

IN THE CONSISTORY COURT OF THE DIOCESE OF COVENTRY

In the matter of the Churchyard of Stoneleigh, St Mary the Virgin

IN RE KEITH ROBERT HILLYARD
(DECEASED)

&

ON THE PETITION OF HELEN JENNIFER SCHOFIELD
SEEKING EXHUMATION AND RE-BURIAL

JUDGMENT

1. By a petition dated 28th January 2022 the Petitioner, who has a firm of Solicitors acting for her, seeks exhumation of the buried remains of Keith Robert Hillyard, who had been buried in the same double depth grave as the Petitioner's Mother, Gwendoline Schofield, in the consecrated graveyard of Stoneleigh, St Mary the Virgin. Mr Hillyard, it is agreed, had been the unmarried partner of Gwendoline Schofield and was both a major beneficiary under Mrs Schofield's will and an executor of that will (signed in April 1996). It is asserted by the Petitioner that the relationship between her Mother and Mr Hillyard had 'just about ceased' when Gwendoline Schofield died and that the 'understanding' was that she should be buried in the same grave as her Mother. No evidence, not even anecdotal reports, as to that 'understanding' nor the failed relationship has been provided other than an assertion by the Petitioner, even though the state of the relationship was identified as an issue of relevance in directions of the Court. Of note also, there was no suggestion in the petition to what location it was proposed Mr Hillyard's mortal remains should be

relocated should exhumation be granted. The petitioner did, however, acknowledge that no faculty had ever been sought to preserve for her a right to be buried in the same grave as her Mother. That is also confirmed by the Parish and Diocesan Registry records.

2. The thrust of the petition is that Helen Schofield, as the daughter of the person first buried in a double depth grave, asserts she had a greater right to be buried there than the Mother's unmarried partner, and that she, as the closest living relative of Gwendoline Schofield, should have been consulted before anyone was buried in the same grave as her Mother. The petitioner also sought to rely upon the fact that, although she had not sought a faculty to preserve her right to be buried in the grave, she had written to 'the church' in 2008 stating that she did not wish for Mr Hillyard to be buried with her Mother. (Of note, the letter to the Parish in 2008 was sent from Cyprus, where the petitioner then resided, and bore contact details including an email address registered in Cyprus. Subsequent to that letter being written the Petitioner moved from Cyprus and did not provide any forwarding address to those administering the Parish. I am informed that when a representative of the Parish attempted communication through the given email address (after Mr Hillyard's death) the message 'was undelivered' (i.e. 'bounced' back). The petitioner's current email address bears no resemblance to that she had when in Cyprus. The Petitioner contends that someone from Stoneleigh Church ought to have contacted the Solicitors who dealt with probate for Gwendoline Schofield's estate in the year 2000 in order to track down a more recent address for the Petitioner).

Procedural history of this petition

3. Despite having Solicitors acting on her behalf there had been a previous petition from July 2021 with numerous errors and necessary sections uncompleted, and the signed declaration was palpably wrong. Owing to the errors and, on the face of it, false declaration, certain directions were issued in

September 2021 to permit the errors to be corrected and to give the Petitioner (or her Solicitors) further time to make contact with the relatives of the late Mr Hillyard, that being his nephew and his niece, who had not been asked whether either consented to the exhumation of Mr Hillyard's remains. In the directions a time-frame for compliance was given, with permission to seek extension of time if required, but the directions were not complied with in full and no extension of time was sought. The court was therefore faced with a defective petition bearing false declarations and non-compliance with written directions, so a judgment was issued dismissing that petition.

4. Despite still having Solicitors representing her the new petition from Ms Schofield similarly bears incorrect or contradictory alternative assertions and has a signed declaration that is again incorrect. This time, however, the petitioner had provided some proof of efforts to contact the known remaining relatives of the late Mr Hillyard by, with consent of the Court, placing a notice on a stake upon the grave, which had apparently not elicited any response. Mr Hillyard's estranged daughter, Michelle Hillyard, had already indicated that she had taken no part in his interment, had rescinded her Father's request that she be an executor of his estate, and had no wish to be involved in the request that he be exhumed and re-interred elsewhere.
5. With the Parish being in an interregnum there was no Incumbent to sign the section on the Petition where a Priest is meant to consent, in principle, to the exhumation. As is required in those circumstances the Petitioner had, on 21st July 2021 (so for the previous petition not this) obtained the signed 'consent', in principle, for the exhumation of the Area Dean. I am not aware of what information the Petitioner gave to the Area Dean when seeking her signature. I very much doubt that any counter-argument from those who arranged Mr Hillyard's funeral was presented. I have not been informed whether the Area

Dean was told that Mr Hillyard had specifically requested he be interred in that particular plot in his will.

6. In an attempt to move this matter on, directions were issued in February 2022. These included a requirement for details of the funeral directors it was proposed would carry out the exhumation and re-interment of Mr Hillyard's remains, an assurance from those undertakers that the process would be carried out with decorum, and details of the grave plot within Stoneleigh churchyard where it was proposed the re-interment would take place. Further, as permitted by the faculty jurisdiction rules, there having been no apparent contact with the close relatives of Mr Hillyard - other than his estranged daughter - it was directed that the Petitioner should put notice in the local papers for the last known address of each of Mr Hillyard's known relatives (his nephew and his niece) concerning the petition and asking that those relatives get in touch with her or her Solicitor. Another direction was that if, by a certain date, there had been no contact made by Mr Hillyard's relatives with the petitioner, or those representing her, the Diocesan Registry should ensure that a letter was sent to each at his or her last known address, giving details of the petition.
7. In the February directions it was indicated that the matter would be determined on written representations unless any person made representations otherwise. There has been no representation from any person that a formal hearing of the petition should be held.
8. In response to the February directions the Solicitors representing the Petitioner provided details of the likely fees that would be charged by W. Goodwin & Sons, funeral directors, for exhumation and re-interment. The correspondence from the Solicitor included an assertion '*obviously our client does not expect to pay any exhumation fees*'. Those Solicitors also provided copies of notices that had been placed in local newspapers. Further, the Solicitors provided details of

their fees thus far, and also the cost of placing notices in two local papers. The Solicitors also stated to the Diocesan Registry that they would be ‘*seeking direction regarding the payment of this firm’s fees Again, our client cannot be expected to settle these as this exhumation process is through no fault of her own*’. Given that there was no party opponent to the proceedings, no application had been made by the Solicitors to make any other person or legal body a party to the proceedings, and that no specific allegation had been made that anyone had acted unlawfully, or was said to have made an actionable error in the original interment of Mr Hillyard, that was a somewhat surprising assertion to be made. The court has been provided with no information that either the Solicitors, or the petitioner, have made any efforts to have anyone agree that ‘a mistake as to location’ had occurred (see below concerning the law relating to exhumations) and/or to reach agreement that that person or body should pay for the proposed exhumation and re-interment. I am reminded that under the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules (as amended) it is the duty of the parties to help the court to further the overriding objective, including by cooperating with others in resolving, as far as possible, matters that are in dispute.

9. In the February directions the Petitioner was required to provide details of the grave plot at Stoneleigh St Mary the Virgin where Mr Hillyard’s mortal remains could be re-interred should exhumation be granted. Having been informed that the Parochial Church Council at Stoneleigh no longer supported the reservation of grave spaces, instead of referring the matter back to the Court those representing the petitioner made enquiries of the neighbouring parish of Bubbenhall, St Giles, for a grave space to accommodate the remains of Mr Hillyard. As it was the express wish of Mr Hillyard in his will that he be buried in the Churchyard of Stoneleigh, St Mary the Virgin, the Court would be reluctant to permit re-burial in an entirely different Parish. I remind myself that the churchyard regulations contain this important statement : “*many people find*

comfort in knowing that their mortal remains will be interred in a particular churchyard and in a particular setting.”

10. In accordance with the February directions the Diocesan registry sent letters to the last known address of Mr Hillyard’s niece, Alison Mitchell, and his nephew, David Mitchell. In response to those letters there was a reply indicating the following on behalf of both the nephew and the niece: *“Thank you for your letter . . . regarding the proposed exhumation of our late Uncle Mr Keith Hillyard. This has caused major distress to myself and my brother. We wish to make clear, as a family, that it is our Express Wish that this DOES NOT TAKE PLACE under ANY circumstances whatsoever.*

We object in the strongest possible terms to this proposal and DO NOT give our consent for this to take place, now or at any time in the future.”

11. As there was now written objection to the petition, further directions were issued in May 2022. In those directions were indicated issues of relevance that the parties should assist the Court upon. The identified issues were: (a) The state of the relationship between Gwendoline Mabel Schofield and Keith Robert Hillyard at the time she died in July 2000; (b) Any communications the petitioner had with those representing the Parish of Stoneleigh, St Mary the Virgin, raising any objection to the remains of Mr Hillyard being interred in the grave and the reason behind such communications; and (c) The circumstances in which the mortal remains of Keith Robert Hillyard came to be interred in the same grave as Gwendoline Mabel Schofield. To assist the court the Archdeacon was also asked to make such enquiries as were reasonable into the issues identified.

12. After having each received Form 5 from the Diocesan Registry (and no doubt fearing the risk of being made subject to a costs order), Alison Mitchell and David Mitchell each declined to become a Party Opponent to the proceedings. Further directions were thus issued permitting the Petitioner, should she so wish, to submit further evidence or make representations in writing upon the issues raised in her petition. The response to that was a document headed 'Statement - Petition for Faculty for exhumation of Human Remains - Keith Robert Hillyard'. Given that the Petitioner still had solicitors acting for her it is surprising to note that the document is not a statement that conforms with the rules; it does not bear a declaration of truth and it is both unsigned and undated (although the PDF by which the typed document was sent bears a date 4th August 2022). The document gives some further information about why a double-depth plot was selected by the petitioner, but gives no further information about 'the understanding' that she should be buried with her Mother, and in fact shows that the Petitioner did not personally inform Mr Hillyard that a double-depth plot had been chosen. There was no information at all concerning the state of the relationship between Gwendoline Schofield and Mr Hillyard at the time she died.

13. I have not seen any confirmation from W. Goodwin & Sons, the funeral directors/undertakers who would be engaged to carry out the exhumation and re-interment, as to their proposed methods in ensuring the procedure would be carried out with due decorum and without disturbing the remains of Gwen Schofield. However, I can safely assume that with such a well-established firm the exhumation would be professionally completed in a discreet and safe manner, especially given the relatively short passage of time since the original interment of Mr Hillyard.

Principles in law that apply

14. **‘Ownership’ of graves within a consecrated Churchyard.** The legal position on this important issue was set out by the Chancellor of the Diocese of Oxford when he gave judgment in 2011 **In the Matter of the Churchyard of St Mary the Virgin, Burghfield**. The relevant points of his judgment were set out at Paragraph 4. “*Although a grave space may be reserved by a faculty issued by the diocesan chancellor (see The Perivale Faculty, de Romana v Roberts [1906] P 332 at 338; Re West Pennard Churchyard [1991] 4 All ER 124), the grave itself is not owned by the deceased or by his relatives whether before or after the burial (see Cripps on Church and Clergy (8th ed., 1937) at 572; Hill Ecclesiastical Law (3rd ed, 2007) at 7.113), even if there is an exclusive right of burial confirmed by faculty after 1964: see the Faculty Jurisdiction Measure 1964, section 8(1). Indeed, there is no right even to erect a monument over a grave without the permission of the diocesan chancellor, although this permission is usually given through an authority delegated to the [clergy]: see Re Woldingham Churchyard [1957] 2 All ER 323.*” I am further mindful that in Legal Opinions of the Church of England there is an useful opinion called Burials and Cremations: further burials in existing graves and in land already used for burials. It would be correct to say that that work supports the propositions identified in **Burghfield**. In particular in the opinion it is stated ‘*The problem* [someone else being buried in a grave already used] *is a pastoral one not a legal one*’. To that end I must conclude that, without a faculty reserving the right of burial, there is no prohibition in law upon who may be interred in a grave already used in consecrated ground.

15. **The principles to be applied to an exhumation of a body following a Christian burial.** These principles are well known and were set out by the Court of Arches in the case of **In Re Blagdon Cemetery [2002] Fam 299**.

16. The presumption is that burial of human remains in consecrated ground is permanent. The Right Reverend Christopher Hill (then Bishop of Stafford) in *The Theology of Christian Burial* (as quoted in paragraph 23 of the judgment) explained this permanency:

‘The funeral itself articulates very clearly that its purpose is to remember before God the departed; to give thanks for [his/her] life; to commend [him/her] to God the merciful redeemer and judge; to commit [his/her] body to burial/cremation and finally to comfort one another.’

He went on to explain more generally that :

‘The permanent burial of the physical body/the burial of cremated remains should be seen as a symbol of our entrusting the person to God for resurrection. We are commending the person to God, saying farewell to them (for their “journey”), entrusting them in peace for their ultimate destination, with us, the heavenly Jerusalem. This commending, entrusting, resting in peace does not sit easily with “portable remains”, which suggests the opposite: reclaiming, possession, and restlessness; a holding on to the 'symbol' of a human life rather than a giving back to God’.

17. In *Blagdon* the Court of Arches explained the legal view of permanency thus :
- “The general concept of permanence is reflected in the fact that it is a criminal offence to disturb a dead body without lawful permission. Moreover, the fact that there is no ownership of a dead body according to English law, and the absence of any legal right in English law or under the European Convention of Human Rights to exhume a body or cremated remains, reflects a culture in which the norm is that the remains of a dead person should not be disturbed once they have undergone the initial act of interment.”*

18. The above comments do not mean that exhumation cannot occur, but in Blagdon the Court expressed that there has to be some exceptional circumstance before the norm of permanent burial is set aside. The Court gave some guidance as to what could constitute exceptional circumstances. These factors include medical reasons supported by necessary psychiatric evidence (which do not apply here), or a mistake in the administration of the burial so that an important error in location had been made. However, it seems there was no error in location here as Keith Hillyard had specified in his last will and testament where he wished to be buried and that was indeed where he was laid to rest.

Facts in this matter

19. Both Gwendoline Schofield and Keith Hillyard were buried in the consecrated churchyard of Stoneleigh, St Mary the Virgin, according to the rites of the Church of England and in a ceremony presided over by an ordained minister of the Church. Gwendoline Schofield was laid to rest by Revd Kenneth Lindop in July 2000. She had specifically asked in her Last Will and Testament (dated 24th April 1996) to be laid to rest in the Churchyard at Stoneleigh. Her will was silent as to whom she hoped would also be interred in the double depth plot. No faculty was ever sought to preserve the right of anyone else to be buried in that plot. Keith Hillyard was laid to rest by Revd David Wintle in January 2021. Mr Hillyard had specifically asked in his Last Will and Testament to be interred in the same plot as Gwendoline Schofield.
20. Three issues of potential importance arising from the petition were identified in the directions and I look now to each of those.
21. **The state of the relationship between Gwendoline Mabel Schofield and Keith Robert Hillyard at the time she died in July 2000.**

The Petitioner has stated that the relationship between her Mother and Mr Hillyard had ‘just about ceased’ by the time Gwendoline Schofield died. She has provided no evidence of this alleged state of affairs. The relatives of Keith Hillyard were specifically asked their views. Michelle Hillyard (whose own relationship with her Father had clearly been somewhat strained) stated: *“I have asked my Mother regarding Ms Helen Schofield’s assertion that the relationship had ended. As far as we know they were still in a relationship at the time of Gwendoline’s death. Shortly after Gwendoline’s death my father visited my place of work to tell me the news.”*

David and Alison Mitchell stated *“We have to say we doubt very much if the relationship statement is true.”*

22. Facts that could perhaps assist in an assessment of the position concerning the relationship include that Gwendoline Schofield had named Keith Hillyard as one of her executors, together with the petitioner, and he was a principal beneficiary under her will. The information I have seen suggests that he did perform his duties as executor to the estate (had he reason to not want to be associated with Gwendoline Schofield he could have filed application with the Court to be relieved of the duties of an executor, as did his own daughter when he named her as an executor of his will).
23. The Priest who oversaw Gwendoline Schofield’s burial died not many years afterwards, so the assistant archdeacon was unable to enquire whether Keith Hillyard was a principal mourner at the service or whether he was simply not involved in funeral.
24. The assistant Archdeacon has been informed by those representing the petitioner that it was Helen Schofield who arranged the funeral of Gwendoline Schofield. Revd David Wintle, however, was informed that Keith Hillyard and Helen Schofield together arranged the funeral. The fact that the petitioner

liaised with the funeral director could potentially support her claim, but it could just as simply have been that she was the point of contact, as one of two executors of Gwendoline Schofield's will, with those arranging the details of the burial. It is common for funeral directors to deal with just one representative of the many bereaved when a funeral is arranged.

25. The Petitioner seems to set great store by the fact that in her Mother's will there is no expressed desire that Keith Hillyard should subsequently be buried in the other part of the double depth plot. That fails to acknowledge the other obvious point, that in the same will there is no mention that Gwendoline Schofield wanted her daughter buried with her rather than her partner of many years. All that can really be said of the will is that it named both the Petitioner and Keith Hillyard as the two executors and as the major beneficiaries.
26. The headstone for the grave states that Gwendoline Schofield was a 'Treasured Mum and Friend'. Mum is clearly referring to the relationship with Helen, Friend either including or specifically meaning her friendship with Keith Hillyard.
27. **Any communications the petitioner had with those representing the Parish of Stoneleigh St Mary the Virgin raising any objection to the remains of Mr Hillyard being interred in the grave and the reason behind such communications.**

The handwritten note from the Petitioner, on notepaper bearing pictures of a pastoral scene, was discovered filed with papers in the Parish office of Stoneleigh St Mary the Virgin. It was dated January 2008.

Of course, the existence of the letter is probative of nothing but the Petitioner's wants. There is no evidence that she, or anyone else, ever gave Keith Hillyard a

chance to put his side of the argument about whether Gwendoline Schofield had ever stated a preference over who else should be buried in the other part of this double plot. The evidence we do have is that in his Last Will and Testament (dated, it appears, April 2012, so more than a decade after Gwendoline Schofield died), he specifically desired to be buried with his deceased partner. The assertion that ‘it was understood’ that the Petitioner was to be buried with her Mother seems rather to be contradicted by the existence of the note written in 2008. If there was indeed ‘an understanding’ then there would have been no need for the note. The fact that the Petitioner stated in her note that she believed Keith Hillyard would want to be buried in the grave suggests that there was no actual ‘understanding’ that the Petitioner was to be buried in the grave with her Mother. It could be argued rather that there was clearly some understanding that Keith Hillyard would or might wish to be buried with Gwendoline Schofield. I have seen no correspondence, written to Keith Hillyard or anyone else other than ‘the church’, to assert the ‘understanding’ that the petitioner should be buried with Gwendoline Schofield rather than Mr Hillyard and, of course, no faculty was sought.

28. The circumstances in which the mortal remains of Keith Robert Hillyard came to be interred in the same grave as Gwendoline Mabel Schofield.

The assistant archdeacon has made enquiries into this matter. It is correct that no-one specifically spoke with the Church administrator about the Church files concerning the burial plot. However, the funeral of Keith Hillyard had the double disadvantage that it took place during the Covid lockdown, when the Church administrator was not working in the parish offices, and it fell during an interregnum in the parish. The priest who presided over the funeral and oversaw the burial has confirmed that he had made numerous attempts to speak with the church administrator by telephone, and the funeral director similarly made several telephone calls that were not answered. No provision had been

made for the telephone at the parish office to be diverted to the administrator's home address, but that is perhaps understandable in the very strange situation we all faced in the Covid lockdown. It may perhaps have been better, when the telephone failed, to have at least attempted contact by email. However, even had the administrator been spoken with it seems she would not have personally known of the note about this one particular grave. (The note was written over a decade previously when someone else answered the correspondence to the parish). Equally, would it necessarily have made any difference if the note was found at that time? I have already mentioned that the contact details on the note were considerably out of date, and when attempts were made to contact the Petitioner through the contact details she had provided the message 'bounced' back. To accept the assertion by the petitioner that 'the church' should have made more extensive enquiries (such as contacting the Solicitors who handled the grant of probate on Gwendoline Schofield's estate in the year 2000) would, in my view, be to place an unacceptable burden on the parish administration. The burden must surely have been on the petitioner - if she believed her note should have been acted upon - to have ensured that the Church administrator had up to date contact details. In any event, the correct legal route the petitioner should have taken (whether in 2000, or in 2008 or indeed at any time before Mr Hillyard's burial) was to seek a faculty preserving a right to be buried with her Mother. She did not take that route. The Priest conducting Mr Hillyard's funeral was therefore faced with a pastoral situation, of grieving friends and relatives wanting and needing the funeral to be arranged. The Priest was aware that Gwendoline Schofield had a daughter living - he was informed - somewhere abroad and suspected to be in the antipodes. He also knew it was accepted that Mr Hillyard had been Gwendoline Schofield's partner, he had been a major beneficiary under her will, he had been an executor of her will, and Mr Hillyard had specifically requested in his will to be buried in the same double-depth plot as Gwendoline Schofield. I have not been referred to any rule or judgment that the child of a deceased person has a greater right to be

buried in the same double-depth plot as a deceased person than her unmarried partner.

29. It can be regarded as an omission that the Parish administrator was not specifically spoken with about the interment of Mr Hillyard. However, such an omission does not make the burial unlawful. No faculty is required for a burial. Had the Parish administrator been contacted it is known she would find that there is no faculty preserving the right of anyone to be buried in that particular double depth plot, and there is no guarantee that the 13 year old, hand-written note from the Petitioner would have been discovered prior to the interment, especially with the Parish office being closed during lock-down. Even had the note been located, there is again the problem that there were no up-to-date contact details provided by the Petitioner, so no-one could have liaised with her with ease. No-one from the parish could have easily discovered whether between January 2008 (when the letter was written) and April 2012 (when Mr Hillyard's will was signed) or even by the time of his death there had been agreement between the petitioner and Mr Hillyard that her objection to his burial in the plot had been withdrawn. A lot can change in a period of four and a bit years, let alone 13 years. It also cannot be forgotten that there were the several factors, mentioned above, about the connection of Mr Hillyard with Gwendoline Schofield and his stated desire to be buried in that double plot. The omission of not speaking with the Parish administrator does not, of itself, create the 'mistake' as to the administration of the burial envisaged under *Bladgon*, where that 'mistake' was particularly where the body had been interred in the wrong grave (the judgment refers to 'a mistake as to location', *vis* "*Sometimes genuine mistakes do occur, for example, a burial may take place in the wrong burial plot in a cemetery or in a space reserved for someone else in a churchyard. In such cases it may be those responsible for the cemetery or churchyard who apply for a faculty to exhume the remains from the wrong burial plot or grave. Faculties can in these circumstances readily be granted,*

because they amount to correction of an error in administration rather than being an exception to the presumption of permanence, which is predicated upon disposal of remains in the intended not an unintended plot or grave. . . . A mistake may also occur due to a lack of knowledge at the time of burial that it was taking place in consecrated ground with its significance as a Christian place of burial.”) Here there was no mistake as to location, the plot was not reserved by faculty for the burial of anyone else, and it was the exact location where Mr Hillyard had requested in his will that he be interred.

Determination

30. I am asked to consider the legal situation of the interment of Keith Robert Hillyard, not the pastoral circumstances that arise. In law there seems to have been no prohibition upon Keith Hillyard being interred in Grave 9 Section D Row 23 in the consecrated Churchyard of St Mary the Virgin in Stoneleigh. It is not determinative in law, but is a fact, that he had specifically asked to be interred where he was buried. His interment was not interfering with any right in law of anyone else to be buried in that particular location as no faculty had been sought or granted preserving such a right. There is a presumption in law against exhumation of a body buried in consecrated ground. The burden of overcoming the presumption in permanence of burial rests with the Petitioner. She has failed to satisfy me to the required standard that any of the exceptions espoused in **Blagdon** - or indeed, any other exception to the permanence of burial - applies in the circumstances of this matter.
31. The requested faculty for exhumation will not be granted. I see no reason to refrain from making an order of costs payable by the petitioner.

Costs assessment

A great deal of work has had to be carried out by the Diocesan Registry in this matter, and by the Assistant Archdeacon, mostly caused because the necessary

consents or information required on a correctly completed petition were not sought or supplied, leading to the issuing of several sets of directions. Having had legal advisers working for her throughout I have to assume that the Petitioner was advised concerning her petition, and has been correctly advised concerning the law relating to burials and also as to exhumations. In those circumstances the petitioner must pay the fees of the Registry and the Chancellor's fee under the current Fees Order. I certify that this judgment took four hours to prepare. The Chancellor's fee therefore amounts to £544.00, as I waive the Chancellor's fee payable where directions have been given. In addition the costs of the registry, over and above the fees already paid, are assessed at eight hours plus the fee where directions have been made, meaning a sum of £1,311 is payable. The assessed eight hours is considerably lower than the hours actually spent by the Registry staff on this matter. The total court costs are therefore £1,855.00 to be paid within two calendar months.

Glyn Samuel
Chancellor
16th August 2022.