SUBMISSION TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DRAFT SUBSIDIARY LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE CIVIL JUSTICE REFORM

I refer to the meeting of the Subcommittee on Friday 29 February 2008.

In accordance with the request of the Hon Margaret NG, Chairman of the Subcommittee, there now follows a written summary of my comments at the aforementioned meeting.

1. Statements of Truth (RHC Order 41A)

Statements of Truth were introduced for statements of case (pleadings) by the English CPR Part 22 for two reasons. The first was to make sure that the parties (and their legal advisers) did not knowingly advance false cases. The second was to enable statements of case to be used in evidence in interim hearings and therefore remove the need for additional witness statements and affidavits – therefore reducing costs.

It is debatable whether CPR Part 22 has achieved either of these purposes. My own experience, at least insofar as the second objective is concerned, is that it has not.

2. Expert Witnesses (RHC Order 38 and Appendix D)

There are a number of additions that could be made to the provisions on expert witnesses.

2.1 Written Questions to Expert Witnesses

First, it may be useful to introduce a rule similar to CPR Part 35.6 –

> (1) A party may put to –
> (a) an expert instructed by another party; or
> (b) a single joint expert appointed under rule 35.7, written questions about his report.
> (2) Written questions under paragraph (1) –
> (a) may be put once only;
> (b) must be put within 28 days of service of the expert's report; and
> (c) must be for the purpose only of clarification of the report, unless in any case –
> (i) the court gives permission; or
> (ii) the other party agrees.
> (3) An expert's answers to questions put in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be treated as part of the expert's report.
> (4) Where –
> (a) a party has put a written question to an expert instructed by another party in accordance with this rule; and
> (b) the expert does not answer that question,
> the court may make one or both of the following orders in relation to the party who instructed the expert –
> (i) that the party may not rely on the evidence of that expert; or

(ii) that the party may not recover the fees and expenses of that expert from any other party.

Practice Direction 31 paragraph 5 of the CPR adds –

5.1 Questions asked for the purpose of clarifying the expert's report (see rule 35.6) should be put, in writing, to the expert not later than 28 days after receipt of the expert's report (see paragraphs 1.2 to 1.5 above as to verification).
5.2 Where a party sends a written question or questions direct to an expert, a copy of the questions should, at the same time, be sent to the other party or parties.
5.3 The party or parties instructing the expert must pay any fees charged by that expert for answering questions put under rule 35.6. This does not affect any decision of the court as to the party who is ultimately to bear the expert's costs.

The primary purpose of these written questions is, as can be seen, to clarify the expert's report. They are not intended to be used for tactical purposes. Their other purpose is to save time and costs, especially at trial when the lengthy cross-examination of an expert witness may be dispensed with as a consequence of a well-worded set of written questions.

2.2 Expert's right to ask the court for directions

Another useful addition would be a rule on the basis of CPR Part 35.14 -

(1) An expert may file a written request for directions to assist him in carrying out his function as an expert.
(2) An expert must, unless the court orders otherwise, provide a copy of any proposed request for directions under paragraph (1)–
(a) to the party instructing him, at least 7 days before he files the request; and
(b) to all other parties, at least 4 days before he files it.
(3) The court, when it gives directions, may also direct that a party be served with a copy of the directions.

This reflects the fact that it is the expert's duty to assist the court (in Order 38 rule 35A) and accordingly gives him the right, and means, to communicate directly with the court. The provision also aims to reduce costs and delay by minimising the "links" (i.e. the parties' legal advisers) in the chain of communication.

2.3 Challenging a single joint expert's evidence

The proposed Order 38 rule 4A anticipates what may happen if a party objects to the appointment of a single joint expert witness. There does not, however, appear to be any provision for what happens if a party, who had no objection to his appointment, is subsequently unhappy with that single joint expert's report.

The position in England has been determined by case law. In *Daniels v Walker* [2000] 1 WLR 1382 the Court of Appeal held that, provided that there were "sound reasons" for the party's request and if it would be unjust (within CPR Part 1.1) not to do so, the court should exercise its discretion to permit that party to instruct another expert. If, however, the claim involved only "modest" damages the court might decline the dissatisfied party's request for a new expert and only allow him to cross-examine the single joint expert. The Court of Appeal added that "every effort" should be made to resolve such issues (e.g. by the use of the written questions provision in CPR Part 35.6) and that experts giving oral evidence at trial should be "a last resort".

Subsequent case law has clarified, among other things, what may or may not be "sound reasons". It may be that the Subcommittee would prefer to avoid the need for such clarificatory case law here and, instead, make provision for such eventualities within the proposed RHC.

2.4 Code of Conduct

It is encouraging to see a Code of Conduct appended to the proposed RHC. This will greatly assist those instructed to act as expert witnesses. It is, however, light on the guidance that may – on occasions – be required by those who actually instruct the experts. The Subcommittee may be interested in the contents of the UK Civil Justice Council's "Protocol for the Instruction of Experts to give Evidence in Civil Claims", which is attached to this note. The Civil Justice Council is a public body established under the Civil Procedure Act 1997 and is responsible for overseeing and co-ordinating the modernisation of the civil justice system in England and Wales. Its membership comprises judges, legal professionals, civil servants and lay persons. See http://www.civiljusticecouncil.gov.uk/index.htm

3. Sanctioned offers and payments (RHC Order 22)

3.1 Sanctioned payments

The provisions of the new Order 22 are very close to those of the pre-April 2007 CPR Part 36. On 6 April 2007, CPR Part 36 was radically altered. The main change was that CPR Part 36 payments (the equivalent of sanctioned payments) were abolished. Originally, defendants had to "make good" their CPR Part 36 offers by making a CPR Part 36 payment of the sum involved. The unspoken rationale for this rule was that plaintiffs needed a guarantee that such offers were genuine. A secondary, and again unspoken, rationale was that all defendants were assumed not to be making genuine offers. This, in my and many others' opinion, undermined the very spirit of CPR Part 36 - to encourage mutually beneficial settlements between parties - in that it harked back to an adversarial approach to litigation.

The changes in April 2007 were specifically prompted by a consultation paper "Part 36 of the Civil Procedure Rules: Offers to settle and payments into court" (this can be found at http://www.dca.gov.uk/consult/civilproc36/cp0206.htm) published in January 2006 by

the UK Government. This consultation had, in turn, arisen from the decisions in *Crouch v King's Healthcare NHS Trust* [2005] 1 All E.R. 207 and *The Trustees of Stokes Pension Fund v Western Power Distribution (South West) plc* [2005] 1 WLR 3595 where the Court of Appeal held that certain categories of defendant – government departments and insurers - need only make CPR Part 36 offers without the supporting CPR Part 36 payments as they were, to put it bluntly, "good for the money" (according to the DCA, approximately 70-80 percent of CPR Part 36 Payments in England and Wales are made by public sector and insured defendants). The Court of Appeal had used the "if the court so orders" words within CPR Part 36.1(2) to justify these decisions. This provision is mirrored in the proposed Order 22 rule 2(4).

Order 22 rule 3(1) is quite explicit that "An offer by a defendant to settle the whole or part of a claim or an issue arising from the claim does not have the consequences set out in this Order unless it is made by way of a sanctioned offer or sanctioned payment or both". Order 22 rule 3(2) adds "Where an offer by a defendant involves a payment of money to the Plaintiff, the offer must be made by way of a sanctioned payment". It is possible that the courts will use Order 22 rule 2(4) in the same way that the English courts used CPR Part 36.1(2) but the Subcommittee may prefer to reconsider the rule and adopt the post-April 2007 position if it takes the view that the profile of Hong Kong defendants (i.e. the proportion that are insured) resembles that in England.

3.2 Enhanced interest

Under the proposed Order 22 rule 20(2), where a plaintiff does better at trial than he proposed in his sanctioned offer, the court may order interest on the whole or part of any damages (excluding interest) he is awarded at a rate "not exceeding 10% above judgment rate for some or all of the period starting with the latest date on which the defendant could have accepted the offer without requiring the leave of the Court".

This provision is similar to that in the CPR. It sits uneasily with the objective of encouraging mutually beneficially settlements as it is little more than a form of punitive damages. I would urge its removal from the proposed RHC.

4. Underlying Objectives (Order 1A rule 1)

I note the following provisions of the proposed RHC –

> 1. Underlying objectives (O. 1A, r. 1)
> The underlying objectives of these rules are –
> …
> (d) to promote greater equality between the parties;
> (e) to facilitate the settlement of disputes…

The "underlying objectives" are inspired by – but are not intended to be the same as – the overriding objective of the CPR. It is important to remember this when considering these two items.

4.1 Equality

Under CPR Part 1.1 (2) (a) the overriding objective entails "ensuring that the parties are on an equal footing". This reflects the right to "equality of arms" under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights ("ECHR"), to which the UK is a signatory and which was given further effect by the Human Rights Act 1998.

The Subcommittee has expressed its concern about the effect the new RHC may have on unrepresented litigants. Members may be interested to learn that CPR Part 1.1(2)(a) was utilized in *Maltez v Lewis* (1999) The Times, 4 May 1999, where the court held that it could "level the playing field" between "rich and poor" parties by, for example, allowing a poorer party (or rather its smaller firm of solicitors) more time to prepare court bundles or ordering the wealthier party (or its larger firm of solicitors) to carry out the task instead

Returning to the RHC, Order 1A rule 1(d) is subtly different to its CPR equivalent in that its aim is "to promote greater equality between the parties". This is a term pregnant with meaning. A conservative assumption would be that it means the same as CPR Part 1 and that the different language is of no practical concern. This is not as straightforward as it seems, however, given that the CPR draws upon jurisprudence developed under the ECHR. Is the suggestion that such European case law is now to be applied, albeit indirectly, in Hong Kong? This needs to be clarified.

4.2 Settlement

The provision in Order 1A rule 1(e) that courts should "facilitate the settlement of disputes" is found in CPR Part 1.4(f) among the elements of active case management. "Facilitating settlement" is commonly understood to include encouraging the parties to try some form of Alternative Dispute Resolution ("ADR"), usually mediation. ADR is actively promoted elsewhere in the CPR, in the pre-action protocols and in the individual court guides such as that of the Commercial Court, which states that legal representatives "should" - not "ought" or "may" - consider with their clients and the other parties, the possibility of attempting to resolve their dispute by ADR.

The Subcommittee may wish to give further consideration to this provision in light of the ongoing discussion on the future role of mediation within Hong Kong. Perhaps liaison with the Secretary of Justice's Working Party would be helpful.

5. Discovery (Order 24)

I welcome the presence of Order 24 rule 15A and hope that it will be used by the courts to cut down unnecessarily costly discovery exercises.

It may be that the courts would benefit from considering the approach adopted by the Commercial Court in England in this area, which can be noted from Section E (Discovery) of the Admiralty and Commercial Court Guide. The Guide can be found at

http://www.hmcourts-service.gov.uk/publications/guidance/admiralcomm/index.htm or I can provide the PDF if necessary.

Of particular interest is the following passage -

> E2.1 At the case management conference the court will normally wish to consider one or more of the following:
> (i) ordering standard disclosure: rule 31.5(1);
> (ii) dispensing with or limiting standard disclosure: rule 31.5(2);
> (iii) ordering sample disclosure;
> (iv) ordering disclosure in stages;
> (v) ordering disclosure otherwise than by service of a list of documents, for example, by service of copy documents; and
> (vi) ordering specific disclosure: rule 31.12.

The Subcommittee and judiciary may find it beneficial to consult the case law on this particular area or, perhaps, discussing the same with UK colleagues.

Conclusion

The above submission is relatively brief in nature. There is, as the Subcommittee recognises, a great amount of detail to be examined in relation to the draft subsidiary legislation relating to the Civil Justice Reform.

I am grateful for the opportunity to express my opinions to the Subcommittee and I would, of course, be delighted to continue to assist with its work if this assistance is required.

The views expressed in this submission are mine alone and no liability attaches to any other person, the University of Hong Kong or the Faculty of Law for the same.

GM 3.3.08

Gary Meggitt
MA (Oxon), ACII, MCIArb
Barrister at Law and Solicitor Advocate (England & Wales)

Teaching Consultant
Department of Professional Legal Education
Faculty of Law
University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road
HONG KONG

Protocol for the Instruction of Experts to give Evidence in Civil Claims

June 2005

CONTENTS

Page No.

1. Introduction………………………………………………………... 3
2. Aims of Protocol…………………………………………………... 3
3. Application………………………………………………………… 4
   - Limitation……………………………………………………. 4
4. Duties of Experts…………………………………………………...5
5. Conduct of Experts Instructed only to advise…………………... 6
6. The Need for Experts……………………………………………… 7
7. The Appointment of Experts………………………………………7
   - Conditional and Contingency Fees…………………….. 9
8. Instructions………………………………………………………… 9
9. Experts' Acceptance of Instructions……………………………. 10
10. Withdrawal………………………………………………………… 11
11. Experts' Right to ask Court for Directions……………………... 11
12. Power of the Court to Direct a Party to Provide Information…... 12
13. Contents of Experts' Reports…………………………………… 12
   - Qualifications……………………………………………… 13
   - Tests……………………………………………………….. 13
   - Reliance on the work of others…………………………. 14
   - Facts……………………………………………………….. 14
   - Range of opinion…………………………………………...14
   - Conclusions…………………………………………………...15
   - Basis of report: material instructions…………………… 15
14. After Receipt of Experts' Reports……………………………… 15
15. Amendments of Reports…………………………………………… 16
16. Written Questions to Experts…………………………………… 17

- ➢ Written requests for directions in relation to questions… 17

17. Single Joint Experts……………………………………………….. 18
    - ➢ Joint instructions……………………………………….. 18
    - ➢ Conduct of the single joint expert……………………… 19
    - ➢ Cross-examination……………………………………… 20

18. Discussions between Experts…………………………………… 20
    - ➢ Arrangements for discussions between experts………… 21

19. Attendance of Experts at Court………………………………… 23

Protocol for the Instruction of Experts to give evidence in civil claims

1. Introduction

Expert witnesses perform a vital role in civil litigation. It is essential that both those who instruct experts and experts themselves are given clear guidance as to what they are expected to do in civil proceedings. The purpose of this Protocol is to provide such guidance. It has been drafted by the Civil Justice Council and reflects the rules and practice directions current [in June 2005], replacing the Code of Guidance on Expert Evidence. The authors of the Protocol wish to acknowledge the valuable assistance they obtained by drawing on earlier documents produced by the Academy of Experts and the Expert Witness Institute, as well as suggestions made by the Clinical Dispute Forum. The Protocol has been approved by the Master of the Rolls.

2. Aims of Protocol

2.1 This Protocol offers guidance to experts and to those instructing them in the interpretation of and compliance with Part 35 of the Civil Procedure Rules (CPR 35) and its associated Practice Direction (PD 35) and to further the objectives of the Civil Procedure Rules in general. It is intended to assist in the interpretation of those provisions in the interests of good practice but it does not replace them. It sets out standards for the use of experts and the conduct of experts and those who instruct them. The existence of this Protocol does not remove the need for experts and those who instruct them to be familiar with CPR35 and PD35.

2.2 Experts and those who instruct them should also bear in mind para 1.4 of the Practice Direction on Protocols which contains the following objectives, namely to:

(a) encourage the exchange of early and full information about the expert issues involved in a prospective legal claim;

(b) enable the parties to avoid or reduce the scope of litigation by agreeing the whole or part of an expert issue before commencement of proceedings; and

(c) support the efficient management of proceedings where litigation cannot be avoided.

3. Application

3.1 This Protocol applies to any steps taken for the purpose of civil proceedings by experts or those who instruct them on or after 5th September 2005.

3.2 It applies to all experts who are, or who may be, governed by CPR Part 35 and to those who instruct them. Experts are governed by Part 35 if they are or have been instructed to give or prepare evidence for the purpose of civil proceedings in a court in England and Wales (CPR 35.2).

3.3 Experts, and those instructing them, should be aware that some cases may be "specialist proceedings" (CPR 49) where there are modifications to the Civil Procedure Rules. Proceedings may also be governed by other Protocols. Further, some courts have published their own Guides which supplement the Civil Procedure Rules for proceedings in those courts. They contain provisions affecting expert evidence. Expert witnesses and those instructing them should be familiar with them when they are relevant.

3.4 Courts may take into account any failure to comply with this Protocol when making orders in relation to costs, interest, time limits, the stay of proceedings and whether to order a party to pay a sum of money into court.

Limitation

3.5 If, as a result of complying with any part of this Protocol, claims would or might be time barred under any provision in the Limitation Act 1980, or any other legislation that imposes a time limit for the bringing an action, claimants may commence proceedings without complying with this Protocol. In such circumstances,

claimants who commence proceedings without complying with all, or any part, of this Protocol must apply, giving notice to all other parties, to the court for directions as to the timetable and form of procedure to be adopted, at the same time as they request the court to issue proceedings. The court may consider whether to order a stay of the whole or part of the proceedings pending compliance with this Protocol and may make orders in relation to costs.

4. Duties of experts

4.1 Experts always owe a duty to exercise reasonable skill and care to those instructing them, and to comply with any relevant professional code of ethics. However when they are instructed to give or prepare evidence for the purpose of civil proceedings in England and Wales they have an overriding duty to help the court on matters within their expertise (CPR 35.3). This duty overrides any obligation to the person instructing or paying them. Experts must not serve the exclusive interest of those who retain them.

4.2 Experts should be aware of the overriding objective that courts deal with cases justly. This includes dealing with cases proportionately, expeditiously and fairly (CPR 1.1). Experts are under an obligation to assist the court so as to enable them to deal with cases in accordance with the overriding objective. However the overriding objective does not impose on experts any duty to act as mediators between the parties or require them to trespass on the role of the court in deciding facts.

4.3 Experts should provide opinions which are independent, regardless of the pressures of litigation. In this context, a useful test of 'independence' is that the expert would express the same opinion if given the same instructions by an opposing party. Experts should not take it upon themselves to promote the point of view of the party instructing them or engage in the role of advocates.

4.4 Experts should confine their opinions to matters which are material to the disputes between the parties and provide opinions only in relation to matters which lie within their expertise. Experts should indicate without delay where particular questions or issues fall outside their expertise.

4.5 Experts should take into account all material facts before them at the time that they give their opinion. Their reports should set out those facts and any literature or any other material on which they have relied in forming their opinions. They should indicate if an opinion is provisional, or qualified, or where they consider that further information is required or if, for any other reason, they are not satisfied that an opinion can be expressed finally and without qualification.

4.6 Experts should inform those instructing them without delay of any change in their opinions on any material matter and the reason for it.

4.7 Experts should be aware that any failure by them to comply with the Civil Procedure Rules or court orders or any excessive delay for which they are responsible may result in the parties who instructed them being penalised in costs and even, in extreme cases, being debarred from placing the experts' evidence before the court. In[1] *Phillips v Symes* Peter Smith J held that courts may also make orders for costs (under section 51 of the Supreme Court Act 1981) directly against expert witnesses who by their evidence cause significant expense to be incurred, and do so in flagrant and reckless disregard of their duties to the Court.

5. Conduct of Experts instructed only to advise

5.1 Part 35 only applies where experts are instructed to give opinions which are relied on for the purposes of court proceedings. Advice which the parties do not intend to adduce in litigation is likely to be confidential; the Protocol does not apply in these circumstances [2] [3].

5.2 The same applies where, after the commencement of proceedings, experts are instructed only to advise (e.g. to comment upon a single joint expert's report) and not to give or prepare evidence for use in the proceedings.

---

[1] *Phillips v Symes* [2004] EWHC 2330 (Ch)
[2] *Carlson v Townsend* [2001] 1 WLR 2415
[3] *Jackson v Marley Davenport* [2004] 1 WLR 2926

5.3 However this Protocol does apply if experts who were formerly instructed only to advise are later instructed to give or prepare evidence for the purpose of civil proceedings.

6. The Need for Experts

6.1 Those intending to instruct experts to give or prepare evidence for the purpose of civil proceedings should consider whether expert evidence is appropriate, taking account of the principles set out in CPR Parts 1 and 35, and in particular whether:

(a) it is relevant to a matter which is in dispute between the parties.

(b) it is reasonably required to resolve the proceedings (CPR 35.1);

(c) the expert has expertise relevant to the issue on which an opinion is sought;

(d) the expert has the experience, expertise and training appropriate to the value, complexity and importance of the case; and whether

(e) these objects can be achieved by the appointment of a single joint expert (see section 17 below).

6.2 Although the court's permission is not generally required to instruct an expert, the court's permission is required before experts can be called to give evidence or their evidence can be put in (CPR 35.4).

7. The appointment of experts

7.1 Before experts are formally instructed or the court's permission to appoint named experts is sought, the following should be established:

(a) that they have the appropriate expertise and experience;

(b) that they are familiar with the general duties of an expert;

(c) that they can produce a report, deal with questions and have discussions with other experts within a reasonable time and at a cost proportionate to the matters in issue;

(d) a description of the work required;

(e) whether they are available to attend the trial, if attendance is required; and

(f) there is no potential conflict of interest.

7.2 Terms of appointment should be agreed at the outset and should normally include:

(a) the capacity in which the expert is to be appointed (e.g. party appointed expert, single joint expert or expert advisor);

(b) the services required of the expert (e.g. provision of expert's report, answering questions in writing, attendance at meetings and attendance at court);

(c) time for delivery of the report;

(d) the basis of the expert’s charges (either daily or hourly rates and an estimate of the time likely to be required, or a total fee for the services);

(e) travelling expenses and disbursements;

(f) cancellation charges;

(g) any fees for attending court;

(h) time for making the payment; and

(i) whether fees are to be paid by a third party.

(j) if a party is publicly funded, whether or not the expert's charges will be subject to assessment by a costs officer.

7.3 As to the appointment of single joint experts, see section 17 below.

7.4 When necessary, arrangements should be made for dealing with questions to experts and discussions between experts, including any directions given by the court, and provision should be made for the cost of this work.

7.5 Experts should be informed regularly about deadlines for all matters concerning them. Those instructing experts should promptly send them copies of all court orders and directions which may affect the preparation of their reports or any other matters concerning their obligations.

Conditional and Contingency Fees

7.6 Payments contingent upon the nature of the expert evidence given in legal proceedings, or upon the outcome of a case, must not be offered or accepted. To do so would contravene experts' overriding duty to the court and compromise their duty of independence.

7.7 Agreement to delay payment of experts' fees until after the conclusion of cases is permissible as long as the amount of the fee does not depend on the outcome of the case.

8. Instructions

8.1 Those instructing experts should ensure that they give clear instructions, including the following:

(a) basic information, such as names, addresses, telephone numbers, dates of birth and dates of incidents;

(b) the nature and extent of the expertise which is called for;

(c) the purpose of requesting the advice or report, a description of the matter(s) to be investigated, the principal known issues and the identity of all parties;

(d) the statement(s) of case (if any), those documents which form part of standard disclosure and witness statements which are relevant to the advice or report;

(e) where proceedings have not been started, whether proceedings are being contemplated and, if so, whether the expert is asked only for advice;

(f) an outline programme, consistent with good case management and the expert's availability, for the completion and delivery of each stage of the expert's work; and

(g) where proceedings have been started, the dates of any hearings (including any Case Management Conferences and/or Pre-Trial Reviews), the name of the court, the claim number and the track to which the claim has been allocated.

8.2 Experts who do not receive clear instructions should request clarification and may indicate that they are not prepared to act unless and until such clear instructions are received.

8.3 As to the instruction of single joint experts, see section 17 below.

9. Experts' Acceptance of Instructions

9.1 Experts should confirm without delay whether or not they accept instructions. They should also inform those instructing them (whether on initial instruction or at any later stage) without delay if:

(a) instructions are not acceptable because, for example, they require work that falls outside their expertise, impose unrealistic deadlines, or are insufficiently clear;

(b) they consider that instructions are or have become insufficient to complete the work;

(c) they become aware that they may not be able to fulfil any of the terms of appointment;

(d) the instructions and/or work have, for any reason, placed them in conflict with their duties as an expert; or

(e) they are not satisfied that they can comply with any orders that have been made.

9.2 Experts must neither express an opinion outside the scope of their field of expertise, nor accept any instructions to do so.

10. Withdrawal

10.1 Where experts' instructions remain incompatible with their duties, whether through incompleteness, a conflict between their duty to the court and their instructions, or for any other substantial and significant reason, they may consider withdrawing from the case. However, experts should not withdraw without first discussing the position fully with those who instruct them and considering carefully whether it would be more appropriate to make a written request for directions from the court. If experts do withdraw, they must give formal written notice to those instructing them.

11. Experts' Right to ask Court for Directions

11.1 Experts may request directions from the court to assist them in carrying out their functions as experts. Experts should normally discuss such matters with those who instruct them before making any such request. Unless the court otherwise orders, any proposed request for directions should be copied to the party instructing the expert at least seven days before filing any request to the court, and to all other parties at least four days before filing it. (CPR 35.14).

11.2 Requests to the court for directions should be made by letter, containing.

(a) the title of the claim;

(b) the claim number of the case;

(c) the name of the expert;

(d) full details of why directions are sought; and

(e) copies of any relevant documentation.

12. Power of the Court to Direct a Party to Provide Information

12.1 If experts consider that those instructing them have not provided information which they require, they may, after discussion with those instructing them and giving notice, write to the court to seek directions (CPR 35.14).

12.2 Experts and those who instruct them should also be aware of CPR 35.9. This provides that where one party has access to information which is not readily available to the other party, the court may direct the party who has access to the information to prepare, file and copy to the other party a document recording the information. If experts require such information which has not been disclosed, they should discuss the position with those instructing them without delay, so that a request for the information can be made, and, if not forthcoming, an application can be made to the court. Unless a document appears to be essential, experts should assess the cost and time involved in the production of a document and whether its provision would be proportionate in the context of the case.

13. Contents of Experts' Reports

13.1 The content and extent of experts' reports should be governed by the scope of their instructions and general obligations, the contents of CPR 35 and PD35 and their overriding duty to the court.

13.2 In preparing reports, experts should maintain professional objectivity and impartiality at all times.

13.3 PD 35, para 2 provides that experts' reports should be addressed to the court and gives detailed directions about the form and content of such reports. All experts and those who instruct them should ensure that they are familiar with these requirements.

13.4 Model forms of Experts' Reports are available from bodies such as the Academy of Experts or the Expert Witness Institute.

13.5 Experts' reports must contain statements that they understand their duty to the court and have complied and will continue to comply with that duty (PD35 para 2.2(9)). They must also be verified by a statement of truth. The form of the statement of truth is as follows:

> "I confirm that insofar as the facts stated in my report are within my own knowledge I have made clear which they are and I believe them to be true, and that the opinions I have expressed represent my true and complete professional opinion."

This wording is mandatory and must not be modified.

Qualifications

13.6 The details of experts' qualifications to be given in reports should be commensurate with the nature and complexity of the case. It may be sufficient merely to state academic and professional qualifications. However, where highly specialised expertise is called for, experts should include the detail of particular training and/or experience that qualifies them to provide that highly specialised evidence.

Tests

13.7 Where tests of a scientific or technical nature have been carried out, experts should state:

(a) the methodology used; and

(b) by whom the tests were undertaken and under whose supervision, summarising their respective qualifications and experience.

Reliance on the work of others

13.8 Where experts rely in their reports on literature or other material and cite the opinions of others without having verified them, they must give details of those opinions relied on. It is likely to assist the court if the qualifications of the originator(s) are also stated.

Facts

13.9 When addressing questions of fact and opinion, experts should keep the two separate and discrete.

13.10 Experts must state those facts (whether assumed or otherwise) upon which their opinions are based. They must distinguish clearly between those facts which experts know to be true and those facts which they assume.

13.11 Where there are material facts in dispute experts should express separate opinions on each hypothesis put forward. They should not express a view in favour of one or other disputed version of the facts unless, as a result of particular expertise and experience, they consider one set of facts as being improbable or less probable, in which case they may express that view, and should give reasons for holding it.

Range of opinion

13.12 If the mandatory summary of the range of opinion is based on published sources, experts should explain those sources and, where appropriate, state the qualifications of the originator(s) of the opinions from which they differ, particularly if such opinions represent a well-established school of thought.

13.13 Where there is no available source for the range of opinion, experts may need to express opinions on what they believe to be the range which other experts would arrive at if asked. In those circumstances, experts should make it clear that the range

that they summarise is based on their own judgement and explain the basis of that judgement.

Conclusions

13.14 A summary of conclusions is mandatory. The summary should be at the end of the report after all the reasoning. There may be cases, however, where the benefit to the court is heightened by placing a short summary at the beginning of the report whilst giving the full conclusions at the end. For example, it can assist with the comprehension of the analysis and with the absorption of the detailed facts if the court is told at the outset of the direction in which the report's logic will flow in cases involving highly complex matters which fall outside the general knowledge of the court.

Basis of report: material instructions

13.15 The mandatory statement of the substance of all material instructions should not be incomplete or otherwise tend to mislead. The imperative is transparency. The term "instructions" includes all material which solicitors place in front of experts in order to gain advice. The omission from the statement of 'off-the-record' oral instructions is not permitted. Courts may allow cross-examination about the instructions if there are reasonable grounds to consider that the statement may be inaccurate or incomplete.

14. After receipt of experts' reports

14.1 Following the receipt of experts' reports, those instructing them should advise the experts as soon as reasonably practicable whether, and if so when, the report will be disclosed to other parties; and, if so disclosed, the date of actual disclosure.

14.2 If experts' reports are to be relied upon, and if experts are to give oral evidence, those instructing them should give the experts the opportunity to consider and comment upon other reports within their area of expertise and which deal with relevant issues at the earliest opportunity.

14.3 Those instructing experts should keep experts informed of the progress of cases, including amendments to statements of case relevant to experts' opinion.

14.4 If those instructing experts become aware of material changes in circumstances or that relevant information within their control was not previously provided to experts, they should without delay instruct experts to review, and if necessary, update the contents of their reports.

15. Amendment of reports

15.1 It may become necessary for experts to amend their reports:

(a) as a result of an exchange of questions and answers;

(b) following agreements reached at meetings between experts; or

(c) where further evidence or documentation is disclosed.

15.2 Experts should not be asked to, and should not, amend, expand or alter any parts of reports in a manner which distorts their true opinion, but may be invited to amend or expand reports to ensure accuracy, internal consistency, completeness and relevance to the issues and clarity. Although experts should generally follow the recommendations of solicitors with regard to the form of reports, they should form their own independent views as to the opinions and contents expressed in their reports and exclude any suggestions which do not accord with their views.

15.3 Where experts change their opinion following a meeting of experts, a simple signed and dated addendum or memorandum to that effect is generally sufficient. In some cases, however, the benefit to the court of having an amended report may justify the cost of making the amendment.

15.4 Where experts significantly alter their opinion, as a result of new evidence or because evidence on which they relied has become unreliable, or for any other reason, they should amend their reports to reflect that fact. Amended reports should include

reasons for amendments. In such circumstances those instructing experts should inform other parties as soon as possible of any change of opinion.

15.5 When experts intend to amend their reports, they should inform those instructing them without delay and give reasons. They should provide the amended version (or an addendum or memorandum) clearly marked as such as quickly as possible.

16. Written Questions to Experts

16.1 The procedure for putting written questions to experts (CPR 35.6) is intended to facilitate the clarification of opinions and issues after experts' reports have been served. Experts have a duty to provide answers to questions properly put. Where they fail to do so, the court may impose sanctions against the party instructing the expert, and, if, there is continued non-compliance, debar a party from relying on the report. Experts should copy their answers to those instructing them.

16.2 Experts' answers to questions automatically become part of their reports. They are covered by the statement of truth and form part of the expert evidence.

16.3 Where experts believe that questions put are not properly directed to the clarification of the report, or are disproportionate, or have been asked out of time, they should discuss the questions with those instructing them and, if appropriate, those asking the questions. Attempts should be made to resolve such problems without the need for an application to the court for directions.

Written requests for directions in relation to questions

16.4 If those instructing experts do not apply to the court in respect of questions, but experts still believe that questions are improper or out of time, experts may file written requests with the court for directions to assist in carrying out their functions as experts (CPR 35.14). See Section 11 above.

17. Single Joint Experts

17.1 CPR 35 and PD35 deal extensively with the instruction and use of joint experts by the parties and the powers of the court to order their use (see CPR 35.7 and 35.8, PD35, para 5).

17.2 The Civil Procedure Rules encourage the use of joint experts. Wherever possible a joint report should be obtained. Consideration should therefore be given by all parties to the appointment of single joint experts in all cases where a court might direct such an appointment. Single joint experts are the norm in cases allocated to the small claims track and the fast track.

17.3 Where, in the early stages of a dispute, examinations, investigations, tests, site inspections, experiments, preparation of photographs, plans or other similar preliminary expert tasks are necessary, consideration should be given to the instruction of a single joint expert, especially where such matters are not, at that stage, expected to be contentious as between the parties. The objective of such an appointment should be to agree or to narrow issues.

17.4 Experts who have previously advised a party (whether in the same case or otherwise) should only be proposed as single joint experts if other parties are given all relevant information about the previous involvement.

17.5 The appointment of a single joint expert does not prevent parties from instructing their own experts to advise (but the costs of such expert advisers may not be recoverable in the case).

Joint instructions

17.6 The parties should try to agree joint instructions to single joint experts, but, in default of agreement, each party may give instructions. In particular, all parties should try to agree what documents should be included with instructions and what assumptions single joint experts should make.

17.7 Where the parties fail to agree joint instructions, they should try to agree where the areas of disagreement lie and their instructions should make this clear. If separate instructions are given, they should be copied at the same time to the other instructing parties.

17.8 Where experts are instructed by two or more parties, the terms of appointment should, unless the court has directed otherwise, or the parties have agreed otherwise, include:

(a) a statement that all the instructing parties are jointly and severally liable to pay the experts' fees and, accordingly, that experts' invoices should be sent simultaneously to all instructing parties or their solicitors (as appropriate); and
(b) a statement as to whether any order has been made limiting the amount of experts' fees and expenses (CPR 35.8(4)(a)).

17.9 Where instructions have not been received by the expert from one or more of the instructing parties the expert should give notice (normally at least 7 days) of a deadline to all instructing parties for the receipt by the expert of such instructions. Unless the instructions are received within the deadline the expert may begin work. In the event that instructions are received after the deadline but before the signing off of the report the expert should consider whether it is practicable to comply with those instructions without adversely affecting the timetable set for delivery of the report and in such a manner as to comply with the proportionality principle. An expert who decides to issue a report without taking into account instructions received after the deadline should inform the parties who may apply to the court for directions. In either event the report must show clearly that the expert did not receive instructions within the deadline, or, as the case may be, at all.

Conduct of the single joint expert

17.10 Single joint experts should keep all instructing parties informed of any material steps that they may be taking by, for example, copying all correspondence to those instructing them.

17.11 Single joint experts are Part 35 experts and so have an overriding duty to the court. They are the parties' appointed experts and therefore owe an equal duty to all parties. They should maintain independence, impartiality and transparency at all times.

17.12 Single joint experts should not attend any meeting or conference which is not a joint one, unless all the parties have agreed in writing or the court has directed that such a meeting may be held [4] and who is to pay the experts' fees for the meeting.

17.13 Single joint experts may request directions from the court - see Section 11 above.

17.14 Single joint experts should serve their reports simultaneously on all instructing parties. They should provide a single report even though they may have received instructions which contain areas of conflicting fact or allegation. If conflicting instructions lead to different opinions (for example, because the instructions require experts to make different assumptions of fact), reports may need to contain more than one set of opinions on any issue. It is for the court to determine the facts.

Cross-examination

17.15 Single joint experts do not normally give oral evidence at trial but if they do, all parties may cross-examine them. In general written questions (CPR 35.6) should be put to single joint experts before requests are made for them to attend court for the purpose of cross-examination [5].

18. Discussions between Experts

18.1 The court has powers to direct discussions between experts for the purposes set out in the Rules (CPR 35.12). Parties may also agree that discussions take place between their experts.

---

[4] *Peet v Mid Kent Area Healthcare NHS Trust* [2002] 1 WLR 210

18.2 Where single joint experts have been instructed but parties have, with the permission of the court, instructed their own additional Part 35 experts, there may, if the court so orders or the parties agree, be discussions between the single joint experts and the additional Part 35 experts. Such discussions should be confined to those matters within the remit of the additional Part 35 experts or as ordered by the court.

18.3 The purpose of discussions between experts should be, wherever possible, to:

(a) identify and discuss the expert issues in the proceedings;

(b) reach agreed opinions on those issues, and, if that is not possible, to narrow the issues in the case;

(c) identify those issues on which they agree and disagree and summarise their reasons for disagreement on any issue; and

(d) identify what action, if any, may be taken to resolve any of the outstanding issues between the parties.

Arrangements for discussions between experts

18.4 Arrangements for discussions between experts should be proportionate to the value of cases. In small claims and fast-track cases there should not normally be meetings between experts. Where discussion is justified in such cases, telephone discussion or an exchange of letters should, in the interests of proportionality, usually suffice. In multi-track cases, discussion may be face to face, but the practicalities or the proportionality principle may require discussions to be by telephone or video conference.

18.5 The parties, their lawyers and experts should co-operate to produce the agenda for any discussion between experts, although primary responsibility for preparation of the agenda should normally lie with the parties' solicitors.

---

[5] *Daniels v Walker* [2000] 1 WLR 1382

18.6 The agenda should indicate what matters have been agreed and summarise concisely those which are in issue. It is often helpful for it to include questions to be answered by the experts. If agreement cannot be reached promptly or a party is unrepresented, the court may give directions for the drawing up of the agenda. The agenda should be circulated to experts and those instructing them to allow sufficient time for the experts to prepare for the discussion.

18.7 Those instructing experts must not instruct experts to avoid reaching agreement (or to defer doing so) on any matter within the experts' competence. Experts are not permitted to accept such instructions.

18.8 The parties' lawyers may only be present at discussions between experts if all the parties agree or the court so orders. If lawyers do attend, they should not normally intervene except to answer questions put to them by the experts or to advise about the law [6].

18.9 The content of discussions between experts should not be referred to at trial unless the parties agree (CPR 35.12(4)). It is good practice for any such agreement to be in writing.

18.10 At the conclusion of any discussion between experts, a statement should be prepared setting out:

(a) a list of issues that have been agreed, including, in each instance, the basis of agreement;

(b) a list of issues that have not been agreed, including, in each instance, the basis of disagreement;

(c) a list of any further issues that have arisen that were not included in the original agenda for discussion;

(d) a record of further action, if any, to be taken or recommended, including as appropriate the holding of further discussions between experts.

[6] *Hubbard v Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham HA* [2001] EWCA 1455

18.11 The statement should be agreed and signed by all the parties to the discussion as soon as may be practicable.

18.12 Agreements between experts during discussions do not bind the parties unless the parties expressly agree to be bound by the agreement (CPR 35.12(5)). However, in view of the overriding objective, parties should give careful consideration before refusing to be bound by such an agreement and be able to explain their refusal should it become relevant to the issue of costs.

19. Attendance of Experts at Court

19.1 Experts instructed in cases have an obligation to attend court if called upon to do so and accordingly should ensure that those instructing them are always aware of their dates to be avoided and take all reasonable steps to be available.

19.2 Those instructing experts should:
(a) ascertain the availability of experts before trial dates are fixed;

(b) keep experts updated with timetables (including the dates and times experts are to attend) and the location of the court;

(c) give consideration, where appropriate, to experts giving evidence via a video-link.

(d) inform experts immediately if trial dates are vacated.

19.3 Experts should normally attend court without the need for the service of witness summonses, but on occasion they may be served to require attendance (CPR 34). The use of witness summonses does not affect the contractual or other obligations of the parties to pay experts' fees.