



Judicial Selection and Recommendations for Appointment Statistics, April 2012 to September 2012

**Judicial Appointments Commission
Statistics Bulletin**

Published 6 December 2012

Contents

Executive summary	3
Introduction	5
Results for completed exercises by type of judicial office:	8
Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Courts)	
Fee-paid Service Member of the First-tier Tribunal (War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber)	
Fee-paid Specialist Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber, Criminal Injuries Compensation Appeals Panel)	
Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber)	
Grouped, small selection exercises	
Explanatory Notes	16
Contacts	20

Executive Summary

Below are summary statistics on the diversity profile of applicants and recommended candidates for exercises involving 10 or more recommendations.

Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Courts)

- 44 per cent of the eligible pool were women, 10 per cent were from a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) background, and 85 per cent were solicitors.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 42 per cent to 46 per cent and male applicants decreased from 55 per cent to 54 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds increased from 18 per cent to 25 per cent, and white applicants decreased from 77 per cent to 75 per cent; information regarding ethnicity was not available for the remaining applicants.

Fee-paid Service Member of the First-tier Tribunal (War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber)

- As this was a non-legal selection exercise there was no eligible pool.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants decreased from 13 per cent to 10 per cent and male applicants increased from 82 per cent to 90 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from one per cent to none, and white applicants increased from 94 per cent to 100 per cent; information regarding ethnicity was not available for the remaining applicants.

Fee-paid Specialist Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber, Criminal Injuries Compensation Appeals Panel)

- As this was a non-legal selection exercise there was no eligible pool.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 51 per cent to 70 per cent and male applicants decreased from 40 per cent to 20 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 16 per cent to none, and white applicants increased from 73 per cent to 90 per cent; information regarding ethnicity was not available for the remaining applicants.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber)

- As this was a non-legal selection exercise there was no eligible pool.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 48 per cent to 53 per cent and male applicants decreased from 47 per cent to 44 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 25 per cent to 17 per cent, and white applicants increased from 67 per cent to 76 per cent; information regarding ethnicity was not available for the remaining applicants.

Introduction

This bulletin has been prepared by the Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC). It presents statistics on recommendations for the appointment of judges for completed selection exercises. The statistics are used to monitor and evaluate the diversity of JAC selections for judicial office.

This bulletin reports on selection exercises and recommendations for appointment that were completed between April and September 2012. The results presented here differ from those in previous publications in this series in a number of ways:

- For the first time, results are included broken down by age. This is to present a more complete picture of the diversity of applicants and recommended candidates. This change was pre-announced in the previous publication in this series.
- The results presented in this publication are compared to the diversity of the pool of eligible candidates. The figures used to calculate the pool of eligible candidates have been updated, using more recent data and including results of members of the Chartered Institution of Legal Executives (CILEX). This change was also pre-announced in the previous publication in this series.
- Also for the first time, results are presented with the findings of directly comparable exercises conducted by the JAC in the past. This provides a historical context against which the results of current exercises can be compared.

The **Results** includes an overview of each selection exercise by diversity group¹, covering the eligible pool², the number of eligible and shortlisted applicants, and the number of applicants recommended for appointment. It also includes the corresponding proportions for each of the three diversity monitoring stages of selection exercises.

Tables are presented that supplement the commentary. They contain absolute numbers and proportions of applications, shortlisted candidates and selected candidates segmented by group. The tables also show each group as a proportion of the total number at each stage of the selection exercise, and as a proportion at previous stages, showing how each group has progressed through the exercise.

All the diversity statistics in this report are based on self-declared information applicants have provided on the JAC Application Monitoring Form. Completion of this is voluntary and is not considered in the selection process. Some applicants have chosen not to declare their diversity group or filled in the form

¹ Each diversity group refers to: gender, ethnic background, professional background, the disability status and age of eligible applicants.

² Eligible pool refers to: the approximation of the number of people who are able to meet the job-specific entry requirements laid down for that particular judicial post.

incorrectly, and these applicants have been placed in the “Incomplete” group in the tables.

Information about data sources, statistical revisions, any forthcoming changes, stages in the selection process, description of posts and symbols and conventions used in this bulletin are given in the **Explanatory Notes**.

Any feedback, questions or requests for further information about this statistical bulletin can be directed to the appropriate **Contact** given at the end of this report.

Statistics

This bulletin provides statistics relating to the following selection exercises run by the JAC:

- Deputy District Judge (Magistrates’ Court)
- Fee-paid Service Member of the First-tier Tribunal (War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber)
- Fee-paid Specialist Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber, Criminal Injuries Compensation Appeals Panel)
- Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber)

There were also seven small exercises which were completed. Each of these exercises had less than 10 recommendations for appointment. For the purpose of this report their figures have been grouped together in order to protect applicant confidentiality and to provide more robust counts and percentages. It should be noted that if any individual was an eligible applicant for more than one of these exercises, then they will be counted in these statistics more than once.

Grouped posts:

- Chamber President of the War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber of the First-tier Tribunal
- Regional Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber
- Senior Circuit Judge - Resident Judge
- Specialist Circuit Judge (Mercantile)
- Deputy Senior District Judge (Magistrates' Courts)
- Master of the Queen's Bench Division (Administrative Court)

- Salaried Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal - Social Entitlement Chamber

More information about these posts and the selection exercises can be found in the **Explanatory Notes** section near the end of this report.

Results

In this section, the results of the selection exercises with 10 or more recommendations are presented. In order to protect applicant confidentiality posts with less than 10 recommendations are presented with their results grouped together.

Descriptions of each post can be found in the Explanatory Notes section.

Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Courts) (Tables 1 and 6)

Eligible pool

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 112,000 people; this represents an estimate of the number of people who meet the eligibility requirement that a candidate should have at least five years' experience in the legal profession. Of this pool, 56 per cent were male and 44 per cent female. Around 10 per cent of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 85 per cent of the eligible pool were solicitors, 11 per cent were barristers and five per cent are fellows of CILEX. The disability status and age profile of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 1,467 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 282 (19 per cent) were shortlisted and 28 (10 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

611 (42 per cent) of the 1,467 eligible applicants were women and 802 (55 per cent) were men. Of the 282 shortlisted applicants, 112 (40 per cent) were women and 163 (58 per cent) were men. Of the 28 applicants recommended for appointment, 13 (46 per cent) were women and 15 (54 per cent) were men.

Summary statistics for the only previous Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Court) recruitment exercise the JAC has carried out, in 2009, are presented in Table 6. Compared to that exercise, the proportion of applicants who were women was higher in the 2012 exercise (42 compared to 39 per cent). The proportion of recommended candidates who were women was also higher in the 2012 exercise (46 compared to 42 per cent).

Ethnicity

1,125 (77 per cent) of the 1,467 eligible applicants were white and 263 (18 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 282 shortlisted applicants, 228 (81 per cent) were white and 44 (16 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 28 applicants recommended for appointment, 21 (75 per cent) were white and seven applicants (25 per cent) were from a BAME background.

Compared to the previous Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Court) recruitment exercise the JAC carried out, the proportion of applicants who were from a BAME background was very slightly higher in the 2012 exercise

(18 compared to 17 per cent). The proportion of recommended candidates who were from a BAME background was also higher in the 2012 exercise (25 compared to 12 per cent).

Professional background

757 (52 per cent) of the 1,467 eligible applicants were solicitors and 535 (36 per cent) were barristers. Of the 282 shortlisted applicants, 151 (54 per cent) were solicitors and 95 (34 per cent) were barristers. Of the 28 applicants recommended for appointment, 14 (50 per cent) were solicitors, 10 (36 per cent) were barristers, one (four per cent) was a judicial office-holder and three did not declare their professional background.

Compared to the previous Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Court) recruitment exercise the JAC carried out, the proportion of applicants who were solicitors was lower in the 2012 exercise (52 compared to 63 per cent). The proportion of recommended candidates who were solicitors was also lower in the 2012 exercise (50 compared to 69 per cent).

Although the proportion of applicants who were solicitors was lower in the 2012 exercise than in the 2009 exercise, the number of applicants who were solicitors was higher in the more recent exercise. In the 2009 exercise, 511 solicitors applied; in the 2012 exercise 757 did so. However, the number of applicants who were not solicitors increased by even more between the 2009 and 2012 exercises, from 306 to 710.

Disability status

49 of the 1,467 eligible applicants were disabled (three per cent). Of the 282 shortlisted applicants, 11 (four per cent) were disabled. Of the 28 applicants recommended for appointment, one (four per cent) was disabled.

Compared to the previous Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Court) recruitment exercise the JAC carried out, the proportion of applicants who were disabled was very slightly lower in the 2012 exercise (three compared to four per cent). The proportion of recommended candidates who were disabled was higher in the 2012 exercise (four per cent compared to none).

Age

666 (45 per cent) of the eligible applicants were aged between 36 and 45, making it the age-group with the most applicants. Of the 282 shortlisted applicants, 128 (45 per cent) were in the same age-group. Of the 28 applicants recommended for appointment, 14 (50 per cent) were also in the same age-group, seven applicants (25 per cent) were aged 35 or less, six candidates were aged between 46 and 55, and one candidate was aged between 56 and 65. No candidate was aged more than 65.

This is the first time age has been recorded in this series of Official Statistics, so current age results cannot be compared to those of past exercises.

Fee-paid Service Member of the First-tier Tribunal (War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber) (Table 2)

Eligible pool

As this was a non-legal selection exercise there was no eligible pool.

Of the 120 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 30 (25 per cent) were shortlisted and 10 (33 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

15 (13 per cent) of the 120 eligible applicants were women and 98 (82 per cent) were men. Of the 30 shortlisted applicants, five (17 per cent) were women and 23 (77 per cent) were men. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, one (10 per cent) was a woman and nine (90 per cent) were men.

This is the first recruitment exercise JAC has carried out with 10 recommended candidates or more relating to the War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber. As a result, there are no previous exercises with which to compare these results.

Ethnicity

113 (94 per cent) of the 120 eligible applicants were white and one (one per cent) was from a BAME background. Of the 30 shortlisted applicants, 28 (93 per cent) were white and none were from a BAME background. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, all were white.

Professional background

None of the applicants had a background in the legal profession – all candidates had to have experience in the Armed Forces.

Disability status

Seven of the 120 eligible applicants were disabled (six per cent). Of the 30 shortlisted applicants, two (seven per cent) were disabled. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, one (10 per cent) was disabled.

Age

52 of the 120 eligible applicants were aged between 46 and 55 (43 per cent) making it the age-group with the most applicants. Of the 30 shortlisted applicants, 12 (40 per cent) were in the same age-group. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, four (40 per cent) were in the same age-group, four (40 per cent) were aged between 56 and 65, and two applicants were aged between 36 and 45.

Fee-paid Specialist Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber, Criminal Injuries Compensation Appeals Panel) (Table 3)

Eligible pool

As this was a non-legal selection exercise there was no eligible pool.

Of the 105 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 28 (27 per cent) were shortlisted and 10 (36 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

54 (51 per cent) of the 105 eligible applicants were women and 42 (40 per cent) were men. Of the 28 shortlisted applicants, 15 (54 per cent) were women and 10 (36 per cent) were men. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, seven (70 per cent) were women, two (20 per cent) were men and one candidate did not declare their gender.

This is the first large recruitment exercise (10 recommended candidates or more) relating to a specialist member of Criminal Injuries Compensation Appeals Panel. As a result, there are no previous exercises with which to compare these results.

Ethnicity

77 (73 per cent) of the 105 eligible applicants were white and 17 (16 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 28 shortlisted applicants, 19 (68 per cent) were white and five (18 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, nine (90 per cent) were white and one candidate did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

None of the applicants had a background in the legal profession.

Disability status

Five of the 105 eligible applicants were disabled (five per cent). Of the 28 shortlisted applicants, none were disabled.

Age

47 of the 105 eligible applicants were aged between 46 and 55 (45 per cent) making it the age-group with the most applicants. Of the 28 shortlisted applicants, 10 (36 per cent) were in the same age-group. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, two applicants (20 per cent) were in the same age-group, five were aged between 36 and 45 years old, one was aged 35 or less, one was aged between 56 and 65 and one candidate did not provide information as to their age.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (Tables 4 and 6)

Eligible pool

As this was a non-legal selection exercise there was no eligible pool.

Of the 153 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 93 (61 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

73 (48 per cent) of the 153 eligible applicants were women and 72 (47 per cent) were men. Of the 93 applicants recommended for appointment, 49 (53 per cent) were women, 41 (44 per cent) were men, and three candidates did not declare their gender.

The JAC previously conducted three recruitment exercises for medically qualified members of a first-tier Social Entitlement Chamber in 2009, 2010 and 2011. The summary results are presented in Table 6. Compared to those, the proportion of applicants who were female was higher in the most recent exercise, carried out in 2012 (48 per cent compared to between 34 and 37 per cent). The proportion of recommended candidates who were female was also higher in the most recent exercise (54 per cent compared to between 36 and 39 per cent).

Ethnicity

103 (67 per cent) of the 153 eligible applicants were white and 38 (25 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 93 applicants recommended for appointment, 71 (76 per cent) were white, 16 (17 per cent) were from a BAME background and six applicants did not declare their ethnicity.

Compared to the three previous recruitment exercises JAC has conducted for medically qualified members of a first-tier Social Entitlement Chamber, the proportion of applicants who were from a BAME background was higher in the most recent exercise (25 per cent compared to between 14 and 24 per cent). The proportion of recommended candidates who were from a BAME background in the most recent exercise was in line with those from previous exercises (16 per cent compared to between 12 and 19 per cent).

Professional background

None of the applicants had a background in the legal profession – all candidates had to have medical experience.

Disability status

Seven of the 153 eligible applicants were disabled (five per cent). Of the 93 applicants recommended for appointment, two (two per cent) were disabled.

Compared to the three previous recruitment exercises JAC has conducted for medically qualified members of a first-tier Social Entitlement Chamber, the proportion of applicants who were disabled was in line with previous results (seven per cent compared to between zero and seven per cent in the earlier

exercises). The proportion of recommended candidates who were disabled in the most recent exercise was also in line with those from previous exercises (two per cent compared to between zero and three per cent).

Age

57 of the 153 eligible applicants were aged between 56 and 65 (37 per cent) making it the age-group with the most applicants. Of the 93 applicants recommended for appointment, 37 (40 per cent) were in the same age-group, 24 (26 per cent) were aged between 46 and 55 years old, 16 were aged between 36 and 45, 10 were aged 35 or younger, four were aged 66 or older and two candidates did not declare their age.

This is the first time age is being recorded in this series of Official Statistics, so current age results cannot be compared to those of past exercises.

Grouped, small selection exercises (Table 5)

This subsection relates to the seven small selection exercises which were completed during this period for legal and non-legal posts. These exercises had less than 10 recommendations for appointment. For the purpose of this report the figures have been grouped together in order to protect applicant confidentiality and to provide more meaningful counts and results³. It should be noted that if any individual was an eligible applicant for more than one of these exercises, then they will be counted in these statistics more than once.

Eligible pool

The small selection exercises were grouped; consequently there was no eligible pool.

Gender

16 (27 per cent) of the 60 eligible applicants were women and 41 (68 per cent) were men. Of the 21 shortlisted applicants, four (19 per cent) were women and 17 (81 per cent) were men. Of the nine applicants recommended for appointment, four (44 per cent) were women and five (56 per cent) were men.

Ethnicity

48 (80 per cent) of the 60 eligible applicants were white and eight (13 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 21 shortlisted applicants, 19 (90 per cent) were white and two (10 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the nine applicants recommended for appointment, all were white.

Professional background

19 (32 per cent) of the 60 eligible applicants were solicitors and 19 (32 per cent) were salaried judicial office holders. Of the 21 shortlisted applicants, eight (38 per cent) were salaried judicial office holders and seven (33 per cent) were barristers. Of the nine applicants recommended for appointment, three (33 per cent) were salaried judicial office holders, two (22 per cent) were barristers, two were solicitors, one was from another profession and one applicant did not declare their professional background.

Disability status

Five of the 60 eligible applicants were disabled (eight per cent). Of the 21 shortlisted applicants, two (10 per cent) were disabled. Of the nine applicants recommended for appointment, none were disabled.

Age

26 of the 60 eligible applicants were aged between 46 and 55 (43 per cent) making it the age-group with the most applicants. Of the 21 shortlisted applicants, 10 (48 per cent) were in that same age-group. Of the nine applicants recommended for appointment, six (67 per cent) were also in that

³ In previous bulletins in this series, results for legal and non-legal posts have been grouped separately. However, in this publication, results are being reported for only one non-legal post. In order to protect the confidentiality of applicants for that post and to provide more meaningful counts and results, the results for legal and non-legal posts have been grouped together for this bulletin.

same age-group. In addition, two applicants (22 per cent) were aged between 56 and 65 and one was aged 66 or older.

Explanatory Notes

Data sources

The main source of data for details of applicants for this report was the Equitas database, which is maintained by the JAC. It contains records of all the completed selection exercises using data provided by the candidates on the JAC Application Monitoring Form.

The report also draws data from the Law Society, Bar Council, CILEX and Judicial Office publications to derive data for the eligible pools of potential applicants. The Judicial Office provides data on serving judicial office holders. The Law Society, Bar Council and CILEX provide data on solicitors and barristers and fellows of CILEX who are on the Roll (solicitors) and have been called to the Bar (barristers).

Revisions

The quality assured statistics in this bulletin are provisional and are therefore liable to revision to take account of any late amendments to the administrative databases from which these statistics were sourced. The standard process for revising the published statistics to account for these late amendments is to publish them in the next edition of this bulletin.

This, and previous bulletins, along with downloadable Excel tables, are available from the JAC website: <http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/about-jac/823.htm>

Glossary of terms

A glossary of terms used in this bulletin is available from the JAC website: <http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/about-jac/823.htm>

Stages in the selection process

There are three stages in each selection process at which the diversity of applicants is officially recorded: application, shortlisting and recommendation for appointment. In general, around two to three times as many applicants as there are vacancies are shortlisted, using either a qualifying test or a paper sift. Those shortlisted are invited to a selection day involving an interview and, in the case of entry level positions, a role play.

The Commissioners of the JAC, sitting as the Selection and Character Committee make the selection decision based on a report of the selection day, references, self assessment and the result of statutory consultation with the judiciary. The Commission then makes recommendations to the Lord Chancellor.

Further information on the selection process is available on the JAC website: <http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/selection-process/352.htm>

Description of posts in this bulletin

For each of these posts for England and Wales the selection process is determined by the JAC under the Constitutional Reform Act 2005 (CRA), and is set out on the JAC website:

<http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/selection-process/selection-exercises/past-exercises.htm>

Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Courts)

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under section 8(1) of the County Courts Act 1984, as amended by Schedule 11 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement (TCE) Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select 28 candidates for immediate appointment. Short listing was by qualifying test. Those shortlisted were first invited to an interview and the successful candidates subsequently invited to a role play scenario.

This was the first selection exercise following the reduction of the requirement for 7 years post legal qualification to 5 years.

The 2009 Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Court) exercise was used as a comparator exercise for diversity purposes.

Fee-paid Service Member of the First-tier Tribunal (War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber)

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select 10 candidates for immediate appointment. Short listing was by qualifying test. Those shortlisted were invited to attend a selection day.

The Lord Chancellor requested that candidates have substantial experience of service in Her Majesty's Naval, Military or Air Forces.

There was no appropriate comparator exercise.

Fee-paid Specialist Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber, Criminal Injuries Compensation Appeals Panel)

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select 10 candidates for immediate appointment. Short listing was by on-line qualifying test. Those shortlisted were asked to attend a selection day.

The Lord Chancellor requested that candidates have substantial experience of dealing with victims of crime.

There was no appropriate comparator exercise.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber)

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select 94 candidates for immediate appointment. Candidates were invited to attend a selection day that included a role play scenario.

The 2009 exercise for Fee-paid Member (Medically Qualified) of the First Tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber was the comparator exercise.

Chamber President of the War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber of the First-tier Tribunal

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under section 7(7) of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select a candidate for immediate appointment. Short listing was by sift and those shortlisted were invited to attend a selection day.

There was no appropriate comparator exercise.

Regional Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1(1) of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select 1 candidate for immediate appointment. Short listing was by sift and those shortlisted were invited to attend a selection day.

The 2011 exercise for Regional Judge of the First Tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (SSCS) served as the comparator exercise.

Senior Circuit Judge - Resident Judge

Holders of this office are appointed by the Queen under 16(1) of the Courts Act 1971.

The JAC was asked to select 3 Resident Senior Circuit Judges (Crime) for England and 1 Senior Circuit Judge (Mercantile) for Wales for immediate appointment. Short listing was by sift and those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

There was no appropriate comparator exercise.

Specialist Circuit Judge (Mercantile)

Holders of this office are appointed by the Queen under 16(1) of the Courts Act 1971.

The JAC was asked to select 3 Resident Senior Circuit Judges (Crime) for England and 1 Senior Circuit Judge (Mercantile) for Wales for immediate appointment. Short listing was by sift and those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

There was no appropriate comparator exercise.

Deputy Senior District Judge (Magistrates' Courts)

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Section 10A (2) of the Justices of the Peace Act 1997.

The JAC was asked to select 1 candidate for immediate appointment. Short listing was by sift and those shortlisted were invited to attend a selection day.

The 2010 exercise for Senior District Judge was the comparator exercise.

Master of the Queen's Bench Division (Administrative Court)

Holders of this office are appointed by Her Majesty under Section 89(1) paragraph 26(1) of schedule 11 and paragraph 3(2) of Schedule 3 to the Constitutional Reform Act 2005.

The JAC was asked to select 1 candidate for immediate appointment. Short listing was by sift and those shortlisted were invited to attend a selection day.

There was no appropriate comparator exercise as this was a new post.

Salaried Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal - Social Entitlement Chamber

Holders of this office are designated by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 2 of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 and under paragraph 2(2) of that Schedule.

The JAC was asked to select 1 candidate for immediate appointment. Short listing was not appropriate and all 5 applicants were invited to attend a selection day.

The 2011 Salaried Member (Medically Qualified) of the First Tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber was the comparator exercise.

Contacts

Enquires or comments about the statistics in this bulletin should be directed to:

Adrian Shepherd

Statistician

Judicial Appointments Commission

Steel House, 11 Tothill Street, London, SW1H 9LH

Tel: 020 3334 2483

Email: Adrian.shepherd@justice.gsi.gov.uk

General enquiries on the content of this bulletin should be directed to:

Alan Crouch

Judicial Appointments Commission

Steel House, 11 Tothill Street, London, SW1H 9LH

Tel: 020 3334 0059

Email: alan.crouch@jac.gsi.gov.uk

Press enquiries on the content of this bulletin should be directed to the JAC Outreach Team:

Rebecca Astles

Judicial Appointments Commission

Steel House, 11 Tothill Street, London, SW1H 9LH

Tel: 020 3334 0329

Email: rebecca.astles@jac.gsi.gov.uk

General information about the Judicial Appointments Commission is available from: <http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/about-jac/about-jac.htm>