

City of London Law Society

Corporate Crime Committee

Minutes of Meeting 2 July 2024

(Held as a hybrid meeting)

Attendees (in-person):

Louise Hodges (Chair)	Eve Giles
Neill Blundell (Vice-Chair)	Jeremy Summers
Phil Taylor (Secretary to the Committee)	Jonathan Pickworth
Matthew Rous (CLLS)	Pamela Reddy
Andrew Katzen	Rosanne Kay
Christopher David	Ruby Hamid
Elly Proudlock	Sarah Wallace

Attendees (online):

Camilla da Silva	Ryan Junk
Davina Given	Susannah Cogman
Hannah Laming	Virginia Cannon (Guest)
Laura Ford	

1. The Chair **welcomed** the attendees and extended her thanks to Clifford Chance for hosting the meeting.
2. **Apologies** were received from Daren Allen, David Corker, Davina Given, Eoin O'Shea, Jonathan Cotton, Judith Seddon, Kevin Hart, Matt Getz, Michelle de Kluyver, Tom Epps.
3. **Minutes of the previous meeting** had been circulated, and amendments were invited within 24 hours. The Secretary noted one **matter arising** from the minutes: *all Members to consider suitable guests for future Committee meetings*. A Member suggested Dr Penny Dunbabin from the Home Office, who has been involved in developing the failure to prevent fraud guidance. The Secretary explained that an opportunity had arisen from a Fraud Lawyers Association event, attended by the Chair, to invite HHJ Tony Baumgartner (Southwark Crown Court) and that arrangements would be made accordingly.
 - *The Secretary to make arrangements to invite those suggested, and all Members to continue to consider suitable future attendees and send any suggestions to the Secretary and Chair.*
4. **CLLS / Committee business**
 - a. The Chair noted that a **new membership** round would open in September and that this presented an opportunity for Members to consider suitable contacts from firms not yet represented on the

Committee, bearing in mind the “one member per firm” rule, and the desire to increase diversity among the Membership. This would also be an opportunity for any Member who felt that membership was no longer suitable for them to step down. The Chair reminded the Members of the possibility of appointing “super-sub” for specific tasks and this had already benefited the Law Reform subcommittee.

- b. The Secretary outlined the support available to the Committee from Project Associates (“PA”), the CLLS’s retained PR firm. PA had recently helped set up the Committee’s **new LinkedIn page** which all Members are encouraged to follow and share. The Secretary explained that a series of weekly posts have been planned, spotlighting specific Members.
- *The Secretary to share details of the LinkedIn page by email, and interested Members to contact the Secretary regarding contributing to future posts on the page.*

- c. The Vice-Chair shared an update on the activities of the working group set up to pursue the **work-life balance/culture workstream**. The working group had recently met to further discuss issues raised in the thought piece published by the CLLS Chair, Colin Passmore. The Vice-Chair explained that the discussion had been open and helpful, and had led to a development of the group’s thinking. It had been agreed that the Members likely encountered similar issues relating to work-life balance which may not be easy to solve given the nature of the Committee’s firms and the work we all do.

There followed an open discussion among the Members, who shared their thoughts and opinions on the topic, including the extent to which juniors or more senior lawyers should or need to be supported; mental health first aid; and the concept of “safe spaces” for discussion. The Vice-Chair agreed that the points discussed would be set out in a document addressed to the CLLS Chair.

- *Members to feed back any further thoughts on this topic to the Vice-Chair.*
 - d. The Secretary drew Members’ attention to the new **Southwark Practice Note** which had been circulated with the meeting papers, and explained that this is the product of 12 months’ work by a subcommittee of the Southwark Court Users Group. The note does not create a local practice but reminds practitioners of the way in which Southwark judges might exercise their case management powers, and the relevant law and Criminal Procedure Rules and Practice Directions that must be complied with in dealing with heavy fraud and other complex criminal cases.
5. Members of the Law Reform subcommittee led a discussion on **what the General Election result could mean** for the Committee Members’ practices. The discussion covered a number of points in the Labour Manifesto with particular focus on the plan for an enhanced fraud strategy. Members agreed this appeared to be a continuation of where the current government was heading, and that fraud seems to be a key focus of both the SFO and CPS. There was discussion of recent and potential changes to corporate criminal

liability, and comments (not in the manifesto) around incentivising whistleblowers.

A member of the AML/Sanctions subcommittee confirmed there was little of relevance in the party Manifestos, and noted that plans to introduce OTSI, which had cross-party support, had been put on hold. It was further noted that responses to the consultation on the Money Laundering Regulations were still awaited.

The Vice-Chair noted on behalf of the Disclosure subcommittee that this topic also was not covered in the Manifestos. There was a short discussion among Members on the progress of the Fisher Disclosure Review.

6. There was no **other subcommittee** business of note.
7. No points were raised by Members on the standing item of **Investigation and & Interview Practices (including tech)**.
8. There being **no further business**, the Chair called a close to the meeting with thanks to the Members for their contributions.