

To The Rules Committee

I am even more hesitant to make submissions than last time ( submissions of 10 September 2020) as I am not renewing my current practising certificate. However I make the following points:

Disputes Tribunal – I support increasing the jurisdiction to \$ 50,000 or more as claims of that magnitude are uneconomic for the majority of the citizens to pursue through the District Court yet they are of great value to the people concerned.

I do not support a change of name for the Disputes Tribunals for the following reasons.

- a) name changes only confuse, especially if it is a reversion to a previous name
- b) \$50,000 is not a small claim to most citizens. It amounts to all or most of a year's salary.

I do not support changing the name to adjudicator as it will only cause confusion

Recorders – I was familiar with this system during my pupillage in Lord Ilford's Chambers. It was considered to work well and identify suitable candidates for full time judicial appointments.

Deputy Judges—these were appointed after I left Chambers but my pupil master George Mercer was appointed one and he considered it was very valuable and enabled him to see a case from both sides so that he could do his job as a barrister more effectively.

A major advantage of having Recorders and Deputy Judges is that it adds more flexibility to the supply of judicial officers so that backlogs can be resolved and delays reduced or eliminated.

Please refer to the appendix to my submissions of 10 September 2020 for details of my legal experience.

I make these submissions in my personal capacity

Piers Davies