



FOIL UPDATE

May 2009

Lord Justice Jackson's Preliminary Report

If you're looking to emphasize that your examination of civil costs is indeed a heavyweight investigation, publishing a 1000 page, 54 chapter, preliminary report is certainly one way to go about it. Having heard the views of numerous interested parties over the past four months Lord Justice Jackson is keen to rule very little in or out at this stage of his year-long review. The report contains a few glimpses of his preliminary views but for the most part, in this early report, he is setting out the arguments and gearing up for the real work, cutting through the rhetoric and focussing on a forensic analysis, which will guide the future decision making required before he publishes his final report in December.

For those who have been involved in the issue of costs reform in the past there is some feeling of déjà vu. An increase in the small claims limit for personal injury cases is again on the agenda after its rejection following the DCA consultation in 2007. The prospect of process reform for all cases up to £25k is raised again, echoing the DCA proposals in 2007, resulting in the current process reform programme for RTA cases up to £10k. The idea of 'medical scoring' to assist decisions on quantum is back, having been considered by the Law Commission in 1998.

One-way costs shifting

There are new ideas in the report, in particular, His Lordship is looking in detail at the possibility of one-way costs shifting, enabling claimants to recover costs if they are successful but preventing costs orders against them if they lose. Evidence from an un-named insurance company indicates that in 22,726 cases reported to it during 2008 it paid £2,976,541 in claimants' ATE premiums and only received the benefit of a costs order against a claimant in "one or two" cases. Abolishing ATE is not without risk: in its discussions with Jackson on this issue FOIL called for safeguards if this change were introduced, to discourage frivolous cases and to

"The personal injury litigation industry is populated by numerous interest groups and middlemen, all of whom have to meet their overheads and make a profit on top. If any layer of activity can be removed from the process (and insurance against adverse costs liability is one layer of activity), it may be thought that this will serve the public interest".

Part 6 para 3.5 Preliminary Report

encourage the acceptance of reasonable offers. Jackson's tentative view is that CFAs already provide some protection against both risks.

Small claims limit

In his examination of the small claims limit Jackson LJ raises four possibilities: an increase to £5k; a lesser increase, perhaps to £2.5k; an increase with inflation; and no increase. He runs through the arguments for and against an increase, ranging from APIL's concerns that specialist RTA firms would be "decimated due to the loss of a significant amount of business", through access to justice concerns, onto arguments that ATE would become much more expensive for those cases remaining in the fast track. As Anthony Hughes outlines,

"I am concerned that a change of this kind would encourage claim inflation. It would not be too difficult to stretch an average motor claim up to £5,000 in total. I can also imagine that allocation would become much more difficult if legal representation and costs rested on the decision."

Process Reform

In Lord Justice Jackson's view the "costs of personal injury litigation remains remarkably high". He examines some of the arguments put to him to explain the cost, and, in particular, the higher costs incurred by claimants. A myriad of reasons are cited by claimants including the cost of getting work, the time spent with the client, and cash flow. Defendants counter with arguments focussing on the fact that claimants have no interest in the level of fees, the high hourly rates charged by claimants, referral fees, claimants' exploitation of the litigation process and the lack of competitive tendering. Jackson sees "force on both sides" although he notes that in his straw polls a majority of solicitors indicated that they would support the abolition of referral fees. In Jackson LJ's preliminary view process reform for cases under £25k "makes eminently good sense". He goes on to suggest that it would be sensible to dovetail in the development of the current MOJ RTA process reform with his own proposals, an idea which, if accepted, would put out of the question any implementation of the current MOJ proposals by April 2010.

Contingency fees and CFAs

Jackson LJ acknowledges that the case for contingency fees has been developing slowly. He weighs up the pros and cons which have been put to him but gives no steer on his view except to note that contingency fees have worked satisfactory in Canada, where costs shifting is permitted. One benefit of contingency fees would be a simpler regime than CFAs: in Jackson's view the regulation requiring CFAs to be explained to clients is "completely unrealistic" and, now that success fees and ATE premiums are recoverable, "completely pointless".

Jackson notes that whilst contingency fees are proportionate to damages they can produce a disproportionate reward for lawyers although comments that this result "may not be as common as is sometimes suggested".

He raises various questions to be addressed in the next phase of the review: should contingency fees be permitted?; should costs be recovered on a conventional basis or by reference to the contingency fee?; how should contingency fees be regulated?

In the section on CFAs Jackson LJ's preliminary view is that "some form of payment by results must exist". The questions for the next phase are very broad brush, asking if CFAs in their present form are satisfactory; what reforms should be introduced to create appropriate incentives; and what impact CFAs have had upon various types of litigation.

The question of recoverability of success fees and ATE premiums is

When CFAs were first introduced, the Bar Council's CFA Panel advised barristers that when discussing settlement with clients, they were obliged to point out that it was in the barrister's interest if the client did accept the money on offer. In practice, this becomes almost impossible.

Clients are very often reluctant to accept that they must bear a proportion of the blame for an accident and equally often have hugely inflated expectations as to what their claims are worth or as to what a realistic settlement value is, taking into account the risks on both sides. It becomes totally artificial for a barrister who considers that the other side have made a reasonable offer to advise his client to accept that offer while at the same time stating that it is in his or her interests that such an offer be accepted. These problems are magnified considerably when the settlement discussions are under pressure at the door of the court and even more so when the defendant makes a global offer inclusive of costs as occurs frequently.

If you ask an individual claimant lawyer what he thinks of CFAs, he may give a subjective answer depending on whether he has made or lost money out of them. However, taking an objective view of them, we believe that the system has brought the civil justice system into disrepute."
Evidence of the Personal Injuries Bar Association to the Jackson Review

raised but left open. It is noted in the report that recoverability has increased access to justice for claimants and increased the burden on defendants. No view is expressed on whether there is an ATE market. Views are sought in the next phase on a number of issues:

- The appropriateness of the levels of success fees and ATE premiums
- Whether success fees and premiums should be recoverable
- If not, what steps should be taken to provide for the funding of personal injury cases, and what steps should be taken to provide access to justice for those who currently depend upon success fees and ATE insurance.

BTE and a possible CLAF

Jackson LJ believes it would be in the public interest to promote a substantial extension of BTE insurance. He will be looking further at the Bar Council's proposals that BTE insurance should become compulsory in the same way as motor insurance. Comment is sought on the feasibility and merits of that proposal and ideas are requested on how a substantially more intensive take-up of BTE insurance can be promoted. Interest is expressed in a CLAF, which much more work to be done.

Summary Assessment

The benefits and drawbacks of summary assessment are set out, with claims of speed and reduced cost being countered by claims that summary assessment is "arbitrary, rushed and inconsistent" (a view that accords with the experience of FOIL members).

Three options are mooted:

- No change, which "must be seriously considered" as it is "not the function of the review to make change for changes sake";
- Abolition – judges could be encouraged to order the paying party to make an interim payment on account followed by agreement on costs or detailed assessment;
- Restructure - keep summary assessment but revise the rules, for example, it could be limited to circumstances where the judge has sufficient experience/training, when there is sufficient time, and where everyone has the necessary information and a chance to consider it.

This is an impressive report: a thorough review of costs in the civil litigation system. It is clear that Lord Justice Jackson has undertaken a huge amount of research and his forensic, evidence based approach is to be welcomed. It is particularly pleasing to see that the report is neutral in tone and apparently free from political interference.

It is important to note that the real work starts now. With the second 'consultation' stage of the process underway much more research and discussion is needed. FOIL will be at the fore-front of providing information and comment to inform the debate and encourage the reforms that members have already identified as crucial. The preliminary report will be analysed further over the next few days and a further FOIL consultation document will be circulated to enable members to comments on all of the issues upon which Jackson LJ has sought views.

If you have views you would like to express at this stage please use the discussion board on the website or contact Shirley Denyer on shirley.denyer@foil.org.uk

This publication is intended to provide general guidance only. It does not give legal or professional advice and is not to be used in providing the same. Whilst all efforts have been made to ensure that the information is accurate all liability (including liability for negligence) is excluded to the fullest extent lawfully permitted for any loss or damage howsoever arising from the use of this guidance.



FOIL UPDATE

May 2009

Lord Justice Jackson's Preliminary Report

If you're looking to emphasize that your examination of civil costs is indeed a heavyweight investigation, publishing a 1000 page, 54 chapter, preliminary report is certainly one way to go about it. Having heard the views of numerous interested parties over the past four months Lord Justice Jackson is keen to rule very little in or out at this stage of his year-long review. The report contains a few glimpses of his preliminary views but for the most part, in this early report, he is setting out the arguments and gearing up for the real work, cutting through the rhetoric and focussing on a forensic analysis, which will guide the future decision making required before he publishes his final report in December.

For those who have been involved in the issue of costs reform in the past there is some feeling of déjà vu. An increase in the small claims limit for personal injury cases is again on the agenda after its rejection following the DCA consultation in 2007. The prospect of process reform for all cases up to £25k is raised again, echoing the DCA proposals in 2007, resulting in the current process reform programme for RTA cases up to £10k. The idea of 'medical scoring' to assist decisions on quantum is back, having been considered by the Law Commission in 1998.

One-way costs shifting

There are new ideas in the report, in particular, His Lordship is looking in detail at the possibility of one-way costs shifting, enabling claimants to recover costs if they are successful but preventing costs orders against them if they lose. Evidence from an un-named insurance company indicates that in 22,726 cases reported to it during 2008 it paid £2,976,541 in claimants' ATE premiums and only received the benefit of a costs order against a claimant in "one or two" cases. Abolishing ATE is not without risk: in its discussions with Jackson on this issue FOIL called for safeguards if this change were introduced, to discourage frivolous cases and to

"The personal injury litigation industry is populated by numerous interest groups and middlemen, all of whom have to meet their overheads and make a profit on top. If any layer of activity can be removed from the process (and insurance against adverse costs liability is one layer of activity), it may be thought that this will serve the public interest".

Part 6 para 3.5 Preliminary Report

encourage the acceptance of reasonable offers. Jackson's tentative view is that CFAs already provide some protection against both risks.

Small claims limit

In his examination of the small claims limit Jackson LJ raises four possibilities: an increase to £5k; a lesser increase, perhaps to £2.5k; an increase with inflation; and no increase. He runs through the arguments for and against an increase, ranging from APIL's concerns that specialist RTA firms would be "decimated due to the loss of a significant amount of business", through access to justice concerns, onto arguments that ATE would become much more expensive for those cases remaining in the fast track. As Anthony Hughes outlines,

"I am concerned that a change of this kind would encourage claim inflation. It would not be too difficult to stretch an average motor claim up to £5,000 in total. I can also imagine that allocation would become much more difficult if legal representation and costs rested on the decision."

Process Reform

In Lord Justice Jackson's view the "costs of personal injury litigation remains remarkably high". He examines some of the arguments put to him to explain the cost, and, in particular, the higher costs incurred by claimants. A myriad of reasons are cited by claimants including the cost of getting work, the time spent with the client, and cash flow. Defendants counter with arguments focussing on the fact that claimants have no interest in the level of fees, the high hourly rates charged by claimants, referral fees, claimants' exploitation of the litigation process and the lack of competitive tendering. Jackson sees "force on both sides" although he notes that in his straw polls a majority of solicitors indicated that they would support the abolition of referral fees. In Jackson LJ's preliminary view process reform for cases under £25k "makes eminently good sense". He goes on to suggest that it would be sensible to dovetail in the development of the current MOJ RTA process reform with his own proposals, an idea which, if accepted, would put out of the question any implementation of the current MOJ proposals by April 2010.

Contingency fees and CFAs

Jackson LJ acknowledges that the case for contingency fees has been developing slowly. He weighs up the pros and cons which have been put to him but gives no steer on his view except to note that contingency fees have worked satisfactory in Canada, where costs shifting is permitted. One benefit of contingency fees would be a simpler regime than CFAs: in Jackson's view the regulation requiring CFAs to be explained to clients is "completely unrealistic" and, now that success fees and ATE premiums are recoverable, "completely pointless".

Jackson notes that whilst contingency fees are proportionate to damages they can produce a disproportionate reward for lawyers although comments that this result "may not be as common as is sometimes suggested".

He raises various questions to be addressed in the next phase of the review: should contingency fees be permitted?; should costs be recovered on a conventional basis or by reference to the contingency fee?; how should contingency fees be regulated?

In the section on CFAs Jackson LJ's preliminary view is that "some form of payment by results must exist". The questions for the next phase are very broad brush, asking if CFAs in their present form are satisfactory; what reforms should be introduced to create appropriate incentives; and what impact CFAs have had upon various types of litigation.

The question of recoverability of success fees and ATE premiums is

When CFAs were first introduced, the Bar Council's CFA Panel advised barristers that when discussing settlement with clients, they were obliged to point out that it was in the barrister's interest if the client did accept the money on offer. In practice, this becomes almost impossible.

Clients are very often reluctant to accept that they must bear a proportion of the blame for an accident and equally often have hugely inflated expectations as to what their claims are worth or as to what a realistic settlement value is, taking into account the risks on both sides. It becomes totally artificial for a barrister who considers that the other side have made a reasonable offer to advise his client to accept that offer while at the same time stating that it is in his or her interests that such an offer be accepted. These problems are magnified considerably when the settlement discussions are under pressure at the door of the court and even more so when the defendant makes a global offer inclusive of costs as occurs frequently.

If you ask an individual claimant lawyer what he thinks of CFAs, he may give a subjective answer depending on whether he has made or lost money out of them. However, taking an objective view of them, we believe that the system has brought the civil justice system into disrepute."
Evidence of the Personal Injuries Bar Association to the Jackson Review

raised but left open. It is noted in the report that recoverability has increased access to justice for claimants and increased the burden on defendants. No view is expressed on whether there is an ATE market. Views are sought in the next phase on a number of issues:

- The appropriateness of the levels of success fees and ATE premiums
- Whether success fees and premiums should be recoverable
- If not, what steps should be taken to provide for the funding of personal injury cases, and what steps should be taken to provide access to justice for those who currently depend upon success fees and ATE insurance.

BTE and a possible CLAF

Jackson LJ believes it would be in the public interest to promote a substantial extension of BTE insurance. He will be looking further at the Bar Council's proposals that BTE insurance should become compulsory in the same way as motor insurance. Comment is sought on the feasibility and merits of that proposal and ideas are requested on how a substantially more intensive take-up of BTE insurance can be promoted. Interest is expressed in a CLAF, which much more work to be done.

Summary Assessment

The benefits and drawbacks of summary assessment are set out, with claims of speed and reduced cost being countered by claims that summary assessment is "arbitrary, rushed and inconsistent" (a view that accords with the experience of FOIL members).

Three options are mooted:

- No change, which "must be seriously considered" as it is "not the function of the review to make change for changes sake";
- Abolition – judges could be encouraged to order the paying party to make an interim payment on account followed by agreement on costs or detailed assessment;
- Restructure - keep summary assessment but revise the rules, for example, it could be limited to circumstances where the judge has sufficient experience/training, when there is sufficient time, and where everyone has the necessary information and a chance to consider it.

This is an impressive report: a thorough review of costs in the civil litigation system. It is clear that Lord Justice Jackson has undertaken a huge amount of research and his forensic, evidence based approach is to be welcomed. It is particularly pleasing to see that the report is neutral in tone and apparently free from political interference.

It is important to note that the real work starts now. With the second 'consultation' stage of the process underway much more research and discussion is needed. FOIL will be at the fore-front of providing information and comment to inform the debate and encourage the reforms that members have already identified as crucial. The preliminary report will be analysed further over the next few days and a further FOIL consultation document will be circulated to enable members to comments on all of the issues upon which Jackson LJ has sought views.

If you have views you would like to express at this stage please use the discussion board on the website or contact Shirley Denyer on shirley.denyer@foil.org.uk

This publication is intended to provide general guidance only. It does not give legal or professional advice and is not to be used in providing the same. Whilst all efforts have been made to ensure that the information is accurate all liability (including liability for negligence) is excluded to the fullest extent lawfully permitted for any loss or damage howsoever arising from the use of this guidance.



FOIL UPDATE

May 2009

Lord Justice Jackson's Preliminary Report

If you're looking to emphasize that your examination of civil costs is indeed a heavyweight investigation, publishing a 1000 page, 54 chapter, preliminary report is certainly one way to go about it. Having heard the views of numerous interested parties over the past four months Lord Justice Jackson is keen to rule very little in or out at this stage of his year-long review. The report contains a few glimpses of his preliminary views but for the most part, in this early report, he is setting out the arguments and gearing up for the real work, cutting through the rhetoric and focussing on a forensic analysis, which will guide the future decision making required before he publishes his final report in December.

For those who have been involved in the issue of costs reform in the past there is some feeling of déjà vu. An increase in the small claims limit for personal injury cases is again on the agenda after its rejection following the DCA consultation in 2007. The prospect of process reform for all cases up to £25k is raised again, echoing the DCA proposals in 2007, resulting in the current process reform programme for RTA cases up to £10k. The idea of 'medical scoring' to assist decisions on quantum is back, having been considered by the Law Commission in 1998.

One-way costs shifting

There are new ideas in the report, in particular, His Lordship is looking in detail at the possibility of one-way costs shifting, enabling claimants to recover costs if they are successful but preventing costs orders against them if they lose. Evidence from an un-named insurance company indicates that in 22,726 cases reported to it during 2008 it paid £2,976,541 in claimants' ATE premiums and only received the benefit of a costs order against a claimant in "one or two" cases. Abolishing ATE is not without risk: in its discussions with Jackson on this issue FOIL called for safeguards if this change were introduced, to discourage frivolous cases and to

"The personal injury litigation industry is populated by numerous interest groups and middlemen, all of whom have to meet their overheads and make a profit on top. If any layer of activity can be removed from the process (and insurance against adverse costs liability is one layer of activity), it may be thought that this will serve the public interest".

Part 6 para 3.5 Preliminary Report

encourage the acceptance of reasonable offers. Jackson's tentative view is that CFAs already provide some protection against both risks.

Small claims limit

In his examination of the small claims limit Jackson LJ raises four possibilities: an increase to £5k; a lesser increase, perhaps to £2.5k; an increase with inflation; and no increase. He runs through the arguments for and against an increase, ranging from APIL's concerns that specialist RTA firms would be "decimated due to the loss of a significant amount of business", through access to justice concerns, onto arguments that ATE would become much more expensive for those cases remaining in the fast track. As Anthony Hughes outlines,

"I am concerned that a change of this kind would encourage claim inflation. It would not be too difficult to stretch an average motor claim up to £5,000 in total. I can also imagine that allocation would become much more difficult if legal representation and costs rested on the decision."

Process Reform

In Lord Justice Jackson's view the "costs of personal injury litigation remains remarkably high". He examines some of the arguments put to him to explain the cost, and, in particular, the higher costs incurred by claimants. A myriad of reasons are cited by claimants including the cost of getting work, the time spent with the client, and cash flow. Defendants counter with arguments focussing on the fact that claimants have no interest in the level of fees, the high hourly rates charged by claimants, referral fees, claimants' exploitation of the litigation process and the lack of competitive tendering. Jackson sees "force on both sides" although he notes that in his straw polls a majority of solicitors indicated that they would support the abolition of referral fees. In Jackson LJ's preliminary view process reform for cases under £25k "makes eminently good sense". He goes on to suggest that it would be sensible to dovetail in the development of the current MOJ RTA process reform with his own proposals, an idea which, if accepted, would put out of the question any implementation of the current MOJ proposals by April 2010.

Contingency fees and CFAs

Jackson LJ acknowledges that the case for contingency fees has been developing slowly. He weighs up the pros and cons which have been put to him but gives no steer on his view except to note that contingency fees have worked satisfactory in Canada, where costs shifting is permitted. One benefit of contingency fees would be a simpler regime than CFAs: in Jackson's view the regulation requiring CFAs to be explained to clients is "completely unrealistic" and, now that success fees and ATE premiums are recoverable, "completely pointless".

Jackson notes that whilst contingency fees are proportionate to damages they can produce a disproportionate reward for lawyers although comments that this result "may not be as common as is sometimes suggested".

He raises various questions to be addressed in the next phase of the review: should contingency fees be permitted?; should costs be recovered on a conventional basis or by reference to the contingency fee?; how should contingency fees be regulated?

In the section on CFAs Jackson LJ's preliminary view is that "some form of payment by results must exist". The questions for the next phase are very broad brush, asking if CFAs in their present form are satisfactory; what reforms should be introduced to create appropriate incentives; and what impact CFAs have had upon various types of litigation.

The question of recoverability of success fees and ATE premiums is

When CFAs were first introduced, the Bar Council's CFA Panel advised barristers that when discussing settlement with clients, they were obliged to point out that it was in the barrister's interest if the client did accept the money on offer. In practice, this becomes almost impossible.

Clients are very often reluctant to accept that they must bear a proportion of the blame for an accident and equally often have hugely inflated expectations as to what their claims are worth or as to what a realistic settlement value is, taking into account the risks on both sides. It becomes totally artificial for a barrister who considers that the other side have made a reasonable offer to advise his client to accept that offer while at the same time stating that it is in his or her interests that such an offer be accepted. These problems are magnified considerably when the settlement discussions are under pressure at the door of the court and even more so when the defendant makes a global offer inclusive of costs as occurs frequently.

If you ask an individual claimant lawyer what he thinks of CFAs, he may give a subjective answer depending on whether he has made or lost money out of them. However, taking an objective view of them, we believe that the system has brought the civil justice system into disrepute."
Evidence of the Personal Injuries Bar Association to the Jackson Review

raised but left open. It is noted in the report that recoverability has increased access to justice for claimants and increased the burden on defendants. No view is expressed on whether there is an ATE market. Views are sought in the next phase on a number of issues:

- The appropriateness of the levels of success fees and ATE premiums
- Whether success fees and premiums should be recoverable
- If not, what steps should be taken to provide for the funding of personal injury cases, and what steps should be taken to provide access to justice for those who currently depend upon success fees and ATE insurance.

BTE and a possible CLAF

Jackson LJ believes it would be in the public interest to promote a substantial extension of BTE insurance. He will be looking further at the Bar Council's proposals that BTE insurance should become compulsory in the same way as motor insurance. Comment is sought on the feasibility and merits of that proposal and ideas are requested on how a substantially more intensive take-up of BTE insurance can be promoted. Interest is expressed in a CLAF, which much more work to be done.

Summary Assessment

The benefits and drawbacks of summary assessment are set out, with claims of speed and reduced cost being countered by claims that summary assessment is "arbitrary, rushed and inconsistent" (a view that accords with the experience of FOIL members).

Three options are mooted:

- No change, which "must be seriously considered" as it is "not the function of the review to make change for changes sake";
- Abolition – judges could be encouraged to order the paying party to make an interim payment on account followed by agreement on costs or detailed assessment;
- Restructure - keep summary assessment but revise the rules, for example, it could be limited to circumstances where the judge has sufficient experience/training, when there is sufficient time, and where everyone has the necessary information and a chance to consider it.

This is an impressive report: a thorough review of costs in the civil litigation system. It is clear that Lord Justice Jackson has undertaken a huge amount of research and his forensic, evidence based approach is to be welcomed. It is particularly pleasing to see that the report is neutral in tone and apparently free from political interference.

It is important to note that the real work starts now. With the second 'consultation' stage of the process underway much more research and discussion is needed. FOIL will be at the fore-front of providing information and comment to inform the debate and encourage the reforms that members have already identified as crucial. The preliminary report will be analysed further over the next few days and a further FOIL consultation document will be circulated to enable members to comments on all of the issues upon which Jackson LJ has sought views.

If you have views you would like to express at this stage please use the discussion board on the website or contact Shirley Denyer on shirley.denyier@foil.org.uk

This publication is intended to provide general guidance only. It does not give legal or professional advice and is not to be used in providing the same. Whilst all efforts have been made to ensure that the information is accurate all liability (including liability for negligence) is excluded to the fullest extent lawfully permitted for any loss or damage howsoever arising from the use of this guidance.