	794,299	65,451			957,973

#### Notes to the financial statements

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 5 Net income / (expenditure) for the year

This is stated after charging / crediting:

	2022 £	2021 £
Depreciation charge for the year Auditor's remuneration (excluding VAT):	14,659	14,123
Audit services	7,125	6,785

#### 6 Analysis of staff costs, trustee remuneration and expenses, and the cost of key management personnel

Staff costs were as follows:

	2022	2021
	£	£
Salaries and wages	678,376	684,117
Social security costs	67,136	65,706
Employer's contribution to defined contribution pension schemes	65,253	65,300
Redundancy and termination costs	_	_
Salary Admin (re: childcare vouchers)	-	1,189
Staff training/practising certificate	2,301	4,754
Consultancy	1,950	-
Staff recruitment	28,753	1,722
	843,769	822,788

The following number of employees received employee benefits (excluding employer pension costs and employer's national insurance) during the year between:

	2022 No.	2021 No.
£60,000 - £69,999	1	2
£80,000 - £89,999	-	-
£90,000 - £99,999	-	1

The total employee benefits including pension contributions and employer's national insurance of the key management personnel were £282,945 (2021: £343,028).

The charity Board members were not paid nor received any other benefits from employment with the charity in the year (2021: £nil). No Board member received payment for professional or other services supplied to the charity (2021: £nil).

#### Notes to the financial statements

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

### 7 Staff numbers

The average number of employees (head count based on number of staff employed) during the year was as follows:

	2022	2022	2021	2021
	Employed	FTE	Employed	FTE
	No.	No.	No.	No.
Raising funds	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.1
Research and education	11.7	9.9	12.8	10.4
Membership	1.6	1.3	1.7	1.4
Support	2.2	1.9	2.4	1.9
Governance	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5
	19.0	16.1	20.0	16.3

#### 8 Related party transactions

Aggregate donations from related parties were £30,675 (2021: £27,270).

There are no other related party transactions to disclose for either year.

#### 9 Taxation

The charitable company is exempt from corporation tax as all its income is charitable and is applied for charitable purposes.

#### 10 Tangible fixed assets

	Freehold property £	Database £	IT Equipment £	Total £
<b>Cost or valuation</b> At the start of the year Additions in year Disposals	397,862 _ _	25,180 - -	50,773 3,240 (4,297)	473,815 3,240 (4,297)
At the end of the year	397,862	25,180	49,716	472,758
<b>Depreciation</b> At the start of the year Charge for the year Disposals	87,534 3,979 –	25,180 _ _	36,212 10,680 (4,297)	148,926 14,659 (4,297)
At the end of the year	91,513	25,180	42,595	159,288
Net book value At the end of the year	306,349	-	7,121	313,470
At the start of the year	310,328	_	14,561	324,889

All of the above assets are used for charitable purposes.

#### Notes to the financial statements

### For the year ended 31 March 2022

11	Listed investments	2022	2021
	Fair value at the start of the year	£ 285,893	£ 254,425
	Additions at cost Net gain / (loss) on change in fair value	- 4,655	31,468
		290,548	285,893
	Fair value at the end of the year	290,548	285,893
	Investments comprise:	2022 £	2021 £
	UK Common investment funds	290,548	285,893
		290,548	285,893
	Investments representing over 5% by value of the portfolio comprise:		
		2022 £	2021 £
	CCLA COIF Fixed Interest Fund Charishare Common Investment Fund	109,288 181,260	117,573 168,320
12	Debtors	2022 £	2021 £
	Other debtors Prepayments Accrued income	32,770 10,304 10,922	241 17,561 12,421
		53,996	30,223
13	Creditors: amounts falling due within one year		
		2022 £	2021 £
	Trade creditors Rent received in advance	7,586	10,173 7,250
	Taxation and social security Pension contributions payable Accruals	- 21,278 6,586 34,731	19,225 6,661 35,779
		70,181	79,088

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 14a Movements in funds (current year)

	At 1 April 2021 £	Income & gains £	Expenditure & losses £	Transfers £	At 31 March 2022 £
Endowment fund	416,853	8,065	(3,979)	_	420,939
Restricted funds:					
Administrative Justice Council	-	35,000	(51,342)	16,342	-
Administrative Justice Council Intern	283	-	(283)	-	-
Capital Campaign	5,000	_	(5,000)	_	_
Challenging school exclusions Working	-,				
Party	-	9,000	(4,961)	-	4,039
Defending the rule of law, access to justice	(0, 264)	22.964	(20,101)		(14 601)
and human rights Delivering Administrative Justice After the	(9,364)	23,864	(29,191)	-	(14,691)
Pandemic: What can we learn about					
digitalisation and vulnerable groups?		12,681	(12,681)		-
Immigration and Asylum	4,916	-	(8,221)	3,305	-
Improving Access to Justice for Separating					
Families Working Party	-	29,328	(31,201)	-	(1,873)
Intern funding	32,914	-	(32,914)	-	-
Intern funding HB	-	10,000	(10,000)		-
Parole Working Party		7,500	(33,895)	26,395	-
Privatisation Working Party		10,000	(3,735)		6,265
Prosecuting Sexual Offences Working Party	12,013	8,218	(14,648)	-	5,583
Race and state related deaths Reforming Benefits Decision-Making	-	5,440			5,440
Working Party	(3,154)	49,799	(40,367)	-	6,278
Solving Housing Disputes Working Party	-	5,000	(9,937)	4,937	-
Tackling Racial Injustice Working Party	(24,960)	21,500	(5,681)	-	(9,141)
Therium Access grant CJL	-	30,000	(30,000)	-	-
Windrush Working Group		5,000	(13,919)	8,919	-
Total restricted funds	17,648	262,330	(337,976)	59,898	1,900
Council	25,000	-	-	-	25,000
Designated fund – Working Parties	150,000	-	(41,140)	(43,556)	65,304
Total designated funds	175,000	-	(41,140)	(43,556)	90,304
General funds	385,833	634,533	(601,358)	(16,342)	402,666
Total unrestricted funds	560,833	634,533	(642,498)	(59,898)	492,970
Total funds	995,334	904,928	(984,453)		915,809

The narrative to explain the purpose of each fund is given at the foot of the note below.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 14b Movements in funds (prior year)

	At 1 April 2020 £	Income & gains £	Expenditure & losses £	Transfers £	At 31 March 2021 £
Endowment fund	400,172	20,660	(3,979)	_	416,853
Restricted funds:					
Administrative Justice Council	6,045	50,410	(70,790)	14,335	-
Administrative Justice Council Intern	-	2,703	(2,420)		283
Capital Campaign	5,000	-	-	-	5,000
Challenging school exclusions Working					
Party	-	2,500	(5,049)	2,549	-
Defending the rule of law, access to justice					
and human rights	-	5,966	(15,330)	-	(9,364)
Immigration and Asylum	3,751	10,000	(8,835)	-	4,916
Improving Access to Justice for Separating					
Families Working Party	-	2,000	(28,140)	26,140	-
Intern funding	-	36,200	(3,286)		32,914
Prosecuting Sexual Offences Working Party	-	13,057	(1,044)		12,013
Reforming Benefits Decision-Making					
Working Party	-	27,452	(30,606)		(3,154)
Solving Housing Disputes Working Party	-	5,000	(9,210)	4,210	-
Tackling Racial Injustice Working Party	174	21,500	(46,634)	, -	(24,960)
Therium Access grant	30,000	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(30,000)	_	(= .,
-	· · · · · ·				
Total restricted funds	44,970	176,788	(251,344)	47,234	17,648
<b>Unrestricted funds:</b> Designated funds – Administrative Justice					
Council	-	-	-	25,000	25,000
Designated fund – Working Parties	150,000	-	(75,764)	75,764	150,000
Total designated funds	150,000	-	(75,764)	100,764	175,000
General funds	415,351	745,366	(626,886)	(147,998)	385,833
Total unrestricted funds	565,351	745,366	(702,650)	(47,234)	560,833
Total funds	1,010,493	942,814	(957,973)	_	995,334

#### Purposes of endowment funds

Endowment funds are held as part of an expendable endowment fund and is comprised of the freehold property on Carter Lane and some listed investments.

#### Purposes of restricted funds

Restricted funds represent grants and donations given for specific purposes. Unspent funds at the year end are to be carried forward and spent on that specific project in a future period. The specific purposes are:

#### Administrative Justice Council

The Administrative Justice Council was set up to ensure that the administrative justice system is more accessible, fair and effective by improving administrative decision-making, simplifying appeals, complaints procedures and redress mechanisms and ensuring access to justice for some of the most vulnerable people in society. The Council is funded by the Ministry of Justice and Trust for London, with any short-fall in funding made up by JUSTICE.

#### Administrative Justice Council Intern

Westminster University provided funding for an internship to support the AJC's Health/advice partnership project.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 14 Movements in funds (continued)

#### JUSTICE Capital Campaign

These are funds raised to support the refurbishment of our offices at 59 Carter Lane. These funds have been spent on building survey and property advice.

#### Challenging school exclusions Working Party

The Schroder Charity Trust (£4,000) and the Society of the Holy Child Jesus (£5,000) contributed towards implementation of the Challenging School Exclusions Working Party report recommendations. This report examines the processes used to make and review a decision to exclude permanently a pupil in England and identifies serious weaknesses within the current system. Implementation has included responding to the Department for Education's Consultation on Revised Behaviour in Schools Guidance and Suspension and Permanent Exclusion Guidance informed by the Working Party report's recommendations as well as giving evidence to the Children's Rights Alliance for their reporting to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child.

#### Defending the rule of law, access to justice and human rights

The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust is supporting our work on this, with a three-year grant of £71,597, of which £23,864 has been received in this financial year. This grant has supported our work this year responding to proposed reforms of administrative law including judicial review and immigration and the Human Rights Act. This fund is in deficit but future grant payments will be received to bring it back into a positive position.

# Delivering Administrative Justice After the Pandemic: What can we learn about digitalisation and vulnerable groups?

This is Nuffield Foundation funded research project with a group of academics from University of Westminster, UCL and LSE. The research team have been examining the effect of rapid digitalisation on the delivery of justice, identifying the effects on access for marginalised groups and exploring how trust can be built and sustained in parts of the justice system affected by the pandemic. The project focuses on Special Educational Needs (SEND) and Disability; and housing and looks at the overlap in ombudsman scheme and tribunals in four institutions: the local government and social care ombudsman and the SEND tribunal; and the housing ombudsman and the property chamber. The University of Westminster has been awarded a grant to administer this project and have subcontracted Heidi Bancroft of JUSTICE to support the project through an administrative and research role, as a Research Assistant (RA).

#### Immigration and Asylum

The Leri Charitable Trust contributed towards implementation of the 2018 Immigration and Asylum Working Party report recommendations and our response to the Nationality and Borders Bill, with donations of £10k, in 2019 & 2020. The rest of the staff time on implementation was funded from JUSTICE's designated funds.

#### Improving Access to Justice for Separating Families Working Party

This Improving Access to Justice for Separating Families working party commenced in January 2021 and is considering how access to justice can be improved for separating families in private family proceedings. The Treebeard Trust and The Clifford Chance Foundation are supporting this work. This fund is in deficit but future grant payments will be received to bring it back into a positive position.

#### Intern funding

The Dulverton Trust has provided a grant of £36,200 in 2020-21 to support our internship and fellowship programme.

#### Intern funding Henry Brook

An individual donor provided funding for us to recruit a Henry Brook fellow to support our work.

#### **Parole Working Party**

In April 2021, JUSTICE launched it's a Parole System fit for Purpose Working Party, which examined the role, powers, and procedures of the Parole Board and wider system. The report was published in January 2022 and makes 22 practical, achievable, and well-evidenced recommendations which explore and show how the parole system could be truly fit for purpose for those in prison, victims, and the general public. Hogan Lovells International LLP supported this work, along with an individual donor. The rest of the staff time on spent on this work was funded from JUSTICE's designated funds.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 14 Movements in funds (continued)

#### **Outsourcing Working Party**

Over the last forty years, administrative decisions and the delivery of public services have been increasingly contracted out to private companies. This has led to changes to the way in which public administration is structured and decisions by the State are made in (increasingly) front-line services that affect people's legal rights and entitlements, including benefits decisions, social care and homelessness decisions. This working party will seek to ensure that regardless of who is delivering public services, individuals receive the services they are entitled to, are able to understand the decisions that are being made about them and, where necessary, challenge those decisions effectively. Simmons & Simmons LLP supported this work.

#### **Prosecuting Sexual Offences Working Party**

The Dawes Trust is supporting the implementation work of our Prosecuting Sexual Offences Working Party. Implementation work this year included attending a number of meetings to discuss the report's findings and recommendations. For example, we are a member of the Organisational Support and Services for Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation Meeting, chaired by Chief Constable Simon Bailey (The National Police Chiefs' Council's lead for Child Protection and Abuse Investigations). JUSTICE continues to interact with the Home Office regarding the Government's new Child Sexual Abuse strategy launch. During this period we were also preparing briefing materials for the upcoming Online Safety Bill, which could see a number of JUSTICE's key recommendations placed into law. We also responded to the Ministry of Justice's consultation on 'Delivering Justice for Victims'.

#### Race and state related deaths

Matrix Causes Fund are supporting our work on Racism and state related deaths. There is concern about the disproportionate number of people from ethnic minority backgrounds who die in contentious circumstances where the State may have played a role (either due to a positive action, a failure to act, or a discriminatory policy) but despite this issues of discrimination and bias are rarely given consideration during inquests and inquiries,. We aim to put together a practitioners guide to identifying and raising issues relating to bias and race in the context of inquests.

#### Reforming Benefits Decision-Making Working Party

BlackRock Gives and abrdn Financial Fairness Trust (previously the Standard Life Foundation) are supporting our working party on Reforming Benefits Decision–Making. The report published in July 2021 makes 44 recommendations aimed at improving the administrative and procedural aspects of the benefits system. It considers initial decision making, through to appeals, to ensure that the system works well for everyone, regardless of their digital capability, their health, their disabilities, or their vulnerabilities. With rising living costs the need for a fair benefits system that is accessible and makes timely and accurate decisions is as important as ever. Implementation work this year has included responding to the DWP's Health and Disability Green Paper, monitoring the roll out of Adult Disability Payment in Scotland, liaising with other NGOs and meeting with the DWP to discuss the report's recommendations.

#### Solving Housing Disputes Working Party

The 29th May 1961 Charitable Trust provided us with a one-year grant of £5,000 for implementation of our working party on Solving Housing Disputes. The rest of the staff time on this Working Party was funded from JUSTICE's designated funds. Implementation work this year inluded monitoring the progress of housing mediation pilots and we were involved in the evaluation of the possession mediation pilot run by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government and the Ministry of Justice. We also contributed to the update report by the Master of the Rolls Working Group on Possession. We have shared the report with senior officials in the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and have discussed JUSTICE's work on housing with a number of members of the department. We responded to two consultations – the Civil Justice Council's Consultation on Pre-Action Protocols and the Ministry of Justice's Consultation on Legal Aid within the Housing Duty Scheme, highlighting the findings of the Solving Housing Disputes report on these two topics.

#### Tackling Racial Injustice: Children and the Youth Justice System

Barrow Cadbury Trust and The Blagrave Trust are supporting our working party on Racial Disparity in Youth Justice. This working party, chaired by Sandra Paul, examined the causes of BAME disproportionality in the Youth Justice System (YJS) of England and Wales. It made practical recommendations with a view to reducing that disproportionality. In addition, it sought to ensure that children are not needlessly criminalised by improving the attitudes, processes and procedures in the YJS. This fund is in deficit but future grant payments will be received to bring it back into a positive position.

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 14 Movements in funds (continued)

#### Therium Access grant - Civil Justice Lawyer

Therium Access contributed towards the salary of our Civil Justice Lawyer, allowing us to complete implementation work on our civil justice work streams and to set up a new working party on Civil orders with criminal consequences.

#### Windrush Working Party

The 'Reforming the Windrush Compensation Scheme' Working Party report was published in November 2021. It makes 27 recommendations to improve the process for those seeking compensation from the Home Office for the losses and hardships they suffered as a result of not being able to demonstrate their lawful immigration status. Dechert LLP donated  $\pounds$ 5,000 towards this work. The rest of the staff time on this report was funded from JUSTICE's designated funds.

#### Purposes of designated funds

Designated funds have been set aside by the Trustees to fund staff time spent on our Working Parties and the Administrative Justice Council.

#### 15a Analysis of net assets between funds (current year)

	Endowment £	Restricted £	Designated £	General unrestricted £	Total funds £
Tangible fixed assets	306,349	-	-	7,121	313,470
Investments	114,590	-	-	175,958	290,548
Net current assets	-	1,900	90,304	219,587	311,791
Net assets at the end of the year	420,939	1,900	90,304	402,666	915,809

#### 15b Analysis of net assets between funds (prior year)

	Endowment £	Restricted £	Designated £	General unrestricted £	Total funds £
Tangible fixed assets Investments Net current assets	310,328 106,525 -	- - 17.648	- - 175.000	14,561 179,368 191.904	324,889 285,893 384,552
Net assets at the end of the year	416,853	17,648	175,000	385,833	995,334

#### For the year ended 31 March 2022

#### 16 Operating lease commitments payable as a lessee

The charity's total future minimum lease payments under non-cancellable operating leases is as follows for each of the following periods

	Equipmer 2022 £	nt 2021 £
Less than one year Two to five years Over five years	1,162 1,452 –	1,162 2,614 -
	2,614	3,775

#### 17 Operating lease commitments receivable as a lessor

Amounts receivable under non-cancellable operating leases are as follows for each of the following periods:

	Prop	Property	
	2022 f	2021 f	
	-	2	
Less than one year	-	13,527	
One to five years	-	_	
		13,527	

#### 18 Post balance sheet event

JUSTICE owns a freehold building at 59 Carter Lane, London EC4V 5AQ. A building survey completed in late 2021 highlighted significant problems with this building relating to the boiler, accessibility issues, and health and safety. These issues meant that the Board had to make a decision that staff could not return to working from Carter Lane until these issues were resolved. The Board formed a sub-group of Board members, property and financial consultants to review the options and make a decision on next steps. Following a huge amount of research and analysis, the Board made the difficult but pragmatic decision to sell the property as this was the most cost effective solution. The property was sold in October 2022 for £2.1m (before fees). The Board and SMT are investigating launching a matched funding campaign to find a new property for what might become a 'JUSTICE hub'. The aim of the Hub would be to foster innovation and encourage collaboration across the justice sector and beyond. It might also provide a useful 'touchdown' location for our out of London members and a place to meet and work with our team and find out more about our work.

#### 19 Legal status of the charity

The charity is a company limited by guarantee and has no share capital. The liability of each member in the event of winding up is limited to £1.