

## **The Catherine Callaghan Moot 2025**

The annual ALBA Moot has been renamed the “Catherine Callaghan Moot” to honour the memory of Catherine Callaghan KC, who was Chair of ALBA from 2022 to 2023, having previously served as Vice-Chair. Catherine was a widely respected public lawyer and a cherished friend and colleague to many at the public law bar. She died in August 2025, at the tragically young age of 54.

### **Eligibility**

1. The competition is open to current law students, including LLB, GDL, LPC / SQE and Bar Course students, and also to those who have completed the LLB / LLM / GDL / Bar Course / LPC / SQE in the last 5 years. Entrants must not have secured pupillage or a training contract as at 5 November 2025.
2. Entrants need not be members of ALBA but, as explained below, for those selected for the final rounds, it will be a condition of participation in the final that they join ALBA prior to 11 December 2025.
3. Entries must be from a team of two mooters. It is a speed moot with three stages.
4. Those wishing to participate are responsible for arranging their own teams and we are unable to assist in pairing individuals with potential team members.

### **The Moot Exercise**

5. The Moot will be based on an appeal to the Supreme Court from the judgment of the Court of Appeal in *R (on the application of National Council for Civil Liberties) v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2025] EWCA Civ 571; [2025] HRLR 10.
6. The case concerns the validity of changes made in June 2023 to sections 12 and 14 of the Public Order Act 1986 (“the 1986 Act”). Those sections allow the police to impose conditions on a public procession or assembly where the responsible officer reasonably believes that it may result in “serious disruption to the life of the community”. The changes were made by Regulations made by the then Home Secretary (the Public Order Act 1986 (Serious Disruption to the Life of the Community) Regulations 2023). The effect of the Regulations was to define “serious disruption” as disruption which is “more than minor”.

7. The Claimant (the National Council for Civil Liberties, known as “Liberty”) challenged the lawfulness of the Home Secretary’s decision to make the Regulations. The High Court ([2024] EWHC 1181 (Admin); [2024] 1 WLR 5398) upheld the Claimant’s challenge and quashed the Regulations on two grounds:
  - i. That the changes made by the Regulations to the 1986 Act fell outside of the Home Secretary’s legal powers and were therefore unlawful (“the *ultra vires* ground”); and
  - ii. That prior to making the Regulations, the Government had conducted a one-sided and unfair consultation process (“the consultation ground”).
8. The Court of Appeal dismissed the Home Secretary’s appeal, upholding the *ultra vires* ground but reversing the High Court’s decision on the consultation ground.

### **Stage 1: paper sift**

9. You should assume for present purposes that permission to appeal to the Supreme Court has been granted on the following two grounds of appeal / cross-appeal:

Ground of Appeal: The Court of Appeal was wrong in concluding that the Public Order Act 1986 (Serious Disruption to the Life of the Community) Regulations 2023 were *ultra vires* the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022.<sup>1</sup>

Ground of Cross-Appeal: The Court of Appeal was wrong in concluding that no voluntary consultation exercise was undertaken by the Home Secretary, and there was no legal obligation to seek the views of a body or bodies representing the interests of protestors.<sup>2</sup>

10. Teams are asked to submit a **written Skeleton Argument** on behalf of the Appellant / Defendant (the Secretary of State for the Home Department). The Skeleton Argument should argue against the decision of the Court of Appeal on Ground 1 but respond to the cross appeal on behalf of the Respondent / Claimant (Liberty).
11. The Skeleton Argument should take the form of a stand-alone document of no more than 5 pages of 12-point type, at least 1.5 line spacing, setting out your arguments on the two issues. The Skeleton Argument should comply with the LCJ

---

<sup>1</sup> Court of Appeal, [42]-[52], [57], [63].

<sup>2</sup> Court of Appeal, [117]-[125].

*Practice Direction: Citation of Authorities* [2012] 1 WLR 780,<sup>3</sup> save that the only authorities which may be cited are those listed at the end of these instructions.

12. The heading to the Skeleton Argument should be in the standard format for a skeleton argument, including the name of the case, but also:

Skeleton Argument on behalf of the Appellant / Cross-Respondent  
[Name of Team Member 1 / Name of Team Member 2]

13. You should assume for present purposes that all procedural requirements (as to time limits etc.) are satisfied and do not need to be addressed.

### ***How to enter***

14. Entries for the competition should be submitted via the following [Google Form](#), where you will be asked to enter your team's details and upload a copy of your skeleton argument. Entries should be submitted by **5.00pm on Wednesday 5 November 2025**.
15. Only one entry submission is required per team (i.e. a single form should be used for both team members). Please note, however, that **by uploading and submitting your work, both team members agree that this is your own work and that it complies with the rules of the competition.**
16. Please note that you will be required to use a Google Account in order to complete the [Google Form](#). **Wherever possible, applicants should use the Google Form to submit their entries to the competition.** If this is not possible, entries should be submitted by email to [administrator@adminlaw.org.uk](mailto:administrator@adminlaw.org.uk) by 5.00pm on Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> November 2025 and should include the details listed in **Appendix A** of these instructions, a copy of your team's skeleton argument in Microsoft Word or PDF, and an explanation of why it was not possible to submit the entry via the [Google Form](#).
17. Incomplete application forms or email submissions which do not contain all of the required information will not be considered.
18. Extensions of time to allow late entries will only be considered in highly exceptional circumstances and in the discretion of the Mooting Sub-Committee, having regard to the length of extension needed and the reasons given for not complying with the deadline. Applications for an extension of time should be

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/JCO/Documents/Practice+Directions/lcj-pract-dir-citation-authorities-2012.pdf>

submitted by email to [administrator@adminlaw.org.uk](mailto:administrator@adminlaw.org.uk), explaining the reasons why an extension should be granted.

19. Entries will be marked on the papers by members of the ALBA Committee who will select the teams who go through to the next round.
20. The outcome will be notified by email by **Friday 21 November 2024**. We regret that we will not be able to provide feedback to candidates who are unsuccessful at this stage.

### **Stage 2: oral presentation in the Supreme Court, First Round**

21. Six shortlisted teams will be invited to participate in the competition, which will take place at the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom in Parliament Square on **Thursday 11 December 2025** from 5pm.
22. Teams selected for participation in the Final are required to submit a further Skeleton Argument argued from the perspective of the Respondent / Cross Appellant (Liberty), which follows the format of the previously submitted Skeleton save that the title should make clear that it is submitted on behalf of the Respondent / Cross-Appellant. **The deadline for submission of this skeleton is 5.00pm on Thursday 4 December.**
23. It will be a condition for participation in Stage 2 and 3 on 11 December 2025 that those selected confirm, by 4 December 2025, either that they were pre-existing members of ALBA or that they have joined by that date.
24. There will be three full judges for this occasion, who will be drawn from members of the Senior Judiciary. The full-time judges will be assisted by three KC members of the ALBA Committee in the First Round.
25. Teams should come prepared to argue either side of the case on the two identified grounds in the Supreme Court. Teams will be randomly allocated to one or other side of the case, and will be notified of which side they are to argue in the first round on the day of the moot.
26. To reflect the fact that there is a cross-appeal, arguments will be presented in the order: Appellant Team Member 1 (Appeal Ground), Respondent Team Member 1 (Response to Appeal), Respondent Team Member 2 (Cross-Appeal Ground), Appellant Team Member 2 (Response to Cross-Appeal). Each participant will be allowed 8 minutes to argue their respective part of the case.

27. There will be six teams in the first round, split into three moots. Each moot will be judged by one full judge sitting with a KC. Teams should be prepared to deal with some judicial intervention in the course of argument.
28. Candidates will be provided with a link to a tabbed PDF of the authorities bundle and may not refer to any other case authorities. A list of the approved authorities is below. The judges will be provided with a copy of the authorities bundles and candidates should bring their own copy for their use during the moot: they may use electronic or paper authorities bundles as they wish.
29. The winner of each moot will be decided by the judges in their absolute discretion, in consideration of the quality of written argument, oral advocacy, presentation and style, legal analysis and response to judicial intervention. Judges will provide brief oral feedback to all teams, time allowing.
30. The first-round judges will meet to discuss the candidates, and the two highest scoring teams will go through to the final.

### **Stage 3: oral presentation in the Supreme Court, Final**

31. For the Final, teams will have 20 minutes to present, or, as the case may be, respond, to the appeal. Some of the additional time compared with the first round may be taken up with responding to further judicial intervention. The winning team will be selected in the absolute discretion of the judges on the basis of the quality of written argument, oral advocacy presentation and style, legal analysis and response to judicial intervention.
32. There will be a short drinks reception after the event, for all those involved in Stages 2 and 3, along with the second and third round judges and other ALBA members.
33. The prizes are:
  - i. For the winning team: £1000. For the 2nd-placed team: £500.
  - ii. The four members of the winning and 2nd-placed team will each be entitled to a free place at the ALBA summer conference in 2025.

### **List of permitted authorities**

34. In addition to the Divisional Court and Court of Appeal judgments in the *Liberty* case:

- i. *R (Coughlan) v North & East Devon Health Authority* [1999] EWCA Civ 1871; [\[2001\] QB 213](#)
- ii. *R (Milton Keynes Council) v Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government* [\[2011\] EWCA Civ 1575](#)
- iii. *R (Association of Personal Injury Lawyers) v Secretary of State for Justice* [\[2013\] EWHC 1358 \(Admin\)](#)
- iv. *R (on the application of Plantagenet Alliance Ltd) v Secretary of State for Justice* [\[2014\] EWHC 1662 \(Admin\)](#); [2015] 3 All ER 261
- v. *R (Public Law Project) v Lord Chancellor* [\[2016\] UKSC 39](#), [2016] AC 1531
- vi. *R (Article 39) v Secretary of State for Education* [\[2020\] EWCA Civ 1577](#); [2021] PTSR 696
- vii. *R (Eveleigh) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions* [\[2023\] EWCA Civ 810](#); [2023] 1 WLR 3599.

35. The above cases are all accessible on official websites for the purposes of preparing written material ahead of the oral hearing.

9 October 2025

## **Appendix A**

**Wherever possible, applicants should use the [Google Form](#) to submit their entries to the competition.**

If that is not possible, the following details must be submitted alongside a copy of your team's skeleton argument if providing your entry by email.

Only one submission is required per team. Please note, however, that **by uploading and submitting your work, both team members agree that this is your own work and that it complies with the rules of the competition.**

Email submissions which do not contain all of the required information will not be considered.

Please provide the following:

### **Team Member 1**

Team Member 1 full name:

Team Member 1 email:

Please confirm you meet the eligibility requirements by confirming which of the below applies to you. If you have selected 'other' please explain why you consider you are eligible by reference to the rules:

- Current LLB Student
- Current LLM Student
- Current GDL Student
- Current Bar Course Student
- Current LPC/SQE Student
- Completed LLB/LLM/GDL/Bar Course/LPC/SQE in the last 5 years (if so, please answer the next question)
- Other

If you are eligible because completed an LLB/LLM/GDL/Bar Course/LPC/SQE in the last 5 years, please state the last degree you completed and the year of your graduation

Confirmation you do not current hold pupillage or a training contract offer: **YES / NO**

## Team Member 2

Team Member 2 full name:

Team Member 2 email:

Please confirm you meet the eligibility requirements by confirming which of the below applies to you. If you have selected 'other' please explain why you consider you are eligible by reference to the rules:

- Current LLB Student
- Current LLM Student
- Current GDL Student
- Current Bar Course Student
- Current LPC/SQE Student
- Completed LLB/LLM/GDL/Bar Course/LPC/SQE in the last 5 years (if so, please answer the next question)
- Other

If you are eligible because completed an LLB/LLM/GDL/Bar Course/LPC/SQE in the last 5 years, please state the last degree you completed and the year of your graduation

Confirmation you do not current hold pupillage or a training contract offer: **YES / NO**