

**Time line for application for judicial review the grant of permitted development rights to conduct exploratory drilling for hydrocarbons in Woodburn Forest (water catchment).**

**8 April 2016** - Papers and O53 lodged

**26 April - mention to set date.** The court had notified us that the leave hearing date was set for 6 May. Counsel for Respondent and Notice Party sought to move the date through lack of availability. Judge (Maguire) refused to move the date on account of the urgency of the application.

**6 May - Leave hearing.** Leave granted but Court allows affidavits from Notice Party and Respondent on the question of interim relief – full day in court

**12 May - mention** - Counsel for Respondent undertook to provide statement addressing all issues in O.53 by 17 May on the understanding that application for interim relief does not proceed (chief object of said application being the compulsion of the provision of such a statement)

**17 May** – (afternoon) Respondent’s Statement received by Applicant’s Solicitor

**19 May – mention** - Applicant seeks leave to submit amended O53 in response to Respondent's statement. Counsel for Respondent opposes this and claims that a fresh application is required. Case listed for mention on 25 May to address issue of fresh application.

**24 May** - Applicant lodges skeleton to deal with issue of fresh application

**25 May – Brief hearing** before Treacy J. Adjourned for mention on 1 June – different judge not familiar with papers

**1 June – Short hearing** before Colton J - Respondent objected to amended O53. Adjourned to 6 June to allow application to amend O53. – different judge not familiar with case

**6 June – Short Hearing** before Maguire J. Applicant agree not to proceed with application to amend the O53 Statement on the basis that the parties progress the substantive hearing as expeditiously as possible. Senior Counsel for Applicant was available on 14,16 or 17 June but Counsel for other parties stated that they were not. No court dates were available before end of term. Dates agreed for 22-23 September, as these were first available dates in the court calendar.

**7 September** – Court office advises that the hearing dates of 22 and 23 September are no longer available

**18 October – mention**

**24 November – review;** directions given by court for further submissions

**24 May 2017 – hearing** on academic point – half day

**3 August 2017 – judgment** – judicial review not permitted to proceed as the exploratory drilling had now ceased.

**4 August – mention** – judge directed that there would be no costs order. Senior Counsel attended. (5 mins)

Each mention would have been no more than about 10 minutes if that, often just to agree to a date. I expect Senior Counsel (who appeared at all mentions) charged a fixed fee for appearing at a mention (going rate for private sector is £1k). In fairness the mentions on 19/5, 25/5, 1/6 and 6/6 could have been more substantive but as the judge was not familiar with the case they were simply adjourned.