

Judicial Complaints Reviewer Annual Report 2011/2012

1st September 2011 to 31st August 2012



© Judicial Complaints Reviewer (2013)

The text of this document may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium provided that it is reproduced accurately and is not misleading in context. Please acknowledge the material as Judicial Complaints Reviewer copyright.

If you have any enquiries about this publication, please write to the Judicial Complaints Reviewer at The Stamp Office, 10-14 Waterloo Place, Edinburgh, EH1 3EG

This publication can be downloaded free of charge from www.judicialcomplaintsreviewer.org.uk

Contents

Introduction	1
An Overview of the Role of the Judicial Complaints Reviewer	2
- Background to the Creation of a JCR	3
- How Conduct Complaints Reviews are Handled in the Rest of the United Kingdom	3
- What Happens When a Review Request is Received	4
Successes and Challenges in the First Year	5
- Issues Emerging from Reviews	7
Statistics 2011/2012	12
Appendix: Who is the Judicial Complaints Reviewer?	16

Introduction

The role of Judicial Complaints Reviewer (JCR) was created by The Judiciary and Courts (Scotland) Act 2008 to review the handling of complaints investigations into members of the judiciary – judges, sheriffs and justices of the peace – to ensure that they have been dealt with in accordance with the Rules¹.

I was appointed as the first Judicial Complaints Reviewer for Scotland on 1st September 2011 for a three-year term. This, my first annual report, explains my role and gives an account of what I have done during this first year.

When it comes to the publication of annual reports, the legislation is ambiguous, but Scottish Ministers have clarified that the policy intention was that I would produce an annual report. However, I have no independent power to publish reports and may do so only if directed by Scottish Ministers. I am grateful to the Cabinet Secretary for Justice for the direction to report publicly on my work during this first year and hope that I will have the opportunity to produce an annual report for each subsequent year.

Moi Ali
Judicial Complaints Reviewer
January 2013

¹ Complaints about the Judiciary (Scotland) Rules 2011

An Overview of the Role of the Judicial Complaints Reviewer

As the position of Judicial Complaints Reviewer (JCR) is completely new, it is sensible to begin by explaining how I was appointed, how I run my office and what the role entails.

I was appointed by Scottish Ministers, with the Lord President's consent, following a publicly advertised and open process. However, I do not work for the Lord President, for Scottish Government or for Scottish Ministers. I am completely independent, although I must comply with any guidance issued by the Scottish Ministers. (To date, no guidance has been issued.)

I provide a free, impartial service to anyone who has made a complaint about a judicial office holder (JOH), who wishes its handling to be reviewed. My services are equally available to any JOH who has been the subject of an investigation and requests that the investigation be reviewed.

The legislation² states that the JCR must not be a member of the Scottish Executive or a civil servant; a member of the House of Commons, the Scottish Parliament or the European Parliament; a Minister of the Crown; or a current or former judicial office holder, solicitor, advocate or barrister. You can read brief biographical details for me in the appendix to this report.

I am engaged to work for up to 36 days per year, for which I may claim a fee of £210 per day. During my first year I worked as JCR for approximately 44 days, claiming fees for 36 of those days. I have the use of a desk at the Scottish Legal Complaints Commission in Edinburgh but I have no staff and no administrative support. Excluding my daily fee, my annual budget is £2,000 to cover running costs.

My remit is twofold. First, I may review investigations administered by the Judicial Office for Scotland to check that they have been carried out in accordance with the Lord President's Rules³. In addition to this, I may "make written representations to the Lord President about procedures for handling the investigation of matters concerning the conduct of judicial office holders." The Lord President, who is the head of the judiciary in Scotland, must have regard to my representations.

The JCR is not an ombudsman and I have no powers to obtain compensation, apologies or other redress for complainers. I can check that the Rules were followed, and I can make wider

² The Judiciary and Courts (Scotland) Act 2008

³ Complaints about the Judiciary (Scotland) Rules 2011

representations to the Lord President that may help to improve the complaints process for others. I cannot overturn decisions, although I can make referrals to the Lord President, who may then re-open an investigation if appropriate.

Background to the Creation of a JCR

From the outset there were some reservations about the creation of a JCR. When the Justice Committee discussed the then Bill back in 2008, the evidence received by the Committee from the judiciary was not supportive. Some said that it was “unnecessary” to have a JCR and feared that it was “likely to generate significant public expenditure” and “might not be cost effective.”

I hope that this report will allay some of the initial concerns among the judiciary that the creation of a JCR would be costly, bureaucratic and of limited value and that it will, as the Cabinet Secretary suggested at the time, be “beneficial and will protect us against the accusation that the system is simply about judges reviewing themselves to protect themselves.”

How Conduct Complaints Reviews are Handled in the Rest of the United Kingdom

In England and Wales there is a combined judicial conduct/appointments ombudsman (JACO), currently Sir John Brigstocke KCB. He has a dual role. Part of his remit is to investigate concerns raised by a complainant, or a judicial office holder who has been the subject of a complaint, about how the complaint was handled under the regulated disciplinary function, by the Office for Judicial Complaints (the body which deals with complaints about the judiciary in England and Wales), a Tribunal President or a Magistrates’ Advisory Committee to ascertain whether there was a failure to follow prescribed procedures. That element of his role is similar to my own, although I may review only the handling of investigations under the Rules, and furthermore, as an ombudsman, he has wider powers to look at maladministration and to make recommendations for redress, including compensation. He may also set aside the original decision and direct a new review to be undertaken, but in Scotland that power is reserved for the Lord President.

The JACO may also investigate complaints from candidates for judicial office who claim to have been adversely affected by maladministration in the way in which their application for appointment, and/or their subsequent complaint to the Judicial Appointments Commission, was handled. In Scotland that part of his role is handled by the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman.

In Northern Ireland there is an ombudsman for judicial appointments but conduct complaints are handled by the Lord Chief Justice of Northern Ireland, who is the head of the judiciary and the equivalent of Scotland's Lord President. There is no mechanism there for independent review.

What Happens When a Review Request is Received?

Review requests can be made by post, email or via the Judicial Complaints Reviewer's website. Once a request has been acknowledged and I have established that it falls within my remit, I ask the Judicial Office for Scotland to send me their complaint file.

Taking into account all of the information that I have before me, I carefully review the case files and compare what happened against what the Rules require in those circumstances. My initial review is a retrospective review of the documentation relating to a complaint, but often I need to correspond with or to meet with the Judicial Office to gain a better understanding of the case or to discuss some of the wider issues arising from it.

Once my review is complete, I draft a determination and send it to the Judicial Office for comments as to factual accuracy. My final determination is sent to the complainer and copied to the Judicial Office for information. Where I find that the Rules were not followed, I also send a copy of my determination to the Lord President, drawing his attention to any breaches.

Sometimes I find that although the Rules were followed, there are issues around how the case was handled which need to be addressed. You can read more about some of these wider issues elsewhere in this report. In such cases I bring these the attention of either the Judicial Office – if they are straightforward operational matters – or, if the issues are more fundamental, I write to the Lord President. I also bring to the Lord President's attention any issues relating to the Rules. In this way, the service for others can be improved.

Successes and Challenges in the First Year

As might be expected during the first year of any new creation, there have been challenges – but also many successes.

The first challenge came on Day 1 when I took up the role. There were two review requests awaiting me, but I had no means of dealing with them as I had no computer, printer, telephone, email address or stationery. I quickly established an office and began some induction into the role, which involved useful fact-finding meetings with other complaints handling organisations such as the Scottish Public Service Ombudsman, the Scottish Legal Complaints Commission and a visit to my counterpart in England and Wales, the office of the Judicial Appointments and Conduct Ombudsman. My thanks go to them all for the advice and assistance they provided. My induction also involved a visit to the courts, and I thank Livingston Sheriff Court for facilitating my visit.

As the first person to occupy this role, much of my time has been spent on one-off, time-consuming activities such as establishing a website from scratch, creating policies and procedures, drafting standard letters, working towards a Memorandum of Understanding with the Judicial Office, and familiarising myself with the Act. This is the nature of any new operation, but it was challenging undertaking it all single-handedly – and handling complex reviews – all in just 36 days. In the coming year I should have more time to devote to reviews, and hope to be able to improve upon my turnaround times as a result.

I had a number of meetings during the year with Scottish Government officials and regular quarterly meetings with the Judicial Office for Scotland, in addition to other meetings with them as necessary. I have not had any meetings with the Lord President, but it is hoped that we will meet in early 2013. Having established the office, next year I would like to have networking meetings with a wider range of stakeholders – particularly with what might be termed consumer organisations – if time allows.

An early challenge presented itself when I studied the Act. Unlike my counterpart in England and Wales, who may review “complaints”, the Act in Scotland is worded such that I may review only “investigations.” It is an important distinction. The two initial review requests (and all those subsequently received to date) never reached the investigation stage. It seemed to me that the Act did not allow me to review the handling of these cases, as no investigation had been carried out. I am grateful to the then Lord President, Lord Hamilton, for taking a pragmatic view and interpreting the word “investigation”

to mean any complaint concerning a judicial office holder received by the Judicial Office for Scotland, whether it had progressed to investigation or not. The new Lord President, Lord Gill, appears to be taking the same line as his predecessor in this regard. During the year I wrote to the Cabinet Secretary for Justice to alert him to my concerns about the wording of the Act, although it is unlikely that it will be changed.

A further challenge occurred around my understanding of my remit, and the Judicial Office's interpretation of the Act in this respect. That is not entirely surprising, given the newness of my role and of theirs. However, it resulted in an *impasse* that caused delays to finalising determinations. I sought legal advice in a bid to resolve the matter. This was important, as a shared understanding of the role is essential. My view was that I could share wider recommendations stemming from a review with the complainer, but the Judicial Office took the view that this was a private matter between me and the Lord President and that I was limited to telling complainers only whether or not the Rules had been followed. We were unable to reach agreement, but I have been sharing my complete findings with complainers and this has not been further challenged by the Judicial Office. Despite initial teething problems, overall there has been a good working relationship with the Judicial Office and they are always willing to listen to, discuss and consider my suggestions. Aside from our quarterly meetings, we have further meetings as necessary to discuss more immediate issues, including complex cases which benefit from face-to-face dialogue rather than a series of written queries.

During the year I became aware that the complaints files I was sent by the Judicial Office were incomplete. They gave me all correspondence between themselves and the complainer, but I was not being sent copies of correspondence between the Judicial Office and the disciplinary judge, nominated judge and Lord President relating to the complaint. I believe that in order to conduct a review, and to make wider recommendations on complaints handling, I need to see files in their entirety. Without this, it is difficult to satisfy myself, let alone complainers, as to the fairness of the process. Furthermore, without access to all documents, I may miss wider complaints handling issues, thus hindering that part of my remit that is "to make written representations to the Lord President about procedures for the investigation of matters concerning the conduct of judicial office holders". The Judicial Office and Lord President disagree with me on that point. This difference of opinion is delaying agreement of a Memorandum of Understanding which sets out how we will work – including what information I will have access to. I have continued to complete reviews but I have made it clear to complainers that I have not had access to all documentation in their complaint file.

The Rules govern how complaints are handled. During my first year I kept a list of issues relating to the Rules – examples of where the Rules needed clarification or amendment. I had intended to raise these formally as part of the review of the Rules that was due to take place in the summer of 2012. That review did not happen then, although I understand that a consultation is now scheduled to take place in early 2013, and that I will be a consultee. In the absence of a Rule review, at the end of the year I wrote to the Judicial Office and to the Lord President with a round-up of issues that had come to light in the previous 12 months. You can read more about this elsewhere in this report.

If at all possible, next year I would like to shorten the time that it takes to complete a review, from the date that a request arrives, to the time when a final determination is dispatched to the complainer. Inevitably the timescale will always depend on the length and complexity of the original complaint; the time that it takes to get all of the necessary information; and the speed with which the Judicial Office responds to any queries I may have. This year the time necessarily spent setting up the office adversely impacted on turnaround times, but that will not be a factor from now on. However, one factor outwith my control is the number of cases in the queue awaiting review. Working for up to three days per month, with no administrative support, means that queues build up very quickly, especially when several requests for review arrive at around the same time. This results in my being unable to give the level of service that I would like to provide.

Issues Emerging from Reviews

As a result of conducting reviews of complaints, I have come up with a variety of suggestions, recommendations and observations that I believe can help improve the complaints handling service offered by the Judicial Office for Scotland. During the year I have brought these to the attention of either the Judicial Office for Scotland (in the case of administrative issues) or the Lord President (in the case of more substantive matters or anything concerning the Rules). Issues raised to date are as follows:

Partiality

This is perhaps one of the most concerning matters that I came across during the year, in a complaint that was made in 2011/12, but finalised just after the year-end. There was a lack of even-handedness shown when the Judicial Office wrote to the judicial office holder (JOH) with information about their advice to the disciplinary judge, but this was not shared with the complainer. This gave the impression that the JOH was in some way being favoured. The Judicial Office tell me, and I accept it to be the case, that this was an isolated error and is not normal practice. I have not come across it in any of the other reviews that I have completed.

Timescales for correspondence

Some timescales for dealing with correspondence from complainers are set out in the Judicial Office's guidance but there is nothing in the Rules about how quickly a complaint will be acknowledged, for example. I wrote to the Judicial Office explaining that complainers would receive a better service if they knew how long they should expect to have to wait for replies at different stages of an investigation. The Judicial Office has agreed that this would be useful, but that timescales and targets should be set out in the guidance rather than in the Rules. They will publish expected and actual timeframes for the handling of complaints. I welcome the fact that timeframes will be published, and I understand the Judicial Office's argument that using guidance rather than the Rules provides more flexibility. However, I remain of the view that timeframes need to be included in the Rules because otherwise, the Judicial Office could take an unreasonable time to deal with complaints correspondence and I would remain unable to find them in breach of the Rules. There have been a number of occasions thus far where the timescales that are already included in the guidance were not met. I will make this point when I respond to the forthcoming Rules consultation.

Resignation/retiral of judicial office holders

Under the legislation, the complaints process ceases when a judicial office holder resigns or retires. The Rules must reflect the legislation, but I am concerned that a judicial office holder who resigns in order to evade investigation, could theoretically be reappointed at a later date with a 'clean slate'. In such circumstances, the complainer would rightly feel cheated of an investigation into their complaint. While there is no provision within the legislation for investigating those who no longer hold office, the Judicial Office suggested when I raised this that they would consider the matter. They have now put in place a mechanism to ensure that details of substantiated complaints are shared appropriately. (Unsubstantiated allegations are not passed to anyone.) The review team (a team from the Lord President's Private Office tasked with reviewing the Rules) has been asked by him to consider what amendments may be needed to deal with the situation where a former judicial office holder who has resigned with an extant complaint being investigated, subsequently obtains a new judicial appointment. I welcome this.

During the year I reviewed a case in which the complained-about judicial office holder retired and was then re-employed. The retirement occurred before the complaint was made, and the complaint against the JOH did not proceed for other reasons, but the complainers were left believing that the retiral was a cynical attempt to avoid investigation. Public perceptions are important and if the Rules can address some of these concerns, that will help improve public confidence in the complaints system.

Complaint escalation

There is nothing in either the Rules or the guidance on the internal complaints escalation process. In some of the reviews that I have carried out, when a complainer writes to the Judicial Office that they are unhappy with the handling of their complaint, this is reviewed by a more senior member of staff. It is not clear whether this internal escalation is a formal part of the process, open to everyone, or some kind of *ad hoc* process. It would be fairer to have a consistent policy, set out either under the Rules or in published guidance. I have raised this with the Judicial Office and they replied as follows: "You have suggested that we set out a policy for internal review of complaints by a more senior member of staff. The Judicial Office will of course correct any administrative error in dealing with complaints if a complainer writes to us about it. However, we take care not to deal with matters which are for your office and would not want complainers to think that they must go through another stage before writing to you." I agree that complainers should not have to go through an additional hurdle before asking me for a review; I was merely suggesting that where complainers ask the Judicial Office to escalate their complaint internally, this be done on a consistent basis.

Terminology

There is confusion among the public as to what the differences are between the various terms used in the Rules. The terms judicial decision, judicial case management and judicial management of court programming are not explained, either in letters to complainers or elsewhere, and the public is often left none the wiser when told that their complaint has been dismissed on one of these grounds. It is a common theme in the correspondence I have received. I raised this matter with the Judicial Office, and they agree. I am pleased to hear that they intend to revisit the definitions and replace them with something that is simpler to understand. As part of the consultation on the Rules, the Judicial Office will see if they can find a better definition that will remove any ambiguity. This will be a very welcome change to the Rules and may help to reduce the number of complaints that I receive. Currently people simply do not understand the various terms, so they complain to me that their complaint has been unreasonably dismissed by the Judicial Office. Better clarity about these terms would help complainers to understand why their complaint has been handled in the way that it has.

Reasons for dismissal of a complaint

A few complainers have raised concerns about not fully understanding (or not understanding at all) why their complaints have been dismissed by the Judicial Office. For example, they are told that they have failed to make a case for 'exceptional circumstances' or that their complaint concerned 'judicial

decision', but they are left unclear about what this means. While definitions of terminology (see above) will go a long way toward helping complainers to understand why a complaint may have been dismissed, there is also a need to provide more detailed *reasons* for dismissal. I suggested this to the Judicial Office and went so far as to ask them to consider whether it could be covered in the Rules. The Judicial Office replied that their practice now (as opposed to some of the earlier complaints that I reviewed) is to include a fuller explanation of why a complaint is dismissed. The review team is also considering whether the Rules could require that reasons must be given.

Numbering system

I received two review requests during the year which alerted me to the need for the Judicial Office to introduce a more effective numbering system. I found that complainers were being given one case reference number, regardless of the number of distinct complaints they may have made about different judicial office holders (JOHs) on different dates. As a result, quite distinct and separate complaints were conflated rather than treated individually, which hindered the handling of complaints and made review difficult too. In one case, this resulted in a complaint not being handled at all because it was lumped in with other complaints made by the same complainer, even though this one was quite separate from the others. In this case I made a referral to the Lord President, who asked the Judicial Office to look at it again.

The Judicial Office's numbering system also poses a potential problem when it comes to providing accurate complaints statistics. I counted up to nine separate complaints in the case of Mr X, but it counted as just two in the Judicial Office's statistics. Anyone comparing my own statistics with theirs might be confused at the different counting methods. I am pleased to report that the Judicial Office is trialling a numbering system internally, which if successful will be rolled out to all communication with complainers.

Plain English

Following the review of my first case, I recommended that the Judicial Office consider plain English training for complaints handling staff, to enable them to adopt a style of language more appropriate to their public-facing role. They had written such things as: "you have failed to identify the judicial office holder your complaint concerns, therefore your complaint is not validly made and cannot be considered." While the Rules require that the judicial office holder be identified, the tone of that letter (and others written around that time) appeared to me to be unfriendly and unhelpful. Simple rephrasing

to “Please supply the name of the judicial office holder so that we can consider your complaint” would give a very different impression.

Although I still believe that there is room for improvement, I am pleased to report that there has been a noticeable improvement in the style of correspondence coming from the Judicial Office. There is now a member of staff who has plain English training and all staff involved in handling complaints have been involved in improving how the Judicial Office communicates with complainers.

Checklists

This issue arose from a case completed during the year. The complainer asked for an extension of the time limit so that they could make their complaint, and their request was duly considered. However, no one asked the complainer for the date of the alleged misconduct; instead, they used other information in the complaint to reach the conclusion that it was prior to the three-month deadline. As a result, I suggested to the Judicial Office that they produce a checklist to ensure that the necessary information is at hand. This has now been instituted.

Referrals to the Lord President

I asked the Lord President if he would formalise the procedure for considering cases referred to him by the Judicial Complaints Reviewer. He has directed the Judicial Office to ensure that the guidance for complainants is revised to include some information about what complainers can expect when I refer a complaint to him.

Notification of Judicial Office Holder (JOH)

The Rules require that once a complaint has been made to the Judicial Office, which meets the basic criteria, the JOH be notified that a complaint about them has been received. There were a number of cases during the year where this did not happen. I have discussed this issue with the Judicial Office, who have revisited their administrative processes. This appears to have addressed the problem.

Date-stamping

I raised with the Judicial Office the need for accurate date-stamping of all correspondence. I had found that some correspondence was not date stamped at all, or bore the wrong date. The Judicial Office has recognised that there have been errors and omissions in date-stamping correspondence and has provided refresher training to the administrative staff that handle complaints and will regularly review files to help to learn lessons and improve complaints handling practice.

Statistics: September 1st 2011 to August 31st 2012

During the year I received 9 review request letters, which ultimately involved undertaking 20 separate reviews. This is because one letter may involve reviews of several different complaints made at different dates against different judicial office holders by one person. For this reason, I have counted the number of reviews undertaken rather than the number of letters seeking a review. My statistics might therefore not match those published by the Judicial Office.

Not all of these reviews were completed by the end of August 2012. By the end of the first year I had dispatched final determinations to four complainers, and the remaining 16 reviews, although underway (some had been completed but were awaiting comment from the Judicial Office), were not dispatched until September (11), October (2) and November 2012 (3).

Of the four reviews completed during the first year, I found a breach of the Rules in one. In that case, the complainer had complained to the Judicial Office about various matters, the majority of which related to judicial decision: the complainer was unhappy with the outcome of his court case. As there must be no interference in judicial independence, the Judicial Office rightly identified that they could not become involved, that the correct procedure if the complainer was dissatisfied was legal appeal, and that it was not a conduct issue.

However, part of the complaint was in my view a matter of potential judicial conduct. The complainer wrote that the judicial office holder's "behaviour was not right towards me", that he "did not let me finish" and that this left him "insecure and scared". It says in the Judicial Office's 'Complaints about Judicial Conduct Guidance Leaflet' that there are times when a judicial office holder "may have to be firm, direct or assertive in his or her management of the case".

It is true that feelings and emotions can run high on both sides in a court room, and a judicial office holder may have to intervene to manage proceedings. This can make it difficult after the event to assess whether their behaviour was the normal, possibly assertive behaviour that may be necessary in order to ensure the smooth running of the court; or inappropriate, intimidating or unacceptable behaviour. Perception is also a factor: what one person may find completely reasonable, another may find scary.

When the Judicial Office made an initial assessment of this complaint, it was not reasonable for them to conclude that the behaviour complained about, which left the complainer "insecure and scared", fell into the category of judicial decision/case management/court programming. According to the Rules, they

should have referred that element of the complaint to the disciplinary judge for consideration. This did not happen, and instead the complaint, in its entirety, was dismissed. For that reason I made a referral to the Lord President, who then revoked that part of the original determination and referred it to the disciplinary judge, who then dismissed the complaint.

Of the 16 review requests arriving during Year 1, which were not completed until Year 2, 11 breaches of the Rules were identified in nine of these cases. I will report more fully in my next annual report on these reviews, but it is fair to say meantime that many of my findings in these cases related largely to small procedural or administrative breaches that did not have a material effect on the outcome of the complaint.

Table 1: Enquiries, Review Requests and Completions

Review requests received in 2011/12	Reviews completed in 2011/12	Reviews from 2011/12 completed in 2012/13	Enquiries received during 2011/12
9 letters involving 20 reviews	4 reviews	16 reviews	3 (all dealt with during the year)

All review requests received during 2011/12 came from members of the public. I received no requests from judicial office holders.

Table 2: Number of Breaches of the Rules

Reviews requests completed in 2011/12 where breaches were found	Review requests from 2011/12 completed in 2012/13 where breaches were found
1 review (1 breach of the Rules)	9 reviews (11 breaches of the Rules)

During this period I also received three enquiries. One was a request for help in retrieving correspondence from the Judicial Office, and I was able to assist with that. Another came from a member of the public who was confused about who dealt with which aspects of the complaints process. The final enquiry was a request to provide comment on whether it was usual for the Judicial Office to conduct an investigation in the way that it had done so. The complainer did not want me to undertake a review, but merely to give an impartial opinion in response to his summary of events. I was able to provide some reassurance that on the basis of what I had been told, the Rules had been followed.

I have accepted all review requests and have not received any which I deemed to be outwith my remit. However, as part of review requests, I have on occasion been asked to provide help that goes beyond my remit. For example, some complainers have asked me to assist them with their legal case or to provide legal or other advice. I have restricted my role purely to that prescribed by the Act, namely to undertake reviews and where necessary to make written representations to the Lord President. When a complainer writes to me, I make clear which parts of their request I can take further and which bits are beyond my remit.

Compared with England and Wales, the number of review requests is small. My counterpart in England and Wales, the Ombudsman Sir John Brigstocke KCB, received 276 complaints in 2011/12. There are a variety of reasons for this. Obviously the population size of England and Wales is some ten times the size of Scotland's. Furthermore, this is the first year that Scotland has had a Judicial Complaints Reviewer, whereas England and Wales has had an Ombudsman since 2006. It may also be the case that as I do not have the powers of an ombudsman to seek redress, complainers can see no purpose in requesting a review.

There has been a high level of post-review correspondence. By this I mean correspondence from complainers who wish to follow-up on my final determination, either to ask questions, to raise new information or to challenge my findings. This correspondence in cases can span several months and is very time-consuming. During the year I was presented with no arguments which caused me to review my original finding.

Follow-up letters have in cases been helpful in identifying further issues. For example, one follow-up letter identified that the Judicial Office needed to amend its guidance leaflet. The complainers wrote to me that they had been denied access to the Rules by the Judicial Office. I checked and found that this was not the case. However, their complaint helped to highlight a potential issue. While the Rules are freely available online, of course not everyone has access to the internet. The Rules are referred to in the Judicial Office's guidance leaflet, but some people prefer to see the full Rules rather than have to

rely on the inevitably simplified guidance document. The electronic version of the complaints leaflet contains a link to the Rules, but many people receive a paper copy of this and might therefore not know where to go to see the full Rules. I suggested to the Judicial Office that they consider incorporating details of where online the Rules can be found into the guidance document, as well as offering to send a hard copy to anyone requesting one. I am happy report that the Judicial Office have agreed to do this.

APPENDIX

Who is the Judicial Complaints Reviewer?



The first Judicial Complaints Reviewer is Moi Ali. Moi works as a communications consultant and author and also has a number of roles in public life. She spent seven years on the Nursing and Midwifery Council, where her mission was to put public protection and involvement at the heart of healthcare regulation. She also served on the Board of Postwatch, championing the interests of 'hard to reach' consumers and chairing its independent complaints review panel.

More recently, Moi spent six years as a member of the Office for Judicial Complaints' review bodies in England and Wales, until April 2012. Currently she is a member of the Scottish Ambulance Service Board, a member of the Scottish Police Authority, and a member of Education Scotland's audit committee.

In a voluntary capacity Moi is a Governor at Edinburgh Napier University and a Public Appointments Ambassador, encouraging a more diverse range of applicants for public appointments.