

Scottish Court Fees 2022-2025

Analysis of Consultation and Scottish Government Response

June 2022



Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba
gov.scot

Abbreviations and acronyms

APIL	Association of Personal Injury Lawyers
CAS	Citizens Advice Scotland
EHCR	Equality and Human Rights Commission
ERCS	Environmental Right's Centre for Scotland
Faculty	Faculty of Advocates
FOIL	Forum of Insurance Lawyers
HRCS/SALC	Human Rights Consortium Scotland and the Scottish Association of Law Centres
ICMS	Integrated Case Management System
LSS	Law Society of Scotland
OPG	Office of the Public Guardian
PIP	Personal independence payments
QOCS	Qualified one-way cost shifting
SCJC	Scottish Civil Justice Council
SCTS	Scottish Courts and Tribunals Service
SSA	Society of Solicitor Advocates
UKSC	United Kingdom Supreme Court

Scottish court fees 2022-2025 – analysis of consultation

1. The Scottish Government thanks all the individuals and organisations who took the time to consider and respond to the proposals contained in the consultation paper on Court Fees.

Background to Consultation

2. The consultation on 'Scottish Court Fees 2022-2025', was published on 10 December 2021 and asked seven questions on which views were specifically sought. The 12 week consultation period ended on 4 March 2022.

Proposals

3. The consultation sought views on the proposals for changes to the level of fees charged by the Scottish courts with the intention of obtaining the views of the general public and court users before the finalisation of the fee instruments, which will be laid in May 2022.
4. Those fees instruments relate to the fees for the three year period from 1 July 2022 to 31 March 2025 to be charged by the Court of Session, High Court of Justiciary, Sheriff Appeal Court, Sheriff Courts including Sheriff Personal Injury Court, Justice of the Peace Courts and Office of the Public Guardian.
5. The main proposal in the consultation paper was that court fees should be increased by 2% in 2022, followed by further 2% rises on 1 April 2023 and 1 April 2024 in order to reflect inflationary pressures.
6. In addition to inflationary increases, some relatively minor amendments to existing fee narratives were proposed to ensure consistency and to simplify the fees in order to meet our objective of making fees easier to understand and administer.
7. Overall the proposals reflected the Scottish Government's commitment to ensuring that the courts are funded to deliver a justice system that is affordable and which provides a high-quality service to those who have cause to use it. It is also committed to ensuring that access to justice is protected through a well - funded system of exemptions and legal aid. The proposals were also informed by the Scottish Government's consideration of the Supreme Court judgment in *UNISON v the Lord Chancellor*¹ on fees charged in the Employment Tribunal, as well as wider developments provided for in the Civil Litigation (Expenses and Group Proceedings) (Scotland) Act 2018, which increases the funding options for pursuers of civil actions and introduces a greater level of equality to the funding relationship between pursuers and defenders in personal injury actions.

Consultees

8. The consultation paper was published on the Scottish Government website and circulated to a number of organisations that are directly involved with the legal

¹ *UNISON v Lord Chancellor* [2017] UKSC 51, paragraph 91

process such as legal professionals, organisations in the justice system and the judiciary, as well as organisations with an interest in consumer legal issues.

9. Interested parties were afforded the opportunity to feed back their opinions by downloading the consultation paper from the Scottish Government website or responding online through the Scottish Government consultation hub, Citizen Space.
10. Consultation exercises like this are not numerically representative; rather they aim to elicit the views and experiences of a range of stakeholders. Owing to the quantity and relatively narrow range of respondent types, it is considered that it would not be appropriate to present the results in percentage form. The small number of responses is thought to be indicative of the specialised nature of the consultation.

Overview of Responses

11. A total of 15 responses were received from organisations and individuals.
12. Where respondents gave permission, their responses have been published on the Scottish Government website.
13. Not all of the respondents answered all of the questions set out in the consultation questionnaire. Some respondents commented on matters that were only indirectly relevant to the consultation. Those comments have also been summarised where appropriate.
14. A table detailing the category of respondents and the number of responses received is provided below:

Category	Responses received
Individuals	2
Legal firms and regulatory and representative bodies	6
Government agencies and public bodies	2
Non-governmental organisations	5

Organisations which responded to the consultation

Association of Personal Injury Lawyers

Citizens Advice Scotland

CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP

Environmental Right's Centre for Scotland

Equality and Human Rights Commission

Faculty of Advocates

Forum of Insurance Lawyers

Human Rights Consortium Scotland and the Scottish Association of Law Centres

Inclusion Scotland

Law Society of Scotland

Police Scotland

Scottish Civil Justice Council

Society of Solicitor Advocates

Findings

15. This report includes a summary of the responses to the Scottish Government Consultation. Individual responses are not repeated verbatim in the report. We have set out the questions posed in the consultation questionnaire and have provided examples of comments from respondents.

Conclusion

16. Having fully considered the views of those who responded to the consultation, the Scottish Government has decided to implement the increases to court fees proposed in the consultation to allow for expected inflation as well as the more minor adjustments proposed. In addition the Scottish Government has listened to the consultation responses and taken forward some suggestions put forward. The next review of court fees is scheduled to take place in 2024 with a view to further changes in 2025. In the meantime, the Scottish Government will continue to monitor the impact of changes to court fees and wider courts reform.

Responses to questions

Question 1

Do you agree that court fees should rise by 2% in the financial year commencing 1 April 2022 and by a further 2% in each of the following two financial years commencing 1 April 2023 and 1 April 2024?

Yes:	1
No:	10
Not answered:	4

17. Most of the respondents who answered this question were clear that they did not approve of court fees *per se*, expressing the view that court fees act as a barrier to justice. Nine out of the ten (the Faculty of Advocates (the Faculty), the Law Society of Scotland (LSS), the Society of Solicitor Advocators (SSA), Citizens Advice Scotland (CAS), the Association of Personal Injury Lawyers (APIL), the Forum of Insurance Lawyers (FOIL), the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHCR), the Human Rights Consortium Scotland and the Scottish Association of Law Centres (HRCS/SALC), and Inclusion Scotland) considered that the burden of maintaining the civil courts should fall upon the taxpayer either entirely or to a significant degree. For example, the SSA wrote:

“We are concerned that an increase in court dues annually by 2% will be a potential barrier to access to justice. The court service is for the benefit of society and in our opinion, the majority of funding ought to be through taxation. We therefore disagree with the proposition that court users should meet the cost of the court system.”

18. Some respondents identified the position of those of limited means (but above the level of income that would qualify for exemption) as a source of concern. HRCS/SALC referenced Article 6(1) of European Convention on Human Rights which protects a right to a fair hearing.
19. HRCS/SALC drew an analogy with other services such as health care provision which is free at the point of need, suggesting that access to justice should be similarly treated. Some respondents, drawing from the Supreme Court judgement, stressed that the benefits of court judgements are felt by society at large and not just the participants in the particular case.
20. Four of the responses, all of whom oppose the current system of fee charging, commented in reference to *UNISON v Lord Chancellor*². For example, HRCS/SALC stated:

“For as long as court fees are a feature of Scotland’s justice system, we welcome the Scottish Government’s commitment to protecting access to justice through a well-funded system of exemptions and to considering concerns about access to justice for vulnerable people. In the 2017 Supreme Court *UNISON* judgment, Lord Reed stated:

‘In order for the fees to be lawful, they have to be set at a level that everyone can afford, taking into account the availability of full or partial remission.’”
21. The LSS singled out fees for the Office of the Public Guardian (OPG) in particular saying:

“Turning specifically to fees due to the Office of the Public Guardian (OPG), we do not support any rise in OPG fees. In relation to OPG fees, in particular, consideration should be given to the savings made to public funds as a result of taking measures through the OPG (which trigger these fees). This is particularly so in relation to fees for powers of attorney.”

Question 2

Do you have any views on the operation of the court fee exemptions system? In particular, we would welcome comments on the impact of fees in relation to access to justice for party litigants with a disability.

22. The SSA, which considers that court fees should be paid out of the public purse, wrote: “The operation of fee exemptions works well in our experience.”
23. A rather different view was taken by the Faculty which argued that litigants in person at a disadvantage in court actions compared to those who have legal

representation. This respondent considered that fee exemptions should not encourage litigants in person them but support those who have legal assistance *pro bono*.

24. Various suggestions were made as to how the exemptions system should be widened.
- Three respondents (LSS, CAS, and HRCS/SALC) considered that those in receipt of Personal Independence Payments (PIP) should be exempt.
 - HRCS/SALC suggested that court fee exemptions were needed for:
 - discrimination claims under the Equality Act 2010;
 - all human rights cases which they considered are always in the public interest;
 - court actions and public interest interventions brought by the Equality and Human Rights Commission, the Scottish Human Rights Commission, and the Children and Young People's Commissioner Scotland;
 - They also proposed that, in the future, court actions provided for by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Incorporation) (Scotland) Bill (under section 7 of the Bill as passed by the Scottish Parliament – 'Proceedings for unlawful acts') and court actions provided for in the future Bill introducing a new human rights framework for Scotland should be exempt.
25. The LSS proposed that the Scottish Government should look at the South African model where costs are not imposed on losing parties engaging in good faith or the Scottish tribunals where fees not levied as alternative models.
26. EHCR, HRCS/SALC considered that more research by the Scottish Government and the SCTS was needed on the impact of fees in relation to access to justice for party litigants with a disability.

Question 3

The Scottish Government is seeking views on whether to exempt environmental cases within the meaning of the Aarhus Convention. Do you consider that such cases should be court fee exempt? If so, how would you define an Aarhus case? Views on fees for public interest litigation more broadly would also be welcomed.

Yes	6
No	0
Not answered	9

27. The Faculty, ERCS, SSA, FOIL, HRCS/SALC, and EHCR answered this question and all six were in favour of exempting Aarhus cases from court fees.
28. ERCS offered a definition of Aarhus Convention cases is as follows:
- (a) an appeal under section 56 of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 as modified by regulation 17 of the Environmental Information (Scotland) Regulations 2004;

- (b) proceedings which include a challenge to a decision, act or omission which is subject to, or said to be subject to, the provisions of Article 6 of the Aarhus Convention; or
- (c) proceedings arising from an act or omission by a private person or a public authority which contravenes the law relating to the environment.

These are slightly amended versions of the Rules of the Court of Session, Chapter 58A which deals with applications for protective expenses orders in Aarhus cases.

Question 4

Do you have any views on fees and exemptions which you would like to share relating to group proceedings as discussed in section 2 of this consultation paper?

29. There was a view that it was still too early to make rules about fees and exemptions relating to group proceedings. APIL took this view. In particular the views of the Scottish Civil Justice Council (SCJC) which is responsible for court rules should be noted.

“The issue of the fees and expenses regime for group proceedings was considered by the SCJC during the policy development of the court rules which are now in place (S.S.I. 2020/208). A number of respondents to the SCJC consultation on the rules proposals raised questions about the judicial expenses and fees structure for these proceedings. The SCJC concluded then that until there is relevant operational experience and data available from the SCTS the cost of servicing the new procedure is unknown. In the absence of such information, the SCJC came to a view then that it was not possible to agree any policy on any new fees provision, and that a review would be undertaken by the SCJC Costs and Funding Committee following the rules being in operation for a period of time.”

30. Other respondents did offer some suggestions. For example, CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP considered that there should be a tailored approach with the fees reflecting the cost of group proceedings to SCTS and that the fees should not prohibit participation. The Faculty did not consider that the amount of extra work for the courts in having test cases justifies additional court fees.
31. HRCS/SALC considered that group proceedings are inherently brought in cases that affect many people and so can be understood to be in the public interest and as such should be exempt.

Question 5

Do you have any comment on the proposed technical changes to court fee narratives detailed in section 3?

32. Only the Faculty had comments on the proposed changes to the fee narratives. It agreed with the proposed changes to:
- motion fees;
 - insolvency;
 - multiple proceedings/counterclaims;
 - Court of Session motions; or
 - a fee for complaint in Sheriff Court Fees Order.
33. The Faculty had concerns about the fee proposal for Annoying Creature applications. It considered that most such applications are likely to be brought in the public interest and that it seems likely that court fees will disproportionately fall on local authorities and animal charities.

Question 6

Do you have any other comments on the subject of this consultation paper or on the future direction of policy considerations for court fees in Scotland?

34. The Faculty and another respondent referred to the Faculty's response to the 2016 Scottish Government consultation on court fees. That stated that civil justice should be paid for out of taxation rather than by court fees. It will be noted that a majority of respondents made this point in answer to question 1 above.
35. These above two and the LSS, FOIL, EHRC, and HRCS/SALC indicated their opposition to a policy of full-cost recovery which they claimed has seen massive increases in court fees over the last few years. One respondent representing defenders considered that they were unfairly targeted particularly in personal injury actions by this policy as, with the introduction of qualified one-way cost (QOCS) shifting, they were unable to recover expenses in cases in which the defender was successful.

Question 7

Do you consider that any of the proposals in this consultation paper are likely to have a disproportionate effect on people or communities who face discrimination or social exclusion owing to race, age, gender, disability, sexual orientation, or any other factor? If so, please specify your views on the possible impact.

36. There was only one response to this question. The respondent considered that those in vulnerable groups suffered most from discrimination and crime and that they should be protected by scrapping court fees.
37. In respect of those receiving PIP and other vulnerable groups, see the responses to question 2 above.

Scottish Government Response

Summary

38. The Scottish Government welcomes the responses to the consultation. Having carefully considered the variety of views expressed the Government has determined to press ahead with the principal changes outlined in the consultation. That is, the overwhelming majority of fees will increase but only by 2% per year which is well below the current inflation rate and below the predicted levels of inflation predicted by the Office of Budget Responsibility (OBR).
39. We have therefore made amendment to our original proposals that seek to address the concerns that exist about whether access to justice has been adequately protected. To that end, we have raised the level of income that can be earned whilst still qualifying for court fee exemption via the benefit related exemptions to £20,592 – in line with the Scottish Living wage.
40. The Scottish Government has also been mindful of Petition 1784 to the Scottish Parliament. The petitioner was concerned that PIP is not one of the qualifying benefits for exemption from court fees in Scotland. We note that there was also support for exemption for those in receipt of PIP from three of the respondents. We have, therefore, extended the system of exemptions to encompass those who are in receipt of PIP whose the gross annual income taken into account for the calculation of the working tax credit is £20,592.
41. The Scottish Government notes that there was overwhelming support from those responding to question 2 which proposed making Aarhus cases in the Court of Session exempt from court fees. We intend to bring statutory instruments before the Scottish Parliament to implement this policy.
42. The Scottish Government notes that respondents proposed that the following should be exempt from fees.
- Aarhus cases in the sheriff court.
 - Discrimination claims under the Equality Act 2010.
 - All human rights cases which they considered are always in the public interest.
 - Court actions and public interest interventions brought by the Equality and Human Rights Commission, the Scottish Human Rights Commission, and the Children and Young People's Commissioner Scotland.
 - In the future, court actions provided for by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Incorporation) (Scotland) Bill (under section 7 of the Bill as passed by the Scottish Parliament – 'Proceedings for unlawful acts') and court actions provided for in the future Bill introducing a new human rights framework for Scotland.

After careful consideration, we have decided not to proceed with these at present, but will give them further consideration in the future.

43. The details of the proposals and further explanation of the Scottish Government's position is provided below.

Charging in Civil Courts

44. Many respondents queried the basis for charging court fees, feeling that the courts should provide a fully funded public service, supported by the taxpayer and free to the user. These respondents generally referenced the UNISON judgment in the Supreme Court regarding fees in the Employment Tribunal as supporting of the proposition that increased court fees imperilled access to justice.
45. The Scottish Government does not propose to abolish court fees such that the costs of funding the courts would fall entirely on the taxpayer, especially at a time of rising taxes.
46. There are a number of policy arguments both for and against charging fees in the civil courts and any government does need to take a balanced policy approach. Good policy reasons not to charge can and do arise where public services deliver a 'public good'. Clearly, these types of benefit to wider society do arise with the courts.
47. The civil courts exist for people to protect and enforce their personal rights, so it can be argued, as many respondents did, that it is inappropriate to charge for the privilege of exercising those rights. The resolution of some individual cases can also potentially contribute to the clarification of the civil law and the building of case law precedent.
48. The Scottish Government accepts that society will benefit from both those outcomes but we do not believe that they alone provide a sufficient justification for the government to completely rule out charging.
49. In addition to any 'public good, both the pursuer and the defender in each individual case will derive a 'private good' from settling their dispute and the government is resolved that some form of financial contribution from end users can be justified given that a private benefit is derived. The public purse is not unlimited and taxpayers do expect their governments to make choices on their behalf between all of the competing demands on the public purse.
50. When making those choices in Scotland, the Scottish Government contributes significantly to the administration of justice through taxpayer contribution but as there is a need to limit the demands on the public purse we will continue to look to the users of the civil courts to help fund those particular public services i.e. an affordable 'user pays' model, with appropriate exemptions and legal aid available to those eligible, is considered appropriate for the civil courts Scotland.
51. The policy decisions taken by the Scottish Government, through the statutory fee charging regime, do result in a balanced approach. The end user is only asked to make a reasonable contribution towards the cost of running the civil courts (where they can afford so to do). The taxpayer will fund the remainder through:
 - some costs being met through the fee exemptions regime (where the end user does not have the means to pay fees themselves); and

- some costs being treated as a subsidy in order to maintain affordability for the end user i.e., the costs that if charged might have created unreasonable barriers in access to justice.

On top of the fee exemptions regime there is a generous system of civil legal aid, that ensures that litigants who need help not only do not have to pay fees, but also receive assistance with paying for legal advice, assistance and representation.

52. The Scottish Government is aware that there will be litigants whose income is just above the thresholds for qualification for legal aid or exemption from court fees. This will always be the case at whatever level the thresholds are set. Careful consideration has been given to these thresholds and they are believed to be fair.
53. The Scottish Government has also taken note of the wider context. Whilst recognising that not all meritorious cases succeed, many litigants bringing forward strong cases will have their court fees paid by the opposing party following success. Other litigants will not face paying a fee as their claims are supported by no-win, no-fee specialists. For most litigants the court fee is only a small portion of the cost of litigation and the cost of legal advice is a far greater consideration. These considerations, taken alongside the exemptions regime, mean that it is hard to discern many situations where the court fee is a serious deterrent to proceeding with legal action.

The Supreme Court judgement

54. The Supreme Court judgement in *UNISON v the Lord Chancellor* did not challenge the legitimacy of charging fees *per se*. The Court specifically commented, “Fees paid by litigants can, in principle, reasonably be considered to be a justifiable way of making resources available for the justice system and so securing access to justice.” The test is, in essence, do the fees effectively prevent access to justice. The Scottish Government has seen no compelling evidence that it does.
55. As with all judgments the Supreme Court judgment applies directly to the particular facts and circumstances of that case. However, those circumstances were extreme. The costs of taking a case to the employment tribunal were raised from zero to a four figure sum in some cases. The demonstrable drop of 70% in claims being brought to the tribunal after the fee increases appeared to be directly attributable to the increases.
56. In considering the Supreme Court judgment, it is clear that very different circumstances apply in respect of court fees in Scotland.
 - There has been a long history of charging fees in the Scottish Courts and it is not a situation of moving from zero fees to a very large fee.
 - There has been no evidence that charging fees (even the increases introduced in November 2016) have resulted in a substantial drop in cases.
 - There is a generous system of civil legal aid and exemptions in place, with the specific objective of increasing access to justice.

- The context of actions in the courts is very different. Whilst employment tribunal cases are often of limited monetary value, the courts deal with a greater variety of private law actions in terms of value and have a specific system of lower fees for low value cases. In very many cases, the fee is a small proportion of the value of the action.

Cost recovery

57. Many respondents highlighted the policy of ‘full-cost recovery’ and suggested that it is incompatible with the decision of the Supreme Court. The Scottish Government is pleased to clarify its policy in this regard.
58. The Scottish Government’s consultation did not refer to the previous policy of full-cost recovery, though six of the respondents suggested that the Government’s policy was still full-cost recovery. Such a policy has never been achieved by the Scottish Government in the past, although the increases in 2016 were substantial and brought us close to that goal. However, since that increase, the Scottish Government has pursued a policy of only increasing fees in line with inflation and in this latest consultation, has proposed an increase that is less than the rate of inflation projected by the OBR.
59. Whilst the term ‘full cost recovery’ has been used for some time, it should be remembered that it is only a convenient shorthand description for a complex policy which includes elements of public subsidy for civil court costs in order to enhance access to justice, including extensive provision of legal aid and a comprehensive scheme of exemptions. The Scottish Government considers that it is desirable that a greater portion of the costs of the civil justice system be recovered from those who use the courts, but that is entirely subordinate to the necessity that unreasonable barriers to the courts and access to justice are not erected.

Individuals with sufficient means (who do not qualify for legal aid or exemptions)

60. Self-evidently, the clearest source of concern would be with regard to individuals who have sufficient earnings to mean that they do not qualify for either legal aid or court fee exemption. The Scottish Government has seen no evidence that court fees cannot reasonably be afforded by people in that position.
61. In contrast with the situation in the Employment Tribunal where litigants normally only have a short window of three months to bring a claim, in the courts cases can generally (with some exceptions such as judicial review) be brought for a number of years. This diminishes the argument that claimants can only afford court fees by unreasonably foregoing day-to-day expenditure. In addition, in some cases (personal injury), litigants may benefit from the support of no-win, no fee arrangements which enable them to take forward actions.
62. Personal injury litigants may also be able to benefit from the introduction of the proposals before Parliament in the Civil Litigation (Expenses and Group Proceedings) (Scotland) Act 2018. The key objective of the Act is to increase

access to justice through creating a more accessible, affordable and equitable civil justice system, by:

- making the costs of court action more predictable;
- increasing the funding options for pursuers of civil actions; and
- introducing a greater level of equality to the funding relationship between claimants and defenders in personal injury actions.

63. Under the Act, a pursuer will pay nothing up front to the cost of a personal injury case under a success fee agreement (a no win, no fee agreement). The provider of the success fee agreement (who could be either a solicitor or a claims management company) will be liable for the outlays incurred in providing the service. The provider is entitled to the success fee under the agreement if the case is won (which will be the subject of a cap under regulations to be made by Scottish Ministers) and any expenses recovered from the opponent. Success fee agreements are said to be popular with clients since they are simple to understand, make the cost of the litigation more predictable and mean that the client does not have to pay anything until the case is concluded.
64. Further, an action under group procedure in the Court of Session, which allows a group of similarly affected persons to bring a single claim attracting a single fee instead of multiple individual claims each incurring separate fees.

Additional Matters raised

65. A number of other specific suggestions were identified during the consultation.

OPG Fees

66. The Scottish Government has listened to what has been said about fees for powers of attorney. Whilst encouraging people to seek powers of attorney is important, it is also important that the costs of applications are met and that the courts are funded. The Scottish Government does not believe that current fee levels act as a significant barrier to the uptake of Powers of Attorney in Scotland. The Scottish Government will monitor the situation as it considers the future direction of fees.

Exemptions

67. As has been noted, the Scottish Government views the court fees exemptions as being absolutely fundamental to protecting access to justice. It is therefore committed to ensuring that the system is as robust as possible in ensuring that the most vulnerable members of society are protected.
68. The Scottish Government notes that there could be cases where an individual of limited means who would be financially eligible for civil legal aid or UK benefits is not in receipt of these at the relevant time, for example because they are waiting for an eligibility assessment to be completed. Such an individual experiencing

hardship may make an application to the Scottish Welfare Fund³ which provides a safety net in a disaster or emergency.

69. As outlined above, the Scottish Government proposes that there be an increase in the income cut-off for the benefit related exemptions from £18,000 to £20,592, and that those on PIP with an income of £20.592 will be exempt from court fees. These reforms increase the coverage of the exemption scheme, reduce the chances of vulnerable people not qualifying for any exemption and thereby increase access to justice.

Conclusion

70. Having considered the consultation responses fully, the Scottish Government intends to increase most fees by 2% in each of the next three years. This is well under the inflation rates at present. According to the OBR in its 'Economic and fiscal outlook - March 2022'⁴, the Consumer Price Index was at 5.5% in January 2022, and is expected to rise to 9% in the fourth quarter of this year and fall back to 4% in 2023.
71. Additionally the Scottish Government will create the new fees and make the changes to fee narratives that were described in the consultation.
72. The fees in these Orders are expected to run until 31 March 2025. A further consultation to consider further changes at that point will be expected in 2024. In addition, in the interim, the Scottish Government will monitor the following factors to see if they require changes to the fees regime.
- The continued roll-out of universal credit
 - The impact of other legislation such as the Civil Litigation (Expenses and Group Procedure) Act 2018 which provides for group proceedings.
 - The impact of wider court reforms such as the proposed Human Rights Bill and the Legal Aid Bill.



© Crown copyright 2022



This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at www.gov.scot

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at

The Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

ISBN: 978-1-80435-500-8 (web only)

Published by The Scottish Government, June 2022

Produced for The Scottish Government by APS Group Scotland, 21 Tennant Street, Edinburgh EH6 5NA
PPDAS1094062 (06/22)

W W W . g o v . s c o t