

Neutral Citation Number [2022] EWFC 166 (B)

IN THE FAMILY COURT SITTING IN DERBY
IN THE MATTER OF THE CHILDREN ACT 1989
AND IN THE MATTER OF:

[
CASE NUMBER: DE21C50083

A Boy K born in 2011

BETWEEN:-

DERBY CITY COUNCIL

Applicant

- and –

K's Mother

First Respondent

- and –

K's Father

Second Respondent

- and –

K

(the Child by his children's guardian)

Third Respondent

JUDGMENT

Hearing 31st October to 2nd November 2022
Judgement delivered 7th November 2022

HHJ SUE WILLISCROFT:

This judgment was delivered in private. The Judge has given leave for this version of the judgment to be published on condition that (irrespective of what is contained in the judgment) in any published version of the judgment the anonymity of the child and members of the family must be strictly preserved. All persons, including representatives of the media, must ensure that this condition is strictly complied with. Failure to do so will be a contempt of court.

HHJ SUE WILLISCROFT:

1. This is a case involving a young person I will find subject to behaviour from his Father designed to alienate him from his Mother and so causing him significant emotional harm.. A prolonged intervention from a range of professionals has led to that relationship being re-established and his moving more recently to live with her and having a continuing relationship with his Father and while living at his Mother's home with his older sister.

2. **The parties** to this case are
 - 1) The Applicant is the Derby City Council represented by Andrea Ferguson, instructed by Lindsay Dunlop. The key social worker is Verity Carr.
 - 2) The First Respondent is the Mother of K , who is represented by Anthony Finch of counsel instructed by Natalie Potter of Elliot Mather Solicitors.
 - 3) The Second Respondent is the father of K, represented by Bethany Wilson of counsel instructed by Zaffar Iqbal of Zacharia Solicitors.
 - 4) The Third Respondent is the child via his Children's Guardian Sarah Bland who is represented by Dee Khunkhuna of Timms Solicitors.

3. **The issues for the court to determine**
4. At this hearing I had to consider whether social services had proved the facts they said meant the child was at risk of significant harm when the public law case about him began caused, they say, by his Father's behaviour and I have also had to consider what the future contact arrangements should be . I have also been invited to make of my own motion a non molestation order against the Father and I have suggested amendments needed to be made to the care plan for K before I approved it.

5. **The basic history**
6. The Father entered the UK in 99 claiming asylum ; he who now speaks some English but was assisted in proceedings, and in his interaction with professionals including at contact by an interpreter. The Mother comes from the same area and also assisted by an interpreter at court.

7. The parents met in their then home country and married there with the Mother later coming to the UK . They have two children . The family are all now UK citizens. The parents separated in unclear circumstances involving visits to their former home country over 2018 and 2019 .By the summer of 2019 both children were living with Father. I do not need to determine reasons for this but I note the Father issued a divorce under his home country's law he told me in 2018 and their English legal divorce I am told completed very recently. The parents continue to share Parental Responsibility for both their children. Their children are a girl now aged 18 and K now aged almost 11.
8. Records show social services investigations over concerns about running away , self-harm and possibly forced marriage for the daughter in 2019 and she moved to live with her Mother at that time. The last contact Mother and K had before care proceedings began was in summer 2019 and the last contact the girl had with her father was in February 2020.
9. The Father went to go to his former home country with K in February 2020 on a trip during the school term , saying it was for an indeterminate time . It seems the Mother found out and had not given permission and prompt action secured K's return to the UK and his passport seized by police. The Father was arrested and shortly afterwards released. The Father remains angry about this. He explained he did not realise he needed the Mother's permission to remove the child from the jurisdiction.
10. **Private law proceedings** were begun by her in April 2020 about both children in which she was seeking an order both live with her ; the children became parties represented by a Children's Guardian from Cafcass and a solicitor ; social workers filed reports including under s37 of the Children Act and detailed interventions with Systemic Therapy were engaged in to restore family relationships.. The professionals would say this was actively undermined by the Father and his involvement in this therapy was superficial at best.
11. In **August 2021 care proceedings** began but for K only . I approved the making of an interim care order with a plan for K to go into foster care , then concerned about

the imminent risk of emotional harm as a result of Father's behaviour and its effect on child, a view and plan supported by professionals and balancing the inevitable distress this separation would cause and knowing it was against K's expressed wishes.

12. His time in foster care had its challenges but within a month he was interested in seeing his Mother and therapy continued involving K and his Mother. The court had commissioned expert psychological advice from Dr Lewis which was filed in November 2011, and later two addendums about this child and his parents.

13. Over the course of time the relationship between this child and his Mother and his sister has been restored and he moved, in fact with Father's permission, under the care order to Mother's care in October of this year, a placement regulated under social services placement with parent regulations.

14. The care plan

15. Social services invite the court to make a final care order with a plan the child remains living with his Mother and sister and suggest his contact with Father in their current revised position should be supervised with an interpreter, subject to an agreement about behaviour entered in to with the Father, with contact taking place once every 2 weeks. They also agree with the Mother that her whereabouts and where the child goes to school should not be shared with the Father and he has agreed to a recording that he will not himself or through others take any steps to find out either places or approach them and will not communicate with son or his Mother except through social services who will, due to the care order, share parental responsibility for K.

16. These care plans are supported by the Mother and the Children's Guardian who reports separately about the welfare needs of K. It is unusual for proceedings to end with a care order when a child is placed with a parent but the circumstances here and the relative recent transition to the care of his Mother means all parties accept the shared parental responsibility is necessary.

17. Although Father says he supports the care order and that he was pleased when seeing K recently that he was happy I am not persuaded that is in fact his real opinion. He

remains angry about what he regards as “force” by the professionals involved and continues to state the court and others should consider the expressed oral wishes of his son about all matters.

18. The issues before this court today

19. I am asked to make findings about the behaviour of the Father and its impact on the parties' son in a document setting out facts the local authority seeks to prove called a Threshold document. The Father disputes this. I also need to determine the amount of contact the Father should have since he would like it two times a week as a minimum and to progress to overnight stays.

20. The Mother is also inviting the court to make of its own motion non molestation orders for a period of time, opposed by the Father on the grounds of jurisdiction as well as necessity.

21. The law

22. In order to give this court jurisdiction to make any orders the court has to be satisfied when this case began K was suffering or at risk of suffering significant harm as a result of the parenting he was receiving ; as set out in s31 of the Children Act 1989. The local authority set out the facts that support this in a documents called a Threshold document since unless it is proved the case ends there. The Father disputes threshold was ever met.

23. The document on file is poorly drafted, and the local authority invites the court to consider it as expressed in its written opening , inviting the court to find;-

- 1) K had not had contact with his mother since August 2019 by reason of the father failing to promote contact between the child and his mother.
- 2) The father frustrated contact between the child and his mother by exposing the child to his own entrenched negative views of the mother.
- 3) The father encouraged the child to adopt his father's entrenched negative views of his mother.

- 4) The father exposed the child to adult themes in respect of the conflict between his parents.
- 5) The child was the subject of lengthy private law proceedings during which the father exposed the child to the detail of the proceedings and the dispute between the parties.
- 6) The father failed to appropriately promote a meaningful relationship between the child and his mother.
- 7) The father encouraged the child to adopt the father's views in respect of contact with his mother and sister and failed to encourage and support the child to form his own views in respect of his relationship with his mother.
- 8) The father failed to meaningfully engage with professional support to reinstate contact between the child and his mother.

24. The original document had one paragraph about the Mother which the local authority rightly concedes was a historical comment rather than a threshold finding. I agree with Father's lawyer that the above is rather repetitive . I consider in fact what is being sought is findings that :-

- a) Father rejected his Daughter and caused risk of emotional harm to K as a result
- b) Father 's behaviour included
 - (1) Giving the child a false narrative of his history including blaming his Mother for his Passport being seized and their holiday ending
 - (2) Supporting him (alleging) being hit by a slipper as sufficient reason not to see his Mother- when it is not-
 - (3) Repeating in his presence allegations about the Mother in order to influence and affect his views, this includes financial matters
 - (4) Allowing him access to both court papers and engaging in discussion about court in which the Father described the Mother as a liar
 - (5) Not allowing a relationship with his Mother and sister for a prolonged period of time by encouraging a narrative that the child's views he had influenced should be accepted without further consideration
 - (6) His inability to understand and explain that it is emotionally healthy to have relationships with both parents and all wider family members

25. Law on proof

26. In order to determine if these allegations are true or not the court considers evidence on the civil standard of proof namely the balance of probabilities or more likely than not.

27. The evidence

28. I have read a large bundle of documents , including a number of assessments, expert, parents evidence, GAL reports and social work recordings . I have had the advantage of dealing with this case since the start of private law proceedings. Oral evidence was heard from Dr Lewis , the social worker and the Father . I have taken the opportunity since hearing helpful submissions of advocates of reviewing the written evidence and my notes

29. My basic conclusions

30. I accept threshold is proved in way I have described. I will explain why.

31. Father's case I consider is that people have wilfully misinterpreted his actions which in his mind are culturally appropriate and justified. It is important for me to remember that with Dr Lewis he could see no inherent benefit for his son having any relationship with his Mother which shows a lack of parenting capacity in my assessment.

32. I am aware both parents have had a part to play in conflict in the past and the circumstances of the Father becoming main carer of both children for a time remain unclear to me but also not necessary for me to determine. Each was found by the expert to see all good in themselves and their son and all bad in the other parent, which the expert considered to be potentially harmful . The Mother has worked to improve her capacity as a parent which includes her thinking about this. None of us are all good or all bad.

33. The Father is proud of the care and support he has given his children and right to record how well school reports about K and feels he should have credit for the

positive young man that is reported. He has no subtle understanding of the importance of ongoing relationships and I found his rejection of his daughter upsetting to hear. That was about him – not her – he was at risk of punishment from god he said about her behaviour but she is his flesh and blood and likely needs his continuing guidance and support if it is not punitive.

34. It was obvious to me spending on the children to a considerable degree took place by him and that seemed to me less about helping them “relax” as he said but I find to encourage them to side with him. His former wife is also his cousin and should deserve respect.

35. Here the local authority say his alienating behaviour was conscious and they point in aid to provable facts which I find are proved by the evidence filed

- 1) There had been no contact between the child and his mother since August 2019
- 2) The child was taken to the parents former home country (although stopped on the way) without the Mothers consent
- 3) His Father left the child in the UK after this when during private law proceedings he went on a long trip to his former home country without informing the Mother even what basic steps he had taken to ensure his care and resulting in the child not attending school for a significant period while a “friend” cared for him.
- 4) The alleged assault K has talked about by his Mother would not in itself justify his then rejecting behaviour
- 5) The Father recording the child setting out this allegation as he did was in itself abusive I find
- 6) The Father explicitly tried to involve K in this court process to justify his Fathers beliefs that there should be no ongoing relationship with his Mother, this including sharing court papers with him but also I recall him wanting to have K physically take part in an early hearing.
- 7) The court took control of the child’s passport in July 2020. L has mentioned his lack of this document to professionals repeatedly saying it makes him unhappy views echoing his Father's and with no objective reasoning. Why would it have any impact on how he feels unless this is something discussed with him?

- 8) That the evidence of what K has said has been notably not reflecting his own thinking but obviously repeating adult phrases and language, this includes for example saying his mother only wants to see him to get his child benefit and other financial issues which have been mentioned by a range of professionals whose evidence I accept
 - 9) The Father's unwillingness to consider steps suggested to promote the relationship demonstrated the strength of his resistance to this taking place an example being visits arranged in Jan 2020 which he then stopped
 - 10) In December 2021 Father repeatedly encouraged K to write down his wishes and feelings which he reported was for Father's solicitor when K was already represented independently
 - 11) The Father's rejection of his daughter with whom he has had no relationship since February 2020 must have impacted the emotional wellbeing of her brother. He was wrong to report her to the police when she tried to contact him. There was nothing remotely criminal about her contacting her Father and this will have affected her and her brother.
36. The situation now is different but has only been achieved through extraordinary resources and K being in foster care, that is care with strangers for a long period of time. Those resources have included
- 1) Him becoming a party and a Cafcass Guardian spending time with him
 - 2) Social services assessments
 - 3) Many systemic therapy sessions funded and provided by social services to his parents
 - 4) His care in foster care which the state has paid for
 - 5) The ongoing assessments by professionals including 3 reports by a psychologist instructed as an expert for the court
37. The situation now is that Father accepts the child has moved into Mother's care and is reunited with his sister. K appears to be doing well and challenges latterly in foster care not seen recently.
38. He is to have an ongoing relationship with his Father about which there was a dispute about the frequency of time he would spend with his Father which I will resolve

today. His Father has also to his credit been agreeable to him having a message that his father approved the move. The Father has accepted the inevitable but I find has been unwilling to recognise his role in this

39. Oral evidence

40. Dr Lewis was instructed by the court to meet with the parties and report. This was due to concerns about the capacity of both parents given the parental conflict and to understand the impact and effect on K of his life experiences to date.

41. Parental alienation is not a diagnosis in itself. It reflects behaviour by the child or young person where resistance to a continuing relationship with a parent is not justified by objective analysis. The behaviour causing it can be conscious and unconscious by a parent. It is not located in the child.

42. Dr Lewis has prepared 3 reports and confirmed the contents of them and his professional opinion as a result of interviews by him and testing were correct. The Father accused him of lying about how long he had spent with him and he said a number of other things though I was unclear what in particular. Father was very clear Dr Lewis lied about being told by K that his Father had gone through court papers about him with his Father. Father was also clear K does not lie. I consider there is no reason or motive for Dr Lewis to lie about this and I found him to be a careful and persuasive witness.

43. His most worrying findings were the effect on K of the behaviour of the Father in reinforcing the Father's views about the Mother in a repeated and not child centred way. He described a child with an insecure avoidant attachment pattern and significant levels of pseudo maturity which he felt as a result of being idealised by both parents and inappropriate levels of exposure to the adult themes of parental conflict and court processes, with an idealised relationship with his Father and a denigrated relationship with his Mother, he described this as typical of "splitting". The reasons for his views of his Mother appeared to him to have little substance and he was also informed by the child of his having seen court papers in which he said she had lied. He felt incidents like his passport being seized had not caused trauma

and were occasions when a parent would soothe a child's reaction rather than, as here, repeat and build on it. The complete denouncement of the other parent was very unusual and not on the evidence he was aware of justified. K's views were not he said his own organic views but because of his Father's behaviour and what his Father said. Reinforcing anxieties rather than alleviating them was clearly in his view not proper parental care. He noted too how K was capable of being soothed by foster parents even when on occasion challenging, meaning his Father could have done this had he chosen to.

44. Despite saying he was very upset at the prospect of seeing his Mother Dr Lewis observed a significant level of positive interaction between him and his mother when they did meet. He concluded that in fact K was then unable to form his own wishes and feelings due to the influence of his Father and his needs and rights needed to be prioritised. This is not a view even now the Father is able to accept.

45. He felt this had happened due to having the undivided attention of his Father who described to him and to me having a very close relationship with his own Father, as well as the material benefits of being with his Father, hearing the narrative of his Father about his Mother and also being away from the conflicted relationship his parents had.

46. With both parents he advised it was important for them to recognise how their seeing the other in a wholly negative light had an inevitable and poor effect on their son who was made by both of them and the distorted thinking this requires would have a poor effect on him. The situation he was in if not repaired might result in a poor outcome for his lifelong ability to form good relationships himself.

47. The fact the Father had been main carer, and that the child shown excerpts of court documents by him to show the Mother in a poor light, reinforced by the Father's own views he told him of, and K's knowledge of financial matters led Dr Lewis to conclude the Father's actions were deliberate rather than unconsciously designed to undermine the child's relationship with his Mother. He felt the Father's "sub optimal" involvement with the systemic therapy confirmed that. I agree and have re-read the

reports about this. I cannot accept a man who described spending thousands of pounds on holidays etc could not manage to take part in a remote discussion properly, saying his phone did not allow that, instead choosing only telephone contacts and not being fully available and I note the therapists views about his lack of serious thought about the issues they were discussing.

48. The expert recommended both parents engage in continued systemic therapy to focus on how their own behaviour and relationship could better support their children and he also recommended psychodynamic therapy for the Father to look at how and why he has behaved the way he has towards his children which he does not see the need for and does not wish to do. The Mother has continued since to take part in the systemic therapy social services arranged for her and K.
49. I heard from social worker **Verity Carr** who has been the key social worker for a long time and obviously now has a close relationship with K. She was a careful and precise witness and clear she had formed her professional opinions as a result of the advice of experts and clear records as well as her own observations and discussions.
50. She had worked with the Mother who had shown the capacity to reflect and ask for support. she felt this significant engagement had achieved positive change and a better understanding of K's needs. By contrast the Father continued to say the local authority had emotionally harmed K by moving him and been unwilling to reflect on his own part in what has taken place. She considered he did not really accept K should have a relationship with his Mother.
51. She had met with K and seen herself how he could revert to a narrative that his Mother had abused him and was not kind but could never give any detail about this and she felt this was a learned narrative. He had told her about his Mother "cancelling his holiday through jealousy" when his passport was taken which she did not feel were his worries but information he had been told and concluded K's views as a result to exposure of his Fathers views and not his own. I am entitled to and do rely on her professional assessment of this.

52. She told me about the move of K from foster care. He had been very surprised to learn his father agreed to it and made the move happily. He had moved into a new school in a well planned way and was happy with his new room and spontaneously affectionate with his Mother and sister. She reported that at the end of September the Father had complained to her that K was not happy or well and that he and his son had not been listened to. This was very recent, and she is right to be anxious about it.
53. I was puzzled to discover that the Father attends half of his contacts with his new wife. He says she is now here legally although I am puzzled upon what basis and understand that she has children in what is also her own former home country . I think this period in his life must have been very confusing for K especially when it seems he was told her children are his siblings, and at a time when he did not see his own full sibling at all. I am confident him calling her mum was not his own choice but one in reality required by his Father.
54. **Father** gave evidence, and was passionate and at times angry about what he said he was wrongly accused of. I remind myself that at the start of these proceedings he had already tried to take K out of school on a trip to his own former home country and shortly after this case began went there and no one knew with whom and where K was, and he was not during the whole of this lengthy period at school. So when he argues about the good basic parenting he has provided in the past I must put this in the balance, neither decision in my view child focussed. He was clear he had not known he needed the Mother's permission to take her son out of the jurisdiction but frankly wouldn't it even at a basic level be good manners for her to know where her child was ? About this incident when he was arrested in Holland for child abduction though never charged he said , "I thought she was doing it as revenge." He could not accept any personal responsibility for this. I am confident he wrongly blames the Mother for his arrest.
55. His evidence was not convincing and often he didn't answer the question asked but continued his own narrative or started giving an answer before the question had ended. He gave a detailed account of how his loving care, and the money he spent on him meant K "realised he had a life with me" and "he helped him to reduce what he

passed through.” He said this was “pressure and suffering.” His anger about what he viewed as forced removal of his son from his care and his son being “forced” to see his Mother remained palpable and he told me it was his intention to sue the local authority in court about this. In fact this was all supported and ordered by the court on the basis of the child’s welfare.

56. It was his evidence that Dr Lewis had not understood his own culture which I cannot accept. He had been particularly upset when asked if he had ever had suicidal thoughts and felt he was being treated as if his strict religion makes him a danger. I reject that contention. I do not accept he only spent 25 minutes with Dr Lewis or that Dr Lewis lied about what K told him about being shown papers.

57. He accepted he had told the Guardian K held hatred for his Mother, a very extreme statement for the complaints made I considered and to me “he is holding a lot of hatred inside.”. He has argued K’s health has been affected by the stress of this case and I am sure it has been stressful for all but I am unconvinced about the symptoms the Father alleges which were not supported by others. He also told me “by my religion it is a sin to keep kids from their Mothers” but could not explain how that linked to his own behaviour. When asked about the steps he had taken to restore the relationship he said he needed to release the pressure on K meaning in fact he had taken no steps at all. His explanation for how K might have seen court papers was wholly unconvincing.

58. It was troubling that he made allegations about Mother’s ill treatment of K which are a lot more extensive than when he spoke to the Guardian and therefore I considered not probable and also not in accord with K’s allegations of “an” incident of abuse.

59. He could not accept K did want to see with his sister but accepted he had organised 4 visits for a meal the last at a restaurant where after some hours both children went together into the female toilet. He was very cross about this; it was wrong for a boy as he might see nakedness he said but I concluded instead it was because it enabled private conversation to take place and we know his sister told K his Mother loved him and wanted to see him. Father claimed she showed her brother a photo of her boyfriend and later disappeared as she said she would walk

home. Father called the police he said. After this he said “K didn’t want to see her. He’d seen bad things. If she loved us why doesn’t she come to live with us ?”. This was an instructive statement I felt but made at a time when he says her actions then justified him not considering her any longer as his daughter. He said in evidence, “she has chosen her own Mother and that is why she is not related to me any more.” Because her behaviour was, in his view, unacceptable he said “I am not ready to get blamed by God for her.” I could not see in this the compassion that religion requires of us.

60. He repeated complaints about the Mother but in evidence exaggerated them and even in this form they did not justify his response of considering no relationship between her and their son was right.

61. His evidence about his daughter was most upsetting. She is a vulnerable young woman who has been affected by her parents break up before these events when it is clear the home was an unhappy one and since. She needs support from both her parents rather than rejection. Her Father considering her behaviour is not Islamic does not justify his rejection.

62. I have also read important written evidence that supports my findings. That includes reports from the Systemic therapist which I accept showing that the Mother has engaged in work over a long period of time but the Father’s engagement was superficial. This was important work designed to make things better for K and his choice not to take part seriously was unfortunate. In his evidence he suggested he had been willing to continue with this but the evidence of his participation is more compelling evidence he did not see the value of it. Ms Taylor, the therapist, felt K was then unable to express his own thoughts and views and was stuck on fixed views and said, “he must act and behave in order to show loyalty with his Father “. Further during her later work she has observed positive changes in his presentation after he moved into foster care and I am confident as a result of the work she did. Even in recent times K is known to reverting to his previously expressed views about his Mother even after he has been observed to be having a lovely time with her.

63. The Guardian has done an enormous amount of work in this case and filed many reports which give evidence of what she has been told and seen as well as her professional opinion. Her evidence was not challenged about her conclusions and I am grateful on behalf in fact of both children for the professional and careful approach to her work.
64. She recognised at the start concerns about dysfunctional parenting from both parents in their hostility to the other and has noted how work with the Mother has been effective in changing her understanding. Her evidence too confirms the expressed wishes of K against his observed behaviour at his Mother's now. She had heard the repeated rather adult complaints he has made which she has never felt justified the rejection of his Mother he expressed.
65. She had noted in her report back in October 2020 that K had found conflict when parents were together difficult. He had told her about an incident when his sister had been self harming and the Father had thrown something at her which K justified saying he "did the right thing." She noted how the terms of the conversation with him mirrored the topics and content his Father had raised just the day before. She had urged the Father to consider how you can disapprove of a person's behaviour and not the person

66. Care plan

67. The local authority invite the court to make an agreed care order. Their plans include provision of therapy from a services called WRAP to support the Mother and child in their ongoing relationship and will involve if needed further systemic therapy. Social services will continue to provide parenting support and advice to the Mother and will supervise the contact with Father and propose now , in alignment with the Guardians suggestions, it is once a fortnight. They will enter into a clear written agreement about how this contact takes place. The father would like more than once each week to continue and would hope it might progress to be unsupervised and overnight.
68. I make decisions for K based on his welfare being my paramount consideration and considering a checklist set out in the Children Act. For the reasons set out in some detail above I cannot accept his wishes and feelings at face value at this time. in

relation to spending time with his Father I am concerned at present about his Fathers capacity to be child centred in discussions with his son and consider supervision is currently necessary. There remains a real risk his strong feelings otherwise would destabilise the child and this would cause serious harm given the steps it has taken to have him now in a settled place.

69. I support the social work plans. It enables this relationship to continue while K settles into what is now his new home. Any development is entirely dependent on the Father's behaviour and thinking. I really think the Father would benefit from therapy. It does not matter that he thinks it is the fault of others he has lost the care of his son but this in itself is a serious loss and I think an independent person to reflect on this would be helpful. Anger can be very wearing to good health and this might help him with that. I would hope too this might enable him to reflect on his proper responsibilities as a parent to both his children

70. An injunction ?

71. I can well understand why the Mother is anxious about Father approaching K and also finding out where he lives as both his home and school are currently secret. However the Father has confirmed to me that he will not either himself or encouraging others attempt to ascertain both the home and school address of his son (or his daughter) and will not contact his former wife or his son except through social services. I consider if he does so he risks his contact with K ending , actually a far more serious threat to my mind than the police arresting him. I note the court has never determined the Mother's now historic claims about his behaviour and during these long proceedings he has never harassed pestered or threatened her in any way. I am not satisfied there is a proper evidential basis to make this order and will reflect what the Father says in my order.

72. I am also accepting what he says about contacts and information about K He will get redacted reports at the looked after children reviews and from school without details of where he lives or goes to school . He has agreed he will not ask K about this either in a direct way or in a way to encourage that information to be shared. Again were

he to do this the case would likely come back quickly to court and I would be very concerned.

HHJ Williscroft