

## **Analysis of Post LASPO Use of Non-Molestation Orders** 15 October 2018

**Thousands misuse abuse orders to get Legal Aid**

**Your chances of being hit with a Non-Molestation Order depends on where you live**

**Children are denied good parents by bad court orders**

**The system needs new checks and balances  
to avoid abuse of innocent parties and children**

**The will of Parliament on bail conditions is being bypassed**

**FNF call on Family Courts and police to complete investigations within three months**

### **Summary – Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations**

Families Need Fathers is a UK shared parenting charity concerned with the welfare of children in the context of family separation. Changes in legislation over the last six years, designed to save money or protect people who have been subject to abuse have also had unintended consequences – ‘collateral damage’ harming or destroying healthy child-parent relationships and fuelling parental conflict.

1. Non-Molestation Orders (NMOs or Non-Mols) are injunctive Civil orders designed to protect anyone who has been abused against further abuse. Following a period of decline in their use, there was a significant, immediate jump in their numbers following changes legislation in 2013 that scrapped Legal Aid in private family proceedings, other than in cases involving domestic violence.

**+ 3,614; 18.5% to 23,140**

2. A further spike in their use occurred in the year after legislation restricting pre-charge police bail conditions came into force in 2017, after concerns that thousands of people's lives were being disrupted for over a year, with restrictions on their civil liberties, without charge.

**+ 2,200; 9.1% to 26,281**

Latest data for the six months to June 2018 shows a continued increase in NMOs of a further 7.5% year-on-year.

3. The total increase in NMOs since the 2013 (LASPO) changes in legislation has been:

**+7,249 cases a year; +37.3%**

4. There are major differences in regional and local likelihood of receiving a NMO. Different regions and police forces have responded differently to changes in legislation resulting in a postcode lottery of the experience of both complainants and respondents. For example people living in London or the Midlands are 6 to 7 times as likely as those in Wales to get a NMO. These differences are starker by individual court. For example, Derby Family Court has increased their annual NMOs tenfold from 47 a year to 456. There is also emerging evidence that they are at least partly driven by individual law firms and service providers with vested interests in securing Legal Aid. *There needs to be an investigation into this and independent assessment, possibly by a judge.*
5. We have been made aware that domestic abuse service providers are routinely asking clients leading questions and prompting them with key words that will trigger access to Legal Aid. This practice has to stop.
6. Half of FNF service users report fabricated or exaggerated claims of abuse in family proceedings. Since 2013 reporting of this has been increasing with many more respondent fathers telling us that they had no choice but to defend such allegations as litigants in person in order for their children to maintain relationships with them, whilst their ex-partners benefited from taxpayer funded Legal Aid.
7. A Non-Molestation order has become the easiest and most used route to obtaining Legal Aid in family proceedings. It is obtained at a Civil threshold of proof i.e. 'on the balance of probabilities' However, a breach of such an order results in a severe Criminal offence. *We therefore recommend that a NMO should only be granted under a Criminal standard of proof if it is going to result in a Criminal offence for breach.*
8. *In any case the 'balance of probability' test should be replaced with the concept of proportionality so orders reflect the gravity and likelihood of risk.*
9. The thinking behind retaining of Legal Aid in abuse cases was so that alleged victims would not be further victimised by their alleged perpetrators. However, in offering Legal Aid only to complainants, but not to those who have been accused, thousands of defendants, in the midst of despair, when their world appears to be falling in around them, are expected to defend themselves without Legal Aid. Usually this takes the form of having to prove their innocence. It is usually only mothers who are granted Legal Aid for Non-Mols. *The system must be even-handed. There needs to be an 'equality of arms' as regards Legal Aid, should be the norm when in these cases where the outcomes have serious life-changing consequences for children and parents.*
10. When NMOs are granted and children are involved, parents who are subject to the NMO and denied normal contact, are often not offered supervised contact with their children. *These parents must be signposted to family courts to ensure that their children's best interests are properly considered and met, and ordering supervised contact, at least to avoid collateral damage of destruction of beneficial child-parent relationships and harm to the child.*
11. Misuse of NMOs to secure Legal Aid is increasingly commonplace. Increasingly, the need for evidence is being downplayed in many areas when abuse is alleged. *There needs to be a sanction for the abuse of NMOs and for making false allegations generally, including the return of any Legal Aid so obtained.*
12. Lying in court under oath to obtain Legal Aid and to damage children's relationships with the other parent is becoming commonplace. *Prosecutions for perjury, contempt of court or perverting the course of justice must be considered as should action on wasting police time. These should be instigated by relevant authorities not parties.* Currently all these are very rare.

13. It is damaging for children to be told details of allegations against their parents. Whatever the outcome of investigations it means that children have to consider one or even both of their parents to be dishonest. It may result in false perspectives and irrational hatred of a once loved parent. Such alienating behaviours are as abusive and damaging as all other forms of child abuse. *The law should recognise this.*
14. The grant of a NMO can be and often is used as a justification for restricting child arrangements for parents in future proceedings – even with no evidence nor any Finding of Fact by the Court. *This path – not intended in the legislation – must be blocked.*
15. *Where children are involved, investigations by the police or family courts must take place on child-appropriate timescales i.e. weeks rather than months or years as is the current norm.*  
  
*FNF call for abuse allegations to be investigated by family courts or police within three months and interim safe arrangements to immediately be put in place for contact in all but exceptional circumstances authorised by a judge.*  
  
*It is not acceptable, therefore, that either pre-charge police bail or NMOs should act as a means of creating delays of many months or years. The replacement of police bail with NMOs of long duration is unacceptable. Similar conditions must be applied with extensions beyond 3-4 months having to be authorised by a judge.*
16. *Where delays of more than a few weeks cannot be avoided, we believe that safe, supervised arrangements must be made to protect child-parent relationships. Such arrangements should be the default position unless agreed in an emergency hearing by a judge.*
17. *Where there are costs associated with these we ask that they should be shared by parents, at least pending court findings of fact or conviction.*
18. Proposed Domestic Abuse Protection Notices and Orders extend the powers of NMO's. *We recommend robust checks and balances to prevent their abuse in a similar way to NMOs.*
19. Language is important for the avoidance of 'confirmation bias'. It also has the power to create great stress and add to family conflict. All authorities and family practitioners must stop using terms such as 'victim' or 'perpetrator' when those facts are unproven. Prefacing them with 'alleged' or referring to 'complainants' and 'respondents' would be appropriate.
20. *Larger sample, authoritative research is needed into the prevalence and consequences to all parties, above all the children, of unfounded allegations in family proceedings.*
21. The data available from family courts is woefully inadequate. *Far better quality of data must be captured and published by the Ministry of Justice on allegations made, findings, consequent delays to children, outcomes in terms of types of orders made, total lengths of proceedings (including follow-up applications), etc.*
22. Family courts must be more transparent. Current reporting is very limited. To have confidence in the system *"Not only must Justice be done; it must **also be seen to be done.**"*
23. There are no Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programmes for mothers. *Cafcass must commission these in the interest of children with violent or abusive mums.*
24. *As much of abuse in the context of families takes place post-separation, we recommend extending the definitions of 'domestic' violence and abuse to former partners in family matters.*
25. *Family courts need to develop more effective procedures for dealing with mental health.*
26. Regional variation of NMO use provides an opportunity to research their effectiveness.

## Background

The BBC reported in July 2018 on allegations of domestic abuse being the primary means of securing Legal Aid in private family court proceedings since April 2013<sup>1</sup> and how this has led to increased making of gross exaggerations and 'false' or unfounded allegations based on fabrications.

The BBC report highlighted our estimate that thousands of parents were abusing these orders every year. The Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (LASPO) removed access to Legal Aid in private family law proceedings from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013, except when allegations of abuse are made. One of the consequences of this well-intentioned, but one-sided, change in legislation has been an increase in fabrication or exaggeration of abuse. The most often used route to such financial assistance, costing £546m and on average worth £5,900 per case<sup>2</sup>, is by the making of applications for Non-Molestation Orders intended to protect vulnerable complainants, but subject to being abused, as the threshold of proof required to obtain one can amount to self-declaration (self-assessed witness statement) without corroborative evidence and is often made ex-parte.

This outline report seeks to share and analyse data on the use of Non-Molestation Orders in England and Wales based on a combination of published and Freedom of Information data from the Ministry of Justice.

## Latest Non-Molestation Order Trends

The latest Government data published to June 2018<sup>3</sup> shows that the grant of Non-Molestation Orders was in decline prior to LASPO, but then immediately went up significantly and these high levels had been sustained. A further increase took place in 2017-18 (+9.1% on which we comment further below) and, as the latest data in Table 1 below shows for Q1 and Q2 of 2018, NMOs continue to rise.

**Table 1 - Latest Non-Molestation Orders Made in England and Wales**

Q1 2018	6,733	+608; +9.9% year-on-year
Q2 2018	6,614	+320; +5.1% year-on-year
Q1 and Q2 combined	13,347	+928; +7.5% year-on-year
Year to June 2018	26,652	+2,396; +9.9% year-on-year

The total number of NMOs since the 2013 changes in legislation has been +7,249 cases a year; +37.3%.

The trends in Non-Molestation Orders since 2009 show, in Table 2 below, that their use was in decline between 2009/10 and 2011/12, levelled-off, but then, in the year of introduction of LASPO increased by 3,614; +18.5%. This seems to be very significant. The increase was broadly sustained after that before a further significant increase of 2,200 in 2017/18; +9.1%. We believe that the most significant change that is likely to explain this size of increase in one year is the 28 day pre-charge bail limit that came into force on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2017 as part of the Police and Crime Act 2017<sup>4</sup>. The change in legislation was brought in to put in place safeguards to people being investigated, prior to charge, by limiting police bail to 28 days with an extension of three months possible to be made by an officer who is a

<sup>1</sup> BBC 'Thousands misusing abuse orders to get legal aid' Hannah Richardson 3 July 2018  
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-44628179>

<sup>2</sup> Ministry of Justice and Legal Aid Agency Legal Aid Statistics for England and Wales January to March 2018 expenditure on family civil representation per full licence certificate completed. Tables 6.3 and 6.5 in  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720553/legal-aid-statistics-tables-jan-mar-2018.ods](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720553/legal-aid-statistics-tables-jan-mar-2018.ods).

<sup>3</sup> Family Court Statistics Quarterly: January to March 2018  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/family-court-statistics-quarterly-january-to-march-2018>

<sup>4</sup> Home Office, The Rt Hon Brandon Lewis MP, and The Rt Hon Amber Rudd MP Press Release of 03.04.2017  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/28-day-pre-charge-bail-limit-comes-into-force>

Superintendent or higher rank. Further extensions could only be made by making applications to a magistrate. It would seem that having to obtain approval from a senior officer was a disincentive in this respect. Interestingly, one of the proposals for the up and coming DV Bill is to further *lower* the bar for obtaining Domestic Abuse (DA) protection Orders/Notices. This is not directly related, but is consistent with the currently popular #BelieveMe phenomenon which seeks to diminish the relevance of evidence in the field of DA/DV.

Home Secretary at the time, Amber Rudd, said in the announcement of these changes:

*“Pre-charge bail is a useful and necessary tool but in many cases it is being imposed on people for many months, or even years, without any judicial oversight - and that cannot be right.”*

*“These important reforms will mean fewer people are placed on bail and for shorter periods. They will bring about much-needed safeguards – public accountability and independent scrutiny – while ensuring the police can continue to do their vital work.”*

Families Need Fathers are increasingly hearing of instances of police encouraging women complainants in particular, who make allegations of abuse, to seek Non-Molestation Orders as these can be of a longer duration than three months, with the same injunctive powers e.g. preventing travel abroad or contacting a parent directly about child arrangements, etc. A transgression of these orders gives police the power of arrest and has the same effect as a breach of police bail conditions. The analysis above leads to the conclusion that Non-Molestation Orders are being used to circumvent the clear intent of Parliament. A NMO can be for a fixed length of time or indefinite. In our experience, six months to a year are the norms which can then easily be extended. These injunctive orders leave people in a legal limbo and damage them, their children's relationships with them and, in turn, harms the children who become collateral damage.

Indeed, further evidence in support of this has come from the police. One of our service users is in the process of obtaining a police cam recording of an officer stating that NMOs are much easier to obtain than going to magistrates to obtain police bail extensions with injunctive restrictions. We also have a report of a National Centre for Domestic Violence (NCDV) trainer encouraging NMOs as a convenient way around the need to get extensions for bail conditions from magistrates. Indeed, some courts are issuing them on receipt of an application, without even having a hearing. A London based magistrate also told us that his experience and understanding was that police were frequently now suggesting that people obtain Non-Molestation Orders rather than seeking to justify extensions of pre-charge bail conditions to magistrates. The fall in pre-charge bail in relation to domestic/sexual abuse is confirmed in a recent report of the National Police Chiefs Council<sup>5</sup>, based on nine police forces. It shows large variations by police force (19.3% to 4.1%) with an overall decline of use of pre-charge bail from 27.4% to 7.3%, as reported in the press<sup>6</sup>.

It should be noted that the effect of a NMO often also prevents a child seeing their parent, the alleged perpetrator. Our service users report that police usually advise complainants to stop all child contact immediately. In those circumstances the accused (usually father) is left with no choice but to seek the assistance of the family court, for example, to have supervised contact pending further inquiries by the police. To make an application costs them £215, if they are making it for themselves and around £1,000 if assisted by lawyers. A NMO application, on the other hand, is free of charge<sup>7</sup> to the complainant. In our view this places an undue and unfair burden on parents, thousands of whom are innocent of allegations made against them. At the very least we believe that there needs to be an even-handedness of approach and an 'equality of arms' i.e. those who are accused of abuse must have the same access to resources to defend themselves (and their relationships with their children) as their accusers. Accusations alone are not evidence and each side must be given equivalent support to

---

<sup>5</sup> National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) Pre-Charge Bail Update 18 April 2018 on pages 151-162 of: <https://www.npcc.police.uk/2018%20FOI/NPCC%20Misc/098%2018%20CCC%20April%202018%20Part%203.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> The Times 22 August 2018 'Victims of Crime put at risk as police abandon bail orders' by Fiona Hamilton - <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/victims-of-crime-put-at-risk-as-police-abandon-bail-orders-wrcdvtqy>.

<sup>7</sup> How to apply for a Non-Molestation Order <https://www.gov.uk/injunction-domestic-violence>

assist in the making of findings of fact, guilt or otherwise. It must be recognised that where someone is falsely accused, they are the true victims.

An important point here is that a NMO can be obtained purely on the basis of allegations that have not been (and possibly will never be) investigated by either the police or by a Finding of Fact hearing in a family court. Also, without access to Legal Aid and with 51% of NMOs granted in ex-parte hearings, many litigants in person are confused when they get them and do not understand their implications i.e. how to contest them or that a breach, however minor, can result in them getting a criminal record. In a civilised society this cannot be an acceptable position.

Using NMOs as a qualifier for Legal Aid leads to an 'inequality of arms' before the courts and huge emotional and practical difficulties for vulnerable defendant parents.

Sir James Munby, until July 2018, the President of the Family Division, said:

*"we know that people game the system, and the classic example of that is one of the bits of LASPO [Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012] is you do get legal aid if there's an allegation of domestic violence".<sup>8</sup>*

The 'balance of probability' test should be replaced with the concept of proportionality so orders reflect the gravity and likelihood of risk. Normally for a criminal conviction it is necessary to be 'sure' (what used to be known as 'beyond reasonable doubt'). However, a breach of such an order results in a severe Criminal offence, with a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment with further consequent implications such as employability. A single text message sent when communications are disallowed by a Non-Mol can result in arrest and a criminal record. We therefore recommend that a NMO should only be granted under a Criminal standard of proof if it is going to result in a Criminal offence for breach. In many cases it would suffice for a party or both parties to make undertakings to the court, rather than to have a NMO

The President of the Family Division, Sir James Munby said<sup>9</sup> of ex-parte NMOs:

*"The vice of the system so often is that an applicant, alleging domestic violence of some sort, goes to court without giving notice, gets an order some would say for the asking... The court doesn't give the respondent a date. If the respondent gets a hearing the thing is just rolled over and is very unsatisfactory to say the least and as we all know, too often the ex-parte injunction grant at the outset sets the entire tone of the whole of the subsequent proceedings".*

Ex-parte NMOs should only be given if someone is in immediate real danger. They should be for 48 hours, renewable pending a hearing with both parties present.

We have heard the argument that although a finding of fact or other steps are not taken to verify allegations of Domestic Violence (DV), the judge is generally able to take a view based on other factors. Whether this is appropriate or not is another issue, but the consequences of the false allegations of DV, if not properly rebutted, can affect the target of the allegations and their contact with their children long into the future. It is profoundly unfair that a parent can be exposed to the often debilitating effects of being "branded" as violent through unfounded and malicious allegations which then go completely unpunished.

In one such case we heard about recently, the father received the NMO requiring him not to contact his ex-partner. He had not been charged with an offence and there had been no findings of fact as to the

---

<sup>8</sup> Families Need Fathers Conference 18 March 2017

<https://fnf.org.uk/news-events-2/public-affairs/meetings-with-sir-james-munby/2-uncategorised/429-munby-transcript-2017>

<sup>9</sup> Families Need Fathers Conference 18 March 2017

<https://fnf.org.uk/news-events-2/public-affairs/meetings-with-sir-james-munby/2-uncategorised/429-munby-transcript-2017>



alleged offence. He was then invited by his ex-partner to visit her. She then called the police to report his breaking of the order, resulting in him having a criminal record for non-compliance.

Similarly, in another case, someone did not appreciate that sending a Christmas text to his child would breach the order. It has to be remembered that most subjects of these orders are not represented by lawyers. Many don't have a good command of English and others suffer from mental health conditions. The orders do not discriminate. It is also likely that a litigant in person, without a representative may have difficulty understanding the order granted by the court, exacerbated by the applicant's representative being asked to draft the order, further putting the respondent at a disadvantage.

The total increase in annual Non-Molestation Orders since LASPO has been +7,249; +37.3%.

A survey by Families Need Fathers in 2016 showed 'false allegations' to be a key issue for half of our service users and the issue increasingly dominates the problems brought to our support meetings. *"The first I knew of this was when I was served papers alleging abuse just after I got a new girlfriend"* and *"I can't afford a lawyer whilst she has legal aid – I'm terrified and don't know what to do"* are now typical of the comments we hear at most of our meetings.

The scale of the problem must not be underestimated. A survey of 370 magistrates<sup>10</sup> in 2017 found that 68% of people in family court hearings represented themselves, up from 41% in 2014. Post LASPO the proportion of Private Law Legal Aid going to men has decreased from 40% to 15%<sup>11</sup>, as might be expected given that most reports of domestic abuse are from women. Many, faced with a NMO, are simply forced to fend for themselves and defend allegations being made by their ex-partners through lawyers. Most are unlikely to have ever been in a court before, let alone had to represent themselves in front of a judge.

**Table 2 – Annual Numbers of Non-Molestation Orders in England and Wales:**

Y/E March	Orders	Year-On-Year Change		Comments
2009/10	22,745			
2010/11	20,818	-1,927	-8.5%	
2011/12	19,507	-1,311	-6.3%	
2012/13	19,526	19	0.1%	
2013/14	23,140	3,614	18.5%	Start of LASPO
2014/15	23,830	690	3.0%	
2015/16	23,629	-201	-0.8%	
2016/17	24,081	452	1.9%	
2017/18	26,281	2,200	9.1%	Restrictions on police bail
<b>17/18 v 12/13</b>		<b>6,774</b>	<b>34.7%</b>	

## Regional Non-Molestation Orders

Families Need Fathers are publishing for the first time the results of the most recent Freedom of Information access requests that help to shed light on the extent of regional variations that cannot be explained away as the result of awareness raising campaigns.

It has been suggested by women's organisations that the increase is the result of a growth in awareness of domestic abuse by women, however, this suggestion appears to be inconsistent with the

<sup>10</sup> Magistrates Say Children Suffer In Family Court Hearings When Their Parents Have No Lawyers – BuzzFeed News 16 December 2017 <https://www.buzzfeed.com/emilydugan/magistrates-say-children-suffer-in-family-court-hearings>

<sup>11</sup> Ministry of Justice Legal Aid Statistics.

huge regional or court-specific variations in the use of such orders since 2013. Further evidence of possible drivers for these regional increases comes from Freedom of Information requests that break the data down by solicitor firms, some of which have strong geographic associations and also in looking at data relating to police forces around England and Wales. Further analysis of this is being carried out.

Evidence provided to us from our local support meetings, combined with the statistics shown here support our view that most of the growth in NMOs is in order to obtain Legal Aid in private family proceedings or in lieu of police having to seek extensions to bail conditions in magistrates courts as it is far easier, not least for the police, if complainants seek NMOs for themselves via the family court. In doing this the police are able to ease pressures on their resources and do not have to justify extensions of bail conditions or explain delay in the progress of their inquiries.

The figures in Table 3 show that London and Wales experienced declines in Non-Molestation Orders post LASPO. However, there were substantial increases in the North West (+37%) and South East (+32%) and most especially in the Midlands (+154%). Every region experienced a significant increase in 2013/14, the year that Legal Aid in private family proceedings was stopped other than where there were allegations of abuse.

**Table 3 – Regional Trends in Non-Molestation Orders<sup>12</sup>**

Regions	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	17/18 v 12/13
<b>London</b>	5,323	5,257	5,661	5,456	5,075	4,856	4,928	<b>-329</b>
Change %		-1.2%	7.7%	-3.6%	-7.0%	-4.3%	1.5%	<b>-6.3%</b>
<b>Midlands</b>	2,738	2,580	4,023	4,844	5,606	5,569	6,563	<b>3,983</b>
Change %		-5.8%	55.9%	20.4%	15.7%	-0.7%	17.8%	<b>154.4%</b>
<b>North East</b>	3,439	3,207	3,481	3,236	3,006	3,233	3,688	<b>481</b>
Change %		-6.7%	8.5%	-7.0%	-7.1%	7.6%	14.1%	<b>15.0%</b>
<b>North West</b>	2,012	2,230	2,833	2,501	2,526	2,764	3,055	<b>825</b>
Change %		10.8%	27.0%	-11.7%	1.0%	9.4%	10.5%	<b>37.0%</b>
<b>South East</b>	3,681	4,000	4,604	4,903	4,665	4,853	5,267	<b>1,267</b>
Change %		8.7%	15.1%	6.5%	-4.9%	4.0%	8.5%	<b>31.7%</b>
<b>South West</b>	1,991	1,904	2,128	2,409	2,355	2,374	2,366	<b>462</b>
Change %		-4.4%	11.8%	13.2%	-2.2%	0.8%	-0.3%	<b>24.3%</b>
<b>Wales</b>	323	347	365	351	285	286	289	<b>-58</b>
Change %		7.4%	5.2%	-3.8%	-18.8%	0.4%	1.0%	<b>-16.7%</b>
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,525</b>	<b>23,095</b>	<b>23,700</b>	<b>23,518</b>	<b>23,935</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,631</b>
Change %		<b>0.1%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>-0.8%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>

<sup>12</sup> Freedom of Information requests by Mr Richard Nixon to Ministry of Justice and provided to Families Need Fathers.



Based on Table 4, what emerges is that compared to the average of England and Wales, people living in the Midlands are 39% more likely to get a Non-Molestation. In London 28% more likely (it was 89% above average six years ago) and in Wales 80% less likely to i.e. people in London and the Midlands are 6 to 7 times as likely to have one of these injunctive orders as those living in Wales.

The chances of them getting such an order has more than doubled if they live in the Midlands since 2011/12 (+129%); in the North West it has gone up by almost half (+48%) and in the South East a little less (+37%). On the other hand, London, and Wales had experienced declines of 12% - 13%. We cannot be sure what has driven declines in some areas, but speculate that the London decrease may be related to there being a higher proportion of senior family judges who are more experienced, better understand the intentions of changes in legislation, are less willing to entertain inappropriate applications and more likely to accept mutual undertakings from parties than use the much more powerful NMOs, which are not always appropriate or necessary.

It is also clear that the Midlands not only had the biggest increase in Non-Mols in the year post LASPO (+55.9% compared to 18.3% nationally), but also in the year police bail conditions changed (+17.8% compared to 9.3% nationally).

**Table 4 – Regional Number of Non-Molestation Orders Per 100,000 of Population<sup>13</sup>**

Regions	2011/12	2017/18	Change	+/- to Eng/Wales 11/12	+/- to Eng/Wales 17/18
London	79.8	69.4	-13.1%	89.4%	27.8%
Midlands	32.8	75.3	129.4%	-22.1%	38.7%
North East	52.7	55.3	4.8%	25.1%	1.8%
North West	34.6	51.3	48.4%	-18.0%	-5.5%
South East	30.8	42.2	36.8%	-26.9%	-22.3%
South West	44.9	51.0	13.6%	6.5%	-6.1%
Wales	12.7	11.1	-12.4%	-69.9%	-79.5%
England & Wales	42.2	54.3	28.8%	0.0%	0.0%

## Individual Court Non-Molestation Orders

Further tables of data are included in the appendices to this brief report. These include trends in granting of NMOs from individual courts by region. Some fields have been left blank as there have clearly been changes in structure of family courts in some regions e.g. courts closing down with others opening. Hence there will be some distortions in figures, however, these do not affect overall regional data shown. Usually it is clear where re-structuring has occurred from these tables, enabling us to say with some certainty whether a particular court has seen significant changes in the granting of NMOs.

The tables show, for example, that the biggest growth in NMO has been in Derby Family Court +955% post LASPO.

In some areas it is clear that re-structuring of courts has resulted in one closing in the area cases being transferred to the other. In these cases we have sought to include summaries showing the total of both courts combined e.g. the combined Wolverhampton Family Court and closed Wolverhampton Proceedings Court experienced an increase of 355% and the combined Birmingham Family Court and now closed Birmingham Proceedings Court had an increase of 209%.

The tables below show individual court changes in Non-Mols between 2011/12 and 2017/18. They are arranged by region and are presented alphabetically within police force areas, albeit that has not been possible for London.

<sup>13</sup> Office for National Statistics (ONS) Population Estimates for mid-2017 and mid-2011 for all people aged 15+. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesqualitytools>

## Police Authority Non-Molestation Orders

Just as there are major variations between the grant of NMOs by national regions and individual courts, so there are between different police authorities. The tables below show rankings by police force of percentage changes in the year subsequent to introduction of LASPO and the year after changes in conditions of pre-charge police bail. The scale of such variations demands further investigation and understanding. They point to very different responses that will affect the civil liberties of citizens and, most importantly, the ability of children to have both parents in their lives.

**Table 5 – Ranking of Annual Increases in Issue of Non-Molestation Orders by Police Authority In the Year After LASPO**

Change in NMOs in year post LASPO	%	Rank
Derbyshire	90.1%	1
West Midlands	87.6%	2
Northamptonshire	44.4%	3
Greater Manchester	41.5%	4
Leicestershire	40.3%	5
South Yorkshire	34.8%	6
Thames Valley	33.8%	7
North Wales	33.3%	8
Thames Valley	31.5%	9
Merseyside	30.3%	10
Nottinghamshire	29.8%	11
Essex	29.3%	12
Cambridgeshire	26.8%	13
Kent	25.3%	14
West Mercia	21.7%	15
Gloucestershire	21.6%	16
Hampshire	20.5%	17
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	
Humberside	17.3%	18
Avon & Somerset	15.9%	19
Lancashire	15.0%	20
Cleveland	14.1%	21
Staffordshire	13.2%	22
Wiltshire	12.8%	23
Cheshire	12.5%	24
West Yorkshire	11.9%	25
Hertfordshire	10.8%	26
Bedfordshire	9.5%	27
South Wales	7.8%	28
London	<b>7.7%</b>	29
Dorset	7.4%	30
Sussex	5.5%	31
Dyfed Powys	1.8%	32
Durham	0.0%	33
Surrey	-0.3%	34
Devon & Cornwall	-3.3%	35
North Yorkshire	-3.4%	36
Northumbria	-7.2%	37
Suffolk	-13.7%	38
Warwickshire	-21.1%	39
Cumbria	-33.3%	40
Gwent	-36.4%	41
Norfolk	-44.0%	42

These high increases in NMOs in one year are too significant to ignore and imply a modus operandi of certain police forces and other agencies in these areas.

Some of the significant reductions in NMOs in these outlying figures for a few police forces may be influenced by re-structuring of police and court services.

**Table 5 – Ranking of Annual Increases in Issue of Non-Molestation Orders by Police Authority In the Year After Pre-Charge Police Bail Was Restricted**

Change in NMOs after new bail rules	%	Rank
Dyfed Powys	216.7%	1
Norfolk	52.3%	2
Merseyside	46.6%	3
Sussex	42.0%	4
Derbyshire	38.0%	5
Hertfordshire	27.6%	6
Wiltshire	26.3%	7
Leicestershire	24.0%	8
Essex	23.2%	9
Avon & Somerset	23.1%	10
West Midlands	19.1%	11
Lancashire	19.0%	12
South Yorkshire	18.1%	13
Northamptonshire	17.6%	14
Thames Valley	16.0%	15
Cleveland	15.1%	16
Gloucestershire	12.9%	17
West Mercia	10.2%	18
Cheshire	9.3%	19
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	
North Yorkshire	8.1%	20
Nottinghamshire	6.0%	21
Bedfordshire	5.7%	22
Cambridgeshire	3.1%	23
Durham	2.2%	24
Staffordshire	2.0%	25
London	1.2%	26
Northumbria	-0.2%	27
Gwent	-6.5%	28
Dorset	-6.7%	29
Kent	-7.4%	30
Humberside	-8.9%	31
Devon & Cornwall	-9.4%	32
Greater Manchester	-11.4%	33
Hampshire	-12.2%	34
Surrey	-17.4%	35
North Wales	-18.6%	36
South Wales	-19.3%	37
Thames Valley	-20.0%	38
Cumbria	-34.4%	39
Suffolk	-71.1%	40
West Yorkshire		42
Warwickshire		41

It seems possible that the Dyfed Powys and Norfolk police forces figures are outliers due to administrative changes in the organisation of the police forces and/or local courts. Similar reasons for West Yorkshire, Warwickshire and Suffolk seem probable at the bottom end of this ranking table.

However, the scale of variation overall implies that different police forces, courts and law firms have responded very differently to the restrictions placed on pre-charge police bail. In some areas there appears to have been a strong switch towards the use of NMOs, undermining the intention of Parliament of preventing people languishing for months or years in a state of uncertainty.

It should also be noted that police districts do not always match precisely family court regions and people may be subject to Non-Molestation Orders outside of the regions they reside in. However, we do not believe that such blurring of boundaries is sufficiently significant to detract from the overall picture painted by this analysis or from the conclusions that might be derived from this.

It does, however, seem likely that major regional changes in the use of NMOs are related to the different activities and approaches of individual courts, police forces and law firms.

## Further Discussion

### **Prevalence of False Allegations**

The former Director of Public Prosecutions, Sir Keir Starmer, and others have said that false or unfounded allegations are 'rare', whilst accepting that they need to be taken seriously<sup>14</sup>. However, this is not based on any large-scale, authoritative study, but rather on the lack of investigations or prosecutions for perjury – hardly the same thing. Indeed, research by the National Education Union<sup>15</sup>, representing 450,000 teachers and lecturers, found that 22% of staff had false allegations made against them by pupils and 14% by parents. It is simply not credible that in the heat of family separation when raw emotions rage that the figures would be any less. Yet there are no large-scale authoritative studies into exaggerations or false allegations in the context of family separation. The nearest we found is a small-scale research project by University of Strathclyde<sup>16</sup> which revealed that allegations of abuse were made in 35% of contact/residence actions and 70% were found to be false or unfounded.

Action needs to be taken to prosecute for perjury, contempt of court or perverting the course of justice. Relevant authorities must be seen to drive the process rather than parents so as to avoid this being interpreted as an action by one parent against another, adding for family conflict.

A recent report by Professor Liz Trinder et al into 'no-fault divorce' recommended that the need to find fault in divorce must end. FNF agree with this. Professor Trinder reports, for example, how in 1990 the Law Commission concluded that the law and practice encouraged parties to lie or exaggerate in order to expedite a divorce<sup>17</sup>.

*[T]he system still allows, even encourages, the parties to lie, or at least to exaggerate, in order to get what they want. ...In that "wider field which includes considerations of truth, the sacredness of oaths, and the integrity of professional practice".<sup>18</sup>*

The Trinder report finds that 'some lawyers were more explicit or blasé about the gaming of the system to achieve the end goal than others' It quotes a focus group participant as saying *"you sit round the table and you cobble up some words which will, are completely true but, will do the business.... You know, it's the truth, but you know, not the context."*

Another interviewee in the report said *"Nobody's really bothered about what has actually happened in almost all of the circumstances; it's just you [i.e. lawyers, courts] want an outcome"*.

We are ourselves selecting quotations in a different context, however, if these are the kinds of 'work arounds' that lawyers resort to in order to satisfy their clients, they are likely to also be being used to obtain Legal Aid for their low-income clients in a climate where other routes to such support are unavailable.

The report concludes that *'parties often feel under pressure to exaggerate allegations or retro-fit the reasons for their separation into one of the legal Facts'*.

---

<sup>14</sup> Sir Keir Starmer writing in The Guardian 13 March 2013.

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/mar/13/false-allegations-rape-domestic-violence-rare>

<sup>15</sup> Most sex abuse claims against teachers 'made up' - 'The Telegraph 6 October 2018.

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2018/10/06/sex-abuse-claims-against-teachers-made-pupils-teaching-union/>

<sup>16</sup> False allegations of child abuse in contested family law cases: The implications for psychological practice – Professor Tommy MacKay – University of Strathclyde, September 2014.

<sup>17</sup> Finding Fault? Divorce Law and Practice in England and Wales - Liz Trinder, Debbie Braybrook, Caroline Bryson, Lester Coleman, Catherine Houlston, and Mark Sefton published by Nuffield Foundation 2017  
<http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/news/divorce-law-england-and-wales-increases-conflict-and-suffering-separating-couples-and-their-children>

<sup>18</sup> Law Commission, The Ground for Divorce (Law Com No 192, 1990) para 2.11.

Neither should it therefore be any surprise that when people are in the emotional fires of family separation, feeling angry, worried, jealous or hurt at being left, perhaps because of infidelity, that their minds turn to revenge which in-turn leads to the making of false allegations of abuse, which will not only have the effect of locking-out their ex-partner from their lives and hurting them back, but may also enable them to qualify for Legal Aid.

That 'encouragement' has now become systemic within the 'industry'. A domestic violence service provider explained to us how current practice includes the asking of leading questions of complainants so as to ensure that Legal Aid qualification requirements are met.

It does not seem like such a stretch of the imagination that this fits the evidence of the Trinder report on finding fault in divorce where a legal adviser said *"I mean, the system at the moment can be easily manipulated... it's not as though there's many checks made in the system. I mean, there's no checks made of what people write on the form anyway is there really? We're not verifying what they're saying at all."*

Once those allegations are made they are difficult to withdraw from since they are the basis of injunctive orders and often the justification for taxpayer funding of private family proceedings.

Lord Justice Munby, President of the Family Division until July 2018, echoed our experience, of allegations of violence/abuse saying<sup>19</sup>:

*"One of the greatest vices of the system... is the unfounded allegation which festers around and poisons the process. ...The problem of the unfounded allegations - which is a very, very real problem"*

The evidence from our service users and other evidence above points to false allegations being a very big problem. Whilst most of this is from either self-selected groups, the anecdotal evidence of professionals in the field, small scale research or that which is focused on specific groups of people, combined with the circumstantial evidence of trends in NMOs all adds up to a sheer scale of such evidence that it demands an authoritative large-scale research study.

It also demands a political and media response. There has been a historic, understandable, focus on the experience and needs of those who have suffered terrible abuse, particularly that of women, However, attention to the abuse that stems from the making of unfounded/false allegations, particularly in the context of family separation, has been very limited.

Given the prevalence of allegations surfacing after family separation it would seem appropriate that the definitions of 'domestic' violence and abuse are extended to former partners.

Language is important and can be upsetting and stressful. In our experience most judges, particularly the senior judiciary, are clear that allegations are exactly that – parties are 'alleged victims' or 'alleged perpetrators' until determined otherwise. However, calling and treating people as 'victims' or 'survivors' and 'perpetrators' is not unusual amongst Family Court Advisers, very common amongst social workers and the norm by the police. Use of language is important to avoid 'confirmation bias', unnecessary stress and fuelling of conflict.

*"After six months on bail, without charge, on a false allegation that meant I could not even write to my children, the police phoned to say that there was 'insufficient evidence' to charge me, that bail conditions were now lifted and I could contact my children and that the 'victim' had already been informed."*

FNF Service user

---

<sup>19</sup> Families Need Fathers Conference 18 March 2017

<https://fnf.org.uk/news-events-2/public-affairs/meetings-with-sir-james-munby/2-uncategorised/429-munby-transcript-2017>



The current President of the Family Division, Lord Justice McFarlane said<sup>20</sup> *“When domestic abuse allegations, which are sufficiently serious as to be likely to be relevant to the welfare arrangements, it does not help either parent, the children or indeed the court for the contested factual issue to be adjourned and adjourned, rather than determined at the earliest opportunity. In Re J, not only did the court fail to make any contact order for a period measured in years, the father was subject to a continuing non molestation injunction preventing him from having any contact. That injunction had been based upon the untested and contested factual allegations which were never tried. But even where an injunction is not in place, the need, stated in PD12J [Practice Direction 12J], for the court to get on and determine the factual issues is plain. Until the factual context is clarified and determined by the court, the arrangements for the children cannot move on and develop in a way which reflect the risk, or lack of risk, arising from the facts as they are found to be.”*

Unfortunately, lengthy delays are common.

## **Mental Health Related Difficulties**

Our experience is that many of the most difficult cases in family proceedings involve one or both parties having mental health difficulties. They are also more likely to involve false allegations of abuse. 17% of adults meet diagnostic criteria for one common mental health problem<sup>21</sup>. 13.7% screened for personality disorders, 2% for bipolar disorder and around 6% with narcissistic personality disorders (US)<sup>22</sup>. These cases are particularly difficult to resolve, cause untold misery and are particularly ill-suited to an adversarial family justice system. However, they may require diagnosis, which is rare in family justice and they do require firm judicial support, including a greater willingness to ensure that, where possible, children live with the well parent.

## **Impact of False Allegation on Children Proceedings**

Where children are involved, investigations by the police or family courts must take place on child-appropriate timescales i.e. weeks rather than months or years as is the current norm.

‘Justice delayed is justice denied’ is a tenet of the British legal system based on the sentence ‘To no one will we sell, to no one will we refuse or delay, right or justice’ in the Magna Carta signed by King John of England on 15 June 1215. That tenet is especially so for justice for children.

FNF call for abuse allegations to be investigated by family courts or police within three months and interim safe arrangements to be put in place for contact in all but exceptional circumstances authorised by a judge.

*“A range of allegations were made against me in the family court. The mother was not put in the witness box for over four years and then was exposed as a liar in less than an hour of cross-examination by my barrister. The court found in my favour, but the relationship with the children was destroyed by the same lies being shared with them.”* – FNF service user

---

<sup>20</sup> Lord Justice McFarlane - Families Need Fathers Conference Speech of 23 June 2018, published on 25 June 2018. <https://www.judiciary.uk/announcements/speech-by-lord-justice-mcfarlane-families-need-fathers-conference-2018/>

<sup>21</sup> Fundamental Facts About Mental Health 2016- Mental Health Foundation <https://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/sites/default/files/fundamental-facts-about-mental-health-2016.pdf>

<sup>22</sup> Childhood Roots of Narcissistic Personality Disorder - Psychology Today January 2017 <https://www.psychologytoday.com/gb/blog/warning-signs-parents/201701/childhood-roots-narcissistic-personality-disorder>



## Impact of False Allegations on the Innocent

It is important that real victims are protected, but over-zealous protective measures, without effective checks and balances betray the true best interests of children. A similar view was expressed by University of Oxford's Carolyn Hoyle et al in the summary report<sup>24</sup> of their research into the impact of being wrongly accused - *'It is important that all agencies, particularly the police, are alert to the needs of those who claim to be victims of abuse, but not to the extent of overlooking those who are victims of wrongful allegations.'*

The research concluded that honourable policies fuelled by *'a desire to right an historic wrong, and to give victims who had been previously ignored a voice. But this study suggests that in the process, a whole new and growing class of victims is being created, whose suffering is just as intense – all the more so for having been, until now, passed unnoticed. The road to hell, it is said, is paved with good intentions. Unfortunately, that is where the victims of false allegations of abuse are likely to find themselves – in a living hell'*

Whilst this study focused on professionals subjected to false allegations, our experience of working with parents who are falsely accused by their ex-partners or, in some case, brainwashed children have very similar impact on them and in many respects worse as they coincide with family breakdown and loss of their own children. The characteristics of these cases take on the proportions of Shakespearean tragedy.

It is clear that the British public are concerned about domestic abuse. However, during the Celebrity Big Brother series this year, actress Roxanne Pallett made accusations against housemate Ryan Thomas that would almost certainly have led to the career and probably family life of her target being destroyed. In this particular case the accused was fortunate that cameras caught all the action. The strength of public support for the accused and condemnation for the complainant demonstrated that the British, when faced with such situations, are outraged and demand action<sup>23</sup>. Many people contacted us during this time to tell us that this had happened to them, wishing that they too had cameras to enable them to prove their innocence. The public clearly understand the cruelty of such gross exaggerations and unfounded allegations. They understand that when malicious allegations are used as weapons they destroy lives.

University of Oxford research<sup>24</sup> concluded that *'The experience of being falsely accused causes enduring trauma, even for those who are not arrested, prosecuted or convicted'*. The research did not focus on the effect of destroyed parental relationships. We believe that the effect would be even more severe as is implied by University College London research<sup>25</sup> which found that *'Men treasure fatherhood. Their sense of responsibility towards their own children trumps all other concerns'*.

Research and attention to the abuse of men and their reasons for under-reporting of abuse has also been limited and must be rectified. 713,000 men are estimated to have experienced domestic abuse<sup>26</sup> (37% of the total). Not surprisingly, men are less likely to report their experiences. What we do know is that most of children whose parents have separated live with their mothers. In those situations, it is a brave father who will report abuse, having left the family home, for fear of reprisal action. In our experience such complaints result in the instant cessation of contact with their children and a long, painful and often unsuccessful journey through the family justice system to restore it.

---

<sup>23</sup> Daily Mail 13 September 2018 <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/tvshowbiz/article-6128111/CBB-Roxanne-Pallett-labels-hated-woman-Britain-scared-future.html>

<sup>24</sup> The Impact of Being Wrongly Accused of Abuse in Occupations of Trust: Victims' Voices – Carolyn Hoyle et al 2016 University of Oxford Centre for Criminology <https://www.law.ox.ac.uk/research-and-subject-groups/impact-being-wrongly-accused-abuse-occupations-trust-victims-voice>

<sup>25</sup> The Harry's Masculinity Report 2017 – Dr John Barry, University College London

<sup>26</sup> Domestic abuse: findings from the Crime Survey for England and Wales: year ending March 2017 – Office for National Statistics <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/articles/domesticabusefindingsfromthecrimesurveyforenglandandwales/yearendingmarch2017>

Family lawyers often advise against reporting of abuse to authorities so as to 'lower temperatures' in situations where family conflict risks delay or cessation of access to children by their clients.

*"I would not advise going into detail of the assaults against you in the family court as the judge is likely to think that you are as bad as each other and not do anything at all."*

Experienced family law solicitor.

## **Dealing With False Allegations**

In March 2017, in response to a suggestion, supported by FNF, that the making of false allegations should be recognised as a form of abuse, Sir James Munby said<sup>9</sup>:

*"First of all, the definitions are in legislation, I can't change the legislation. I'm very attracted by the idea, it needs careful thinking and I'm going to think about in the context of Practice Direction 12J. It is, as you will imagine, exceedingly controversial, it will be exceedingly controversial in some quarters but that's not a reason to shy away from it and I'm not frightened away by controversy."*

We believe that people who deliberately make fabricated statements, waste police time and pervert the course of justice in seeking to achieve their own ends must be held to account.

*'Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere'*

Martin Luther King Jr – letter from Birmingham Jail 1963

Family courts must be more transparent. Current reporting is very limited, mostly just from higher courts and the public have very little opportunity to scrutinise and see what happens. A generally adopted principle is that for the public to have confidence in the system *"Not only must Justice be done; it must also be seen to be done."* That is certainly not the case in family justice whether it involves family courts, police or social services operations and where confidence amongst litigants is frighteningly low. For the sake of the children (and parents) this must change.

## **Proposed Domestic Abuse Protection Notices and Orders**

The Government have proposed to create new Domestic Abuse Protection Notices and Orders. These would extend the powers available whilst broadening the scope for their use. We believe that, without new checks and balances these will increase the scope for abuse of the system and will not lead to improvements in safety, rather an unhelpful pitching of one gender against the other. The solutions to domestic abuse lie in men and women working together to changing culture and promoting physical and emotional safety.

## **Further Analysis on Non-Molestation Orders**

There is evidence in the data available to us that a small number of law firms are responsible for a large proportion of growth of Non-Molestation Orders. Some increased their NMO caseload from tens to hundreds post LASPO. Further work is being carried out to better understand this.

## **A Case Study – Robert** (all names and identifying details changed)

Robert broke up with his partner of seven years, Heidi, as things were not working out for them. They have a six year old daughter, Amber whom they both love deeply. Heidi told Robert that she wanted him back, otherwise he would never see his daughter again. He refused as he was terribly unhappy in the relationship. She told him never to speak to her again. He sent her two texts trying to reason and make arrangements to see Amber. A few days later he discovered that he had a Non-Molestation Order placed on him for his efforts in maintaining a relationship with Amber.

The only avenue for him was to seek the assistance of the family court. He had to pay £215 for the application, but as he was worried about getting it right he got a solicitor to help him and paid £1,000 to complete and submit the form. At the first hearing he suggested seeing Amber for a few hours each week, but Heidi refused to agree so the matter was listed for further hearings. Having spent a further £7,000 for lawyers to help him with three court appearances and after six months had gone by without seeing Amber he was delighted when the court agreed to his request and made an order. As he had not seen Amber for such a long time, the judge said he'd be able to see her for one hour a week and build-up again over the six months to a day a week. Robert was disappointed with being granted so little time, but looked forward to seeing Amber at the weekend.

However, when he came to collect Amber on Saturday morning, Heidi opened the front door, shouting at Robert and telling him to get lost and never come back whilst Amber looked on confused. Frightened by her reaction he backed off, upset. He went home and cried.

Later that day the police came to his house. They said that he was being arrested to investigate a complaint of assault by Heidi. They held him for six hours in a police cell before interviewing him. They told him he must not go to the house where Amber lived. Six months later the police contacted Robert to say that they would not be pressing charges as the 'victim' did not have sufficient evidence for them to prosecute.

Robert had to pay for a fresh application to court, but as he was still in debt from the first round of court hearings he had to be a litigant in person. However, Heidi said that she had been assaulted by Robert she was granted Legal Aid. There were a further six hearings. The judge found that the mother's claims were baseless and, several hearings later, ordered that Robert could see Amber again, but Heidi just ignored the order. Robert wanted to go get the order enforced, but this is a complicated procedure, not least as, he was told, it would be necessary to prove to a criminal threshold of proof that Heidi was in contempt of court. He did not feel he could handle it himself, but could not afford the extra £10,000 that his lawyers said this would cost him. Robert was now in total despair. He lost his job and sank into depression.

### **Families Need Fathers - *because both parents matter***

FNF is a registered UK national charity providing information and support on shared parenting issues arising from family breakdown, and support to divorced and separated parents, irrespective of gender or marital status. FNF is NOT a fathers' rights group - we support the best interests of children - namely mature and collaborative parenting by both parents - an objective which is inadequately promoted in the family court system and associated services.

Our primary concern is the maintenance of the child's meaningful relationship with both parents.

Founded in 1974, FNF helps thousands of parents every year.



**15<sup>th</sup> October 2018**

## **Appendix - Tables of Data**

Annual Non-Molestation Statistics presented with Year-on-Year changes and variances since the year pre-LASPO.

### **By Individual Court**

Area	Page(s)
London	19-20
Midlands	21-22
North East	23-24
North West	25-26
South East	27-28
South West	29-30
Wales	31

### **By Police Region**

London/Midlands	32
North East / West	33
South East	34
South West	35
Wales	36

## Appendix

### Non-Molestation Orders by Court

London Courts	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Barnet Family Court</b>	102	97	158	200	341	288	340	<b>243</b>
Change %		-4.9%	62.9%	26.6%	70.5%	-15.5%	18.1%	<b>250.5%</b>
<b>Bow Family Court</b>	624	584	621	714	592	472	0	<b>-584</b>
Change %		-6.4%	6.3%	15.0%	-17.1%	-20.3%	-100.0%	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Brentford Family Court</b>	164	121	160	211	159	111	67	<b>-54</b>
Change %		-26.2%	32.2%	31.9%	-24.6%	-30.2%	-39.6%	<b>-44.6%</b>
<b>Bromley Family Court</b>	316	328	438	392	377	320	289	<b>-39</b>
Change %		3.8%	33.5%	-10.5%	-3.8%	-15.1%	-9.7%	<b>-11.9%</b>
<b>Central / Inner Family Court</b>	180	150	87	774	819	799	1,003	<b>853</b>
Change %		-16.7%	-42.0%	789.7%	5.8%	-2.4%	25.5%	<b>568.7%</b>
<b>Clerkenwell &amp; Shoreditch Family Court</b>	69	126	135	166	115	82	69	<b>-57</b>
Change %		82.6%	7.1%	23.0%	-30.7%	-28.7%	-15.9%	<b>-45.2%</b>
<b>Croydon Family Court</b>	382	349	439	436	368	442	385	<b>36</b>
Change %		-8.6%	25.8%	-0.7%	-15.6%	20.1%	-12.9%	<b>10.3%</b>
<b>East London Family Court</b>	0	0	0	99	267	485	1,043	<b>1,043</b>
Change %					169.7%	81.6%	115.1%	
<b>East London FPC</b>	137	140	89	0	0	0	0	<b>-140</b>
Change %		2.2%	-36.4%					<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Edmonton Family Court</b>	369	382	386	355	259	308	431	<b>49</b>
Change %		3.5%	1.0%	-8.0%	-27.0%	18.9%	39.9%	<b>12.8%</b>
<b>Ilford Family Court</b>	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %								
<b>Kingston Family Court</b>	114	156	141	148	92	92	97	<b>-59</b>
Change %		36.8%	-9.6%	5.0%	-37.8%	0.0%	5.4%	<b>-37.8%</b>
<b>Lambeth Family Court</b>	254	261	212	157	144	100	41	<b>-220</b>
Change %		2.8%	-18.8%	-25.9%	-8.3%	-30.6%	-59.0%	<b>-84.3%</b>
<b>North London FPC</b>	17	25	26	0	0	0	0	<b>-25</b>
Change %		47.1%	4.0%					<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>N.W.London FPC</b>	7	2	5	1	0	0	0	<b>-2</b>
Change %		-71.4%	150.0%	-80.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Principle Registry Family Court</b>	1,052	933	1,008	118	88	71	35	<b>-898</b>
Change %		-11.3%	8.0%	-88.3%	-25.4%	-19.3%	-50.7%	<b>-96.2%</b>
<b>Romford Family Court</b>	572	686	756	847	651	570	473	<b>-213</b>
Change %		19.9%	10.2%	12.0%	-23.1%	-12.4%	-17.0%	<b>-31.0%</b>

London Courts ...continued	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>S.E.London FPC</b>	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	-4
Change %		-20.0%	-50.0%					-100.0%
<b>South London FPC</b>	5	4	6	0	0	0	0	-4
Change %		-20.0%	50.0%					-100.0%
<b>South West London FPC</b>	173	185	103	2	0	0	0	-185
Change %		6.9%	-44.3%	-98.1%				-100.0%
<b>Uxbridge Family Court</b>	197	234	298	295	297	311	285	51
Change %		18.8%	27.4%	-1.0%	0.7%	4.7%	-8.4%	21.8%
<b>Uxbridge FPC</b>	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	-2
Change %		0.0%	0.0%					-100.0%
<b>Wandsworth Family Court</b>	91	112	166	158	184	134	107	-5
Change %		23.1%	48.2%	-4.8%	16.5%	-27.2%	-20.1%	-4.5%
<b>West London Family Court</b>	0	0	0	62	99	113	132	132
Change %					59.7%	14.1%	16.8%	
<b>Willesden Family Court</b>	207	190	203	136	91	78	90	-100
Change %		-8.2%	6.8%	-33.0%	-33.1%	-14.3%	15.4%	-52.6%
<b>Woolwich Family Court</b>	158	186	220	185	132	81	28	-158
Change %		17.7%	18.3%	-15.9%	-28.6%	-38.6%	-65.4%	-84.9%
<b>London</b>	<b>5,323</b>	<b>5,257</b>	<b>5,661</b>	<b>5,456</b>	<b>5,075</b>	<b>4,857</b>	<b>4,915</b>	<b>-342</b>
Change %		-1.2%	7.7%	-3.6%	-7.0%	-4.3%	1.2%	-6.5%

<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,526</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>23,735</b>	<b>23,528</b>	<b>23,925</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Change %		0.1%	18.3%	2.8%	-0.9%	1.7%	9.3%	34.0%

<b>Central / Inner Family Court</b>	180	150	87	774	819	799	1,003	853
<b>Principle Registry Family Court</b>	1,052	933	1,008	118	88	71	30	-903
<b>Royal Courts of Justice</b>	<b>1,232</b>	<b>1,083</b>	<b>1,095</b>	<b>892</b>	<b>907</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>1,033</b>	<b>-50</b>
Change %		-12.1%	1.1%	-18.5%	1.7%	-4.1%	18.7%	-4.6%

<b>East London Family Court</b>	0	0	0	99	267	485	1,043	1,043
<b>East London FPC</b>	137	140	89	0	0	0	0	-140
<b>East London Courts</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>1,043</b>	<b>903</b>
Change %		2.2%	-36.4%	11.2%	169.7%	81.6%	115.1%	645.0%



Midlands Courts	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Chesterfield Family Court</b>	19	23	28	24	47	19	34	11
Change %		21.1%	21.7%	-14.3%	95.8%	-59.6%	78.9%	47.8%
<b>Derby Family Court</b>	42	47	107	238	259	365	496	449
Change %		11.9%	127.7%	122.4%	8.8%	40.9%	35.9%	955.3%
<b>High Peak FPC</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change %								
<b>N.E. Derbyshire &amp; Dales FPC</b>	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	-1
Change %		0.0%						-100.0%
<b>South Derbyshire FPC</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change %								
<b>Leicester Family Court</b>	150	145	215	335	490	523	570	425
Change %		-3.3%	48.3%	55.8%	46.3%	6.7%	9.0%	293.1%
<b>Leicestershire FPC</b>	10	7	17	3	-	-	-	-7
Change %		-30.0%	142.9%	-82.4%				-100.0%
<b>Boston Family Court</b>	23	30	38	4	0	0	0	-30
Change %		30.4%	26.7%	-89.5%				-100.0%
<b>Lincoln Family Court</b>	41	29	25	35	20	115	221	192
Change %		-29.3%	-13.8%	40.0%	-42.9%	475.0%	92.2%	662.1%
<b>Lincoln FPC</b>	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Change %								
<b>Northampton Family Court</b>	236	196	275	345	413	404	475	279
Change %		-16.9%	40.3%	25.5%	19.7%	-2.2%	17.6%	142.3%
<b>Northamptonshire FPC</b>	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
Change %								
<b>Mansfield Family Court</b>	73	46	64	53	66	56	26	-20
Change %		-37.0%	39.1%	-17.2%	24.5%	-15.2%	-53.6%	-43.5%
<b>Mansfield FPC</b>	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Change %								
<b>Nottingham Family Court</b>	210	190	243	195	200	176	220	30
Change %		-9.5%	27.9%	-19.8%	2.6%	-12.0%	25.0%	15.8%
<b>Nottingham FPC</b>	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	-2
Change %		100.0%	-50.0%					-100.0%
<b>Burton-upon-Trent Family Court</b>	26	27	-	7	-	-	-	-27
Change %		3.8%						-100.0%
<b>North Staffordshire FPC</b>	3	0	19	0	0	0	0	0
Change %								
<b>South Staffordshire FPC</b>	27	21	20	-	-	-	-	-21
Change %		-22.2%	-4.8%					-100.0%
<b>Stafford Family Court</b>	242	210	156	223	179	0	0	-210
Change %		-13.2%	-25.7%	42.9%	-19.7%			-100.0%
<b>Stoke-On-Trent Family Court</b>	145	128	242	261	366	603	615	487
Change %		-11.7%	89.1%	7.9%	40.2%	64.8%	2.0%	380.5%
<b>Buckinghamshire FPC</b>	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Change %								
<b>Milton Keynes Family Court</b>	172	130	171	261	208	313	363	233
Change %		-24.4%	31.5%	52.6%	-20.3%	50.5%	16.0%	179.2%
<b>Warwickshire FPC</b>	128	95	75	49	42	0	0	-95
Change %		-25.8%	-21.1%	-34.7%	-14.3%	-100.0%		-100.0%
<b>Hereford Family Court</b>	10	10	17	18	-	-	-	-10
Change %		0.0%	70.0%	5.9%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Shrewsbury Family Court</b>	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Shrewsbury FPC</b>	8	11	14	-	-	-	-	-11
Change %		37.5%	27.3%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Telford Family Court</b>	48	44	49	164	140	111	70	26
Change %		-8.3%	11.4%	234.7%	-14.6%	-20.7%	-36.9%	59.1%
<b>Telford FPC</b>	12	12	9	3	-	-	-	-12
Change %		0.0%	-25.0%	-66.7%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Worcester Family Court</b>	146	83	106	114	125	172	242	159
Change %		-43.2%	27.7%	7.5%	9.6%	37.6%	40.7%	191.6%
<b>Worcester FPC</b>	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-1
Change %			0.0%					-100.0%

Midlands Courts ...continued	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Birmingham Family Courts</b>	356	549	1,015	1,649	1,894	1,381	1,967	<b>1,418</b>
Change %		54.2%	84.9%	62.5%	14.9%	-27.1%	42.4%	<b>258.3%</b>
<b>Birmingham FPC</b>	48	88	427	4	-	-	-	<b>-88</b>
Change %		83.3%	385.2%	-99.1%	-100.0%			<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Coventry Family Court</b>	281	236	299	325	366	452	441	<b>205</b>
Change %		-16.0%	26.7%	8.7%	12.6%	23.5%	-2.4%	<b>86.9%</b>
<b>Coventry FPC</b>	53	57	60	7	-	-	-	<b>-57</b>
Change %		7.5%	5.3%	-88.3%	-100.0%			<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Dudley Family Court</b>	39	34	49	10	0	0	0	<b>-34</b>
Change %		-12.8%	44.1%	-79.6%	-100.0%			<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Dudley FPC</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>0</b>
Change %								
<b>Solihull FPC</b>	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	<b>-11</b>
Change %		-31.3%	-100.0%					<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Walsall Family Court</b>	8	9	7	5	69	159	133	<b>124</b>
Change %		12.5%	-22.2%	-28.6%	1280.0%	130.4%	-16.4%	<b>1377.8%</b>
<b>Walsall FPC</b>	146	92	150	13	0	0	0	<b>-92</b>
Change %		-37.0%	63.0%	-91.3%	-100.0%			<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Warley FPC</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>0</b>
Change %								
<b>Wolverhampton Family Court</b>	23	16	31	750	714	692	655	<b>639</b>
Change %		-30.4%	93.8%	2319.4%	-4.8%	-3.1%	-5.3%	<b>3993.8%</b>
<b>Wolverhampton FPC</b>	143	130	254	10	-	-	-	<b>-130</b>
Change %		-9.1%	95.4%	-96.1%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Midlands</b>	<b>2,910</b>	<b>2,710</b>	<b>4,197</b>	<b>5,105</b>	<b>5,598</b>	<b>5,541</b>	<b>6,550</b>	<b>3,840</b>
Change %		<b>-6.9%</b>	<b>54.9%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>-1.0%</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>141.7%</b>
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,526</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>23,735</b>	<b>23,528</b>	<b>23,925</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Change %		<b>0.1%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>-0.9%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>
<b>Birmingham Family Court</b>	356	549	1,015	1,649	1,894	1,381	1,967	<b>1,418</b>
<b>Birmingham Family Proceedings Court</b>	48	88	427	4	0	0	0	<b>-88</b>
<b>Birmingham Family Courts</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>1,442</b>	<b>1,653</b>	<b>1,894</b>	<b>1,381</b>	<b>1,967</b>	<b>1,330</b>
Change %		<b>57.7%</b>	<b>126.4%</b>	<b>14.6%</b>	<b>14.6%</b>	<b>-27.1%</b>	<b>42.4%</b>	<b>208.8%</b>
<b>Coventry Family Court</b>	281	236	299	325	366	452	441	<b>205</b>
<b>Coventry Family Proceedings Court</b>	53	57	60	7	0	0	0	<b>-57</b>
<b>Coventry Family Courts</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>148</b>
Change %		<b>-12.3%</b>	<b>22.5%</b>	<b>-7.5%</b>	<b>10.2%</b>	<b>23.5%</b>	<b>-2.4%</b>	<b>50.5%</b>
<b>Leicester Family Court</b>	150	145	215	335	490	523	570	<b>425</b>
<b>Leicester Family Proceedings Court</b>	10	7	17	3	0	0	0	<b>-7</b>
<b>Leicester Family Courts</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>418</b>
Change %		<b>-5.0%</b>	<b>52.6%</b>	<b>45.7%</b>	<b>45.0%</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>275.0%</b>
<b>Telford Family Court</b>	48	44	49	164	140	111	70	<b>26</b>
<b>Telford Family Proceedings Court</b>	12	12	9	3	0	0	0	<b>-12</b>
<b>Telford Family Courts</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>14</b>
Change %		<b>-6.7%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>187.9%</b>	<b>-16.2%</b>	<b>-20.7%</b>	<b>-36.9%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>
<b>Walsall Family Court</b>	8	9	7	5	69	159	133	<b>124</b>
<b>Walsall FPC</b>	146	92	150	13	0	0	0	<b>-92</b>
<b>Walsall Family Courts</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>32</b>
Change %		<b>-34.4%</b>	<b>55.4%</b>	<b>-88.5%</b>	<b>283.3%</b>	<b>130.4%</b>	<b>-16.4%</b>	<b>31.7%</b>
<b>Wolverhampton Family Court</b>	19	17	28	504	811	680	655	<b>638</b>
<b>Wolverhampton Family Proceedings Court</b>	111	127	229	70	0	0	0	<b>-127</b>
<b>Wolverhampton Family Courts</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>574</b>	<b>811</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>655</b>	<b>511</b>
Change %		<b>10.8%</b>	<b>78.5%</b>	<b>123.3%</b>	<b>41.3%</b>	<b>-16.2%</b>	<b>-3.7%</b>	<b>354.9%</b>

North East Courts	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Hartlepool Family Court</b>	55	70	91	57	60	26	-	<b>70</b>
Change %		27.3%	30.0%	-37.4%	5.3%	-56.7%	-100.0%	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Hartlepool FPC</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Middlesbrough Family Court</b>	320	288	322	372	321	306	382	<b>94</b>
Change %		-10.0%	11.8%	15.5%	-13.7%	-4.7%	24.8%	<b>32.6%</b>
<b>Teesside FPC</b>	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	<b>-4</b>
Change %		-42.9%	-100.0%					<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Bishop Auckland Family Court</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>-</b>
Change %								
<b>Consett Family Court</b>	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Darlington Family Court</b>	46	56	35	30	15	37	37	<b>-19</b>
Change %		21.7%	-37.5%	-14.3%	-50.0%	146.7%	0.0%	<b>-33.9%</b>
<b>Durham Family Court</b>	105	90	106	89	88	98	101	<b>11</b>
Change %		-14.3%	17.8%	-16.0%	-1.1%	11.4%	3.1%	<b>12.2%</b>
<b>Newton Aycliffe Family Court</b>	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	<b>0</b>
Change %				-100.0%				
<b>North Durham FPC</b>	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %		-100.0%		-100.0%				
<b>South Durham FPC</b>	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	<b>-1</b>
Change %			100.0%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>East Yorkshire FPC</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %								
<b>Great Grimsby Family Court</b>	3	1	15	19	-	62	133	<b>132</b>
Change %		-66.7%	1400.0%	26.7%	-100.0%		114.5%	<b>13200.0%</b>
<b>Hull &amp; Holderness FPC</b>	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %				-100.0%				
<b>Kingston-upon-Hull Family Court</b>	296	192	220	224	255	237	185	<b>-7</b>
Change %		-35.1%	14.6%	1.8%	13.8%	-7.1%	-21.9%	<b>-3.6%</b>
<b>North Lincolnshire FPC</b>	0	13	2	0	0	0	0	<b>-13</b>
Change %			-84.6%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Scunthorpe Family Court</b>	63	72	88	137	73	50	-	<b>-72</b>
Change %		14.3%	22.2%	55.7%	-46.7%	-31.5%	-100.0%	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Harrogate &amp; Skipton FPC</b>	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %		-100.0%		-100.0%				
<b>Harrogate Family Court</b>	71	80	90	63	52	50	64	<b>-16</b>
Change %		12.7%	12.5%	-30.0%	-17.5%	-3.8%	28.0%	<b>-20.0%</b>
<b>Scarborough Family Court</b>	41	50	24	42	65	61	70	<b>20</b>
Change %		22.0%	-52.0%	75.0%	54.8%	-6.2%	14.8%	<b>40.0%</b>
<b>Scarborough FPC</b>	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>0</b>
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Skipton Family Court</b>	45	133	124	90	0	10	25	<b>-108</b>
Change %		195.6%	-6.8%	-27.4%	-100.0%		150.0%	<b>-81.2%</b>
<b>Skipton FPC</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>0</b>
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>York &amp; Selby FPC</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %								
<b>York Family Court</b>	102	64	75	113	120	125	107	<b>43</b>
Change %		-37.3%	17.2%	50.7%	6.2%	4.2%	-14.4%	<b>67.2%</b>
<b>Berwick-upon-Tweed FPC</b>	13	7	4	12	0	0	0	<b>-7</b>
Change %		-46.2%	-42.9%	200.0%	-100.0%			<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>City Of Sunderland FPC</b>	6	5	2	-	-	-	-	<b>-5</b>
Change %		-16.7%	-60.0%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Gateshead Family Court</b>	56	36	40	19	22	7	0	<b>-36</b>
Change %		-35.7%	11.1%	-52.5%	15.8%	-68.2%	-100.0%	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Gateshead FPC</b>	4	1	2	-	-	-	-	<b>-1</b>
Change %		-75.0%	100.0%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Mid &amp; S.E. Northumberland FPC</b>	0	2	6	1	0	0	0	<b>-2</b>
Change %			200.0%	-83.3%	-100.0%			<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Morpeth &amp; Berwick Family Court</b>	88	62	57	54	34	-	-	<b>-62</b>
Change %		-29.5%	-8.1%	-5.3%	-37.0%	-100.0%		<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Newcastle &amp; Tynedale FPC</b>	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %		0.0%	200.0%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Newcastle-upon-Tyne Family Court</b>	294	274	194	199	229	279	302	<b>10.2%</b>
Change %		-6.8%	-29.2%	2.6%	15.1%	21.8%	8.2%	

North East Courts ...continued	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>North Shields Family Court</b>	105	85	90	69	50	53	37	
Change %		-19.0%	5.9%	-23.3%	-27.5%	6.0%	-30.2%	<b>-56.5%</b>
<b>North Tyneside FPC</b>	4	5	7	-	-	-	-	
Change %		25.0%	40.0%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>South Shields Family Court</b>	29	36	36	32	8	13	7	
Change %		24.1%	0.0%	-11.1%	-75.0%	62.5%	-46.2%	<b>-80.6%</b>
<b>South Tyneside FPC</b>	1	6	-	-	-	-	-	
Change %		500.0%	-100.0%					<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Sunderland Family Court</b>	102	80	116	77	47	70	75	
Change %		-21.6%	45.0%	-33.6%	-39.0%	48.9%	7.1%	<b>-6.3%</b>
<b>Barnsley Family Court</b>	26	46	41	37	32	73	99	
Change %		76.9%	-10.9%	-9.8%	-13.5%	128.1%	35.6%	<b>115.2%</b>
<b>Doncaster Family Court</b>	44	39	41	33	36	101	135	
Change %		-11.4%	5.1%	-19.5%	9.1%	180.6%	33.7%	<b>246.2%</b>
<b>Doncaster FPC</b>	3	3	2	-	-	-	-	
Change %		0.0%	-33.3%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Rotherham Family Court</b>	36	40	72	47	44	27	0	
Change %		11.1%	80.0%	-34.7%	-6.4%	-38.6%	-100.0%	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Rotherham FPC</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
Change %			-100.0%					<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Sheffield Family Court</b>	68	91	142	118	162	286	341	
Change %		33.8%	56.0%	-16.9%	37.3%	76.5%	19.2%	<b>274.7%</b>
<b>Sheffield FPC</b>	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	
Change %		-50.0%	-100.0%					<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Bradford &amp; Keighley FPC</b>	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	
Change %		-33.3%	-50.0%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Bradford Family Court</b>	466	482	492	487	493	584	772	
Change %		3.4%	2.1%	-1.0%	1.2%	18.5%	32.2%	<b>60.2%</b>
<b>Dewsbury Family Court</b>	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Halifax Family Court</b>	157	150	191	178	174	91	-	
Change %		-4.5%	27.3%	-6.8%	-2.2%	-47.7%	-100.0%	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Halifax FPC</b>	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Huddersfield Family Court</b>	67	139	127	101	114	158	315	
Change %		107.5%	-8.6%	-20.5%	12.9%	38.6%	99.4%	<b>126.6%</b>
<b>Keighley Family Court</b>	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Kirklees FPC</b>	-	2	4	-	-	-	-	
Change %			100.0%					<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Leeds District FPC</b>	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	
Change %		-20.0%	75.0%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Leeds Family Court</b>	359	376	462	429	344	296	362	
Change %		4.7%	22.9%	-7.1%	-19.8%	-14.0%	22.3%	<b>-3.7%</b>
<b>Pontefract Family Court</b>	44	10	0	0	0	0	0	
Change %		-77.3%	-100.0%					<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Pontefract FPC</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Wakefield Family Court</b>	92	107	129	105	108	88	105	
Change %		16.3%	20.6%	-18.6%	2.9%	-18.5%	19.3%	
<b>Wakefield FPC</b>	1	1	8	1	-	-	-	
Change %		0.0%	700.0%	-87.5%	-100.0%			<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>North East</b>	<b>3,439</b>	<b>3,208</b>	<b>3,481</b>	<b>3,241</b>	<b>2,946</b>	<b>3,188</b>	<b>3,662</b>	<b>454</b>
Change %		<b>-6.7%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>-6.9%</b>	<b>-9.1%</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>14.9%</b>	<b>14.2%</b>
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,526</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>23,735</b>	<b>23,528</b>	<b>23,925</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Change %		<b>0.1%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>-0.9%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>
<b>Sheffield Family Court</b>	68	91	142	118	162	286	341	<b>250</b>
<b>Sheffield FPC</b>	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	<b>-1</b>
<b>Sheffield Family Courts</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>249</b>
Change %		<b>31.4%</b>	<b>54.3%</b>	<b>-16.9%</b>	<b>37.3%</b>	<b>76.5%</b>	<b>19.2%</b>	<b>270.7%</b>
<b>Wakefield Family Court</b>	92	107	129	105	108	88	105	<b>-2</b>
<b>Wakefield FPC</b>	1	1	8	1	0	0	0	<b>-1</b>
<b>Wakefield Family Court</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>-3</b>
Change %		<b>16.1%</b>	<b>26.9%</b>	<b>-22.6%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>-18.5%</b>	<b>19.3%</b>	<b>-2.8%</b>

North West Courts	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Chester Family Court</b>	61	59	65	97	103	89	134	<b>75</b>
Change %		-3.3%	10.2%	49.2%	6.2%	-13.6%	50.6%	<b>127.1%</b>
<b>Crewe Family Court</b>	70	100	127	108	63	43	65	<b>-35</b>
Change %		42.9%	27.0%	-15.0%	-41.7%	-31.7%	51.2%	<b>-35.0%</b>
<b>Macclesfield Family Court</b>	26	44	37	17	21	8	-	<b>- 44</b>
Change %		69.2%	-15.9%	-54.1%	23.5%	-61.9%	-100.0%	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Macclesfield FPC</b>	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	<b>-1</b>
Change %		#DIV/0!	100.0%	-50.0%	-100.0%			<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>South Cheshire FPC</b>	1	3	6	-	-	-	-	<b>3</b>
Change %		200.0%	100.0%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Warrington &amp; Halton FPC</b>	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Warrington Family Court</b>	71	105	114	85	80	42	-	<b>- 105</b>
Change %		47.9%	8.6%	-25.4%	-5.9%	-47.5%	-100.0%	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>West Cheshire FPC</b>	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	<b>-1</b>
Change %		-50.0%	0.0%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Barrow-In-Furness Family Court</b>	12	14	20	32	14	17	18	<b>4</b>
Change %		16.7%	42.9%	60.0%	-56.3%	21.4%	5.9%	<b>28.6%</b>
<b>Carlisle Family Court</b>	14	18	2	16	10	18	7	<b>-11</b>
Change %		28.6%	-88.9%	700.0%	-37.5%	80.0%	-61.1%	<b>-61.1%</b>
<b>Kendal Family Court</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>-</b>
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>North Cumbria FPC</b>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	<b>-1</b>
Change %			-100.0%					<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>West Cumbria Family Court</b>	12	3	2	6	-	26	15	<b>12</b>
Change %		-75.0%	-33.3%	200.0%	-100.0%		-42.3%	<b>400.0%</b>
<b>Altrincham Family Court</b>	61	91	109	81	59	14	0	<b>0</b>
Change %		49.2%	19.8%	-25.7%	-27.2%	-76.3%	-100.0%	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Bolton Family Court</b>	82	100	157	57	48	7	-	<b>-100</b>
Change %		22.0%	57.0%	-63.7%	-15.8%	-85.4%	-100.0%	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Bolton FPC</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Bury Family Court</b>	16	40	63	1	-	-	-	<b>-40</b>
Change %		150.0%	57.5%	-98.4%	-100.0%			<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Leigh Family Court</b>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Manchester &amp; Salford FPC</b>	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	<b>-1</b>
Change %		0.0%	200.0%	-100.0%				<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>Manchester Family Court</b>	248	254	433	603	599	649	633	<b>379</b>
Change %		2.4%	70.5%	39.3%	-0.7%	8.3%	-2.5%	<b>149.2%</b>
<b>Oldham Family Court</b>	61	82	119	151	162	182	64	<b>-18</b>
Change %		34.4%	45.1%	26.9%	7.3%	12.3%	-64.8%	<b>-22.0%</b>
<b>Salford Family Court</b>	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Change %		-100.0%						

North West Courts ...continued	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Stockport Family Court</b>	53	64	70	49	40	49	52	-12
Change %		20.8%	9.4%	-30.0%	-18.4%	22.5%	6.1%	-18.8%
<b>Stockport FPC</b>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	-1
Change %			-100.0%					-100.0%
<b>Tameside Family Court</b>	26	23	10	2	7	-	-	-23
Change %		-11.5%	-56.5%	-80.0%	250.0%	-100.0%		-100.0%
<b>Wigan &amp; Leigh FPC</b>	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Change %			-100.0%					
<b>Wigan Family Court</b>	101	127	143	134	164	306	321	194
Change %		25.7%	12.6%	-6.3%	22.4%	86.6%	4.9%	152.8%
<b>Accrington Family Court</b>	2	9	5	0	0	0	0	-9
Change %		350.0%	-44.4%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Blackburn Family Court</b>	293	250	242	166	193	230	285	35
Change %		-14.7%	-3.2%	-31.4%	16.3%	19.2%	23.9%	14.0%
<b>Blackpool Family Court</b>	88	94	127	144	174	88	146	52
Change %		6.8%	35.1%	13.4%	20.8%	-49.4%	65.9%	55.3%
<b>Burnley Family Court</b>	118	111	114	-	-	-	-	-111
Change %		-5.9%	2.7%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Central &amp; S.W. Lancashire FPC</b>	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Change %			-100.0%					
<b>East Lancashire FPC</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Fylde Coast &amp; North Lancs FPC</b>	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	-2
Change %			50.0%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Lancaster Family Court</b>	20	17	36	14	18	10	19	2
Change %		-15.0%	111.8%	-61.1%	28.6%	-44.4%	90.0%	11.8%
<b>Preston Family Court</b>	36	50	84	87	71	152	121	71
Change %		38.9%	68.0%	3.6%	-18.4%	114.1%	-20.4%	142.0%
<b>Rawtenstall Family Court</b>	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Birkenhead Family Court</b>	139	142	189	108	137	135	134	-8
Change %		2.2%	33.1%	-42.9%	26.9%	-1.5%	-0.7%	-5.6%
<b>Liverpool Family Court</b>	305	300	400	419	366	445	682	382
Change %		-1.6%	33.3%	4.8%	-12.6%	21.6%	53.3%	127.3%
<b>Merseyside FPC</b>	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	-2
Change %		-66.7%	300.0%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Southport Family Court</b>	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>St.Helens Family Court</b>	72	121	139	123	155	193	317	196
Change %		68.1%	14.9%	-11.5%	26.0%	24.5%	64.2%	162.0%
<b>North West</b>	<b>2,012</b>	<b>2,230</b>	<b>2,833</b>	<b>2,501</b>	<b>2,484</b>	<b>2,703</b>	<b>3,024</b>	<b>794</b>
Change %		10.8%	27.0%	-11.7%	-0.7%	8.8%	11.9%	35.6%
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,526</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>23,735</b>	<b>23,528</b>	<b>23,925</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Change %		0.1%	18.3%	2.8%	-0.9%	1.7%	9.3%	34.0%



South East Courts	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Bedford Family Court</b>	77	76	45	51	68	61	93	17
Change %		-1.3%	-40.8%	13.3%	33.3%	-10.3%	52.5%	22.4%
<b>Bedfordshire FPC</b>	5	4	8	0	0	0	0	-4
Change %		-20.0%	100.0%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Luton Family Court</b>	252	182	234	218	293	375	368	186
Change %		-27.8%	28.6%	-6.8%	34.4%	28.0%	-1.9%	102.2%
<b>Cambridge Family Court</b>	163	121	139	167	63	9	0	-121
Change %		-25.8%	14.9%	20.1%	-62.3%	-85.7%	-100.0%	-100.0%
<b>North Cambridgeshire FPC</b>	2	3	8	-	-	-	-	3
Change %		50.0%	166.7%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Peterborough Family Court</b>	79	56	83	128	180	183	198	142
Change %		-29.1%	48.2%	54.2%	40.6%	1.7%	8.2%	253.6%
<b>South Cambridgeshire FPC</b>	-	3	2	-	-	-	-	3
Change %			-33.3%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Chelmsford Family Court</b>	141	235	328	295	276	366	493	258
Change %		66.7%	39.6%	-10.1%	-6.4%	32.6%	34.7%	109.8%
<b>Colchester Family Court</b>	170	152	158	161	129	155	199	47
Change %		-10.6%	3.9%	1.9%	-19.9%	20.2%	28.4%	30.9%
<b>Essex FPC</b>	6	13	17	2	0	0	0	-13
Change %		116.7%	30.8%	-88.2%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Southend Family Court</b>	82	187	256	236	227	224	226	39
Change %		128.0%	36.9%	-7.8%	-3.8%	-1.3%	0.9%	20.9%
<b>Harlow Family Court</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Change %								
<b>Hertford Family Court</b>	75	91	118	123	98	59	191	100
Change %		21.3%	29.7%	4.2%	-20.3%	-39.8%	223.7%	109.9%
<b>Hitchin Family Court</b>	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>North and East Herts FPC</b>	6	4	1	-	-	-	-	4
Change %		-33.3%	-75.0%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Watford Family Court</b>	224	326	345	396	339	361	345	19
Change %		45.5%	5.8%	14.8%	-14.4%	6.5%	-4.4%	5.8%
<b>West and Central Herts FPC</b>	2	2	7	1	-	-	-	2
Change %		0.0%	250.0%	-85.7%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>West Herts FPC</b>	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	-2
Change %		0.0%	-100.0%					-100.0%
<b>Canterbury Family Court</b>	176	154	222	233	354	342	339	185
Change %		-12.5%	44.2%	5.0%	51.9%	-3.4%	-0.9%	120.1%
<b>Central Kent FPC</b>	25	36	41	2	0	0	0	-36
Change %		44.0%	13.9%	-95.1%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Dartford Family Court</b>	222	227	281	293	273	285	267	40
Change %		2.3%	23.8%	4.3%	-6.8%	4.4%	-6.3%	17.6%
<b>East Kent FPC</b>	13	16	3	0	0	0	0	-16
Change %		23.1%	-81.3%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Maidstone Family Court</b>	89	69	88	96	82	131	188	119
Change %		-22.5%	27.5%	9.1%	-14.6%	59.8%	43.5%	172.5%
<b>Medway Family Court</b>	123	149	182	262	406	389	354	205
Change %		21.1%	22.1%	44.0%	55.0%	-4.2%	-9.0%	137.6%
<b>North Kent FPC</b>	40	73	85	1	-	-	-	73
Change %		82.5%	16.4%	-98.8%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Thanet Family Court</b>	42	53	85	80	86	43	7	-46
Change %		26.2%	60.4%	-5.9%	7.5%	-50.0%	-83.7%	-86.8%
<b>Tunbridge Wells Family Court</b>	84	94	104	117	119	57	-	94
Change %		11.9%	10.6%	12.5%	1.7%	-52.1%	-100.0%	-100.0%
<b>Great Yarmouth FPC</b>	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	-1
Change %		-75.0%	200.0%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Kings Lynn Family Court</b>	43	40	19	47	23	-	-	40
Change %		-7.0%	-52.5%	147.4%	-51.1%	-100.0%		-100.0%
<b>Kings Lynn FPC</b>	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	-2
Change %		100.0%	0.0%	-100.0%				-100.0%

South East Courts ...continued	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Norwich Family Court</b>	195	191	107	168	109	128	195	4
Change %		-2.1%	-44.0%	57.0%	-35.1%	17.4%	52.3%	2.1%
<b>Norwich FPC</b>	10	14	8	1	0	0	0	-14
Change %		40.0%	-42.9%	-87.5%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Bury St.Edmunds Family Court</b>	35	35	34	54	76	70	28	-7
Change %		0.0%	-2.9%	58.8%	40.7%	-7.9%	-60.0%	-20.0%
<b>Ipswich Family Court</b>	61	89	72	45	47	27	0	-89
Change %		45.9%	-19.1%	-37.5%	4.4%	-42.6%	-100.0%	-100.0%
<b>Lowestoft Family Court</b>	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Suffolk FPC</b>	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Change %								
<b>Epsom Family Court</b>	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Guildford Family Court</b>	103	118	127	184	184	287	237	119
Change %		14.6%	7.6%	44.9%	0.0%	56.0%	-17.4%	100.8%
<b>Reigate Family Court</b>	77	89	89	13	-	-	-	-89
Change %		15.6%	0.0%	-85.4%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Staines Family Court</b>	54	85	78	55	20	0	0	-85
Change %		57.4%	-8.2%	-29.5%	-63.6%	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	-100.0%
<b>Surrey FPC</b>	3	5	2	-	-	-	-	-5
Change %		66.7%	-60.0%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Brighton Family Court</b>	90	120	104	167	220	198	309	189
Change %		33.3%	-13.3%	60.6%	31.7%	-10.0%	56.1%	157.5%
<b>Chichester Family Court</b>	21	47	43	76	70	55	73	26
Change %		123.8%	-8.5%	76.7%	-7.9%	-21.4%	32.7%	55.3%
<b>Eastbourne Family Court</b>	39	37	35	58	94	91	48	11
Change %		-5.1%	-5.4%	65.7%	62.1%	-3.2%	-47.3%	29.7%
<b>Hastings Family Court</b>	70	67	85	150	178	245	407	340
Change %		-4.3%	26.9%	76.5%	18.7%	37.6%	66.1%	507.5%
<b>Horsham Family Court</b>	44	69	83	53	54	88	125	56
Change %		56.8%	20.3%	-36.1%	1.9%	63.0%	42.0%	81.2%
<b>Horsham FPC</b>	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change %								
<b>Sussex (Central) FPC</b>	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	-1
Change %			100.0%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Sussex (Eastern) FPC</b>	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Change %			-100.0%					
<b>Sussex (Western) FPC</b>	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	-2
Change %		100.0%	-100.0%					-100.0%
<b>Worthing Family Court</b>	45	41	52	62	70	47	66	25
Change %		-8.9%	26.8%	19.2%	12.9%	-32.9%	40.4%	61.0%
<b>Berkshire FPC</b>	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	-1
Change %		-50.0%	100.0%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Oxford Family Court</b>	87	124	166	172	148	208	140	16
Change %		42.5%	33.9%	3.6%	-14.0%	40.5%	-32.7%	12.9%
<b>Oxfordshire FPC</b>	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	-1
Change %		0.0%	0.0%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Reading Family Court</b>	176	197	225	228	179	185	159	-38
Change %		11.9%	14.2%	1.3%	-21.5%	3.4%	-14.1%	-19.3%
<b>Slough Family Court</b>	221	166	249	278	187	197	173	7
Change %		-24.9%	50.0%	11.6%	-32.7%	5.3%	-12.2%	4.2%
<b>South East</b>	<b>3,509</b>	<b>3,870</b>	<b>4,430</b>	<b>4,673</b>	<b>4,652</b>	<b>4,866</b>	<b>5,246</b>	<b>1,376</b>
Change %		10.3%	14.5%	5.5%	-0.4%	4.6%	7.8%	35.6%
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,526</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>23,735</b>	<b>23,528</b>	<b>23,925</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Change %		0.1%	18.3%	2.8%	-0.9%	1.7%	9.3%	34.0%

South West Courts	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Bath &amp; Wansdyke FPC</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change %								
<b>Bath Family Court</b>	20	18	38	30	0	0	0	-18
Change %		-10.0%	111.1%	-21.1%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Bristol Family Court</b>	217	193	208	256	249	309	387	194
Change %		-11.1%	7.8%	23.1%	-2.7%	24.1%	25.2%	100.5%
<b>Bristol FPC</b>	4	6	5	1	0	0	0	-6
Change %		50.0%	-16.7%	-80.0%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>North Somerset FPC</b>	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Change %								
<b>South Somerset &amp; Mendip FPC</b>	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Taunton Deane and Sedgemoor FPC</b>	-	3	2	-	-	-	-	3
Change %			-33.3%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Taunton Family Court</b>	51	41	52	69	66	100	109	68
Change %		-19.6%	26.8%	32.7%	-4.3%	51.5%	9.0%	165.9%
<b>Weston-Super-Mare Family Court</b>	61	61	67	73	69	10	-	61
Change %		0.0%	9.8%	9.0%	-5.5%	-85.5%	-100.0%	-100.0%
<b>Yeovil Family Court</b>	42	31	36	32	25	40	69	38
Change %		-26.2%	16.1%	-11.1%	-21.9%	60.0%	72.5%	122.6%
<b>Barnstaple Family Court</b>	24	25	25	36	24	28	23	2
Change %		4.2%	0.0%	44.0%	-33.3%	16.7%	-17.9%	-8.0%
<b>Bodmin Family Court</b>	18	7	8	7	0	7	0	-7
Change %		-61.1%	14.3%	-12.5%	-100.0%		-100.0%	-100.0%
<b>Cornwall (Truro) FPC</b>	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Exeter Family Court</b>	96	90	86	131	73	129	102	12
Change %		-6.3%	-4.4%	52.3%	-44.3%	76.7%	-20.9%	13.3%
<b>Penzance Family Court</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change %								
<b>Plymouth Family Court</b>	179	150	161	107	81	105	86	-64
Change %		-16.2%	7.3%	-33.5%	-24.3%	29.6%	-18.1%	-42.7%
<b>S &amp; W Devon (Plymouth) FPC</b>	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Change %		-50.0%	-100.0%					-100.0%
<b>Torquay &amp; Newton Abbot Family Court</b>	36	30	7	6	14	16	25	-5
Change %		-16.7%	-76.7%	-14.3%	133.3%	14.3%	56.3%	-16.7%
<b>Truro Family Court</b>	88	63	65	92	87	86	100	37
Change %		-28.4%	3.2%	41.5%	-5.4%	-1.1%	16.3%	58.7%

South West Courts ...continued	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Bournemouth &amp; Poole Family Court</b>	283	274	295	412	377	255	286	12
Change %		-3.2%	7.7%	39.7%	-8.5%	-32.4%	12.2%	4.4%
<b>Dorset FPC</b>	6	6	11	-	-	-	-	6
Change %		0.0%	83.3%	-100.0%				-100.0%
<b>Weymouth Family Court</b>	67	126	130	139	103	120	64	
Change %		88.1%	3.2%	6.9%	-25.9%	16.5%	-46.7%	-49.2%
<b>Gloucester &amp; Cheltenham Family Court</b>	115	125	152	166	172	93	105	
Change %		8.7%	21.6%	9.2%	3.6%	-45.9%	12.9%	-16.0%
<b>Aldershot &amp; Farnham Family Court</b>	87	120	130	139	114	150	128	
Change %		37.9%	8.3%	6.9%	-18.0%	31.6%	-14.7%	6.7%
<b>Basingstoke Family Court</b>	30	39	54	78	109	97	125	
Change %		30.0%	38.5%	44.4%	39.7%	-11.0%	28.9%	220.5%
<b>Newport (IOW) Family Court</b>	9	10	19	35	51	65	19	
Change %		11.1%	90.0%	84.2%	45.7%	27.5%	-70.8%	90.0%
<b>Portsmouth Family Court</b>	128	139	161	140	142	165	162	
Change %		8.6%	15.8%	-13.0%	1.4%	16.2%	-1.8%	16.5%
<b>South &amp; South East Hants FPC</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Southampton Family Court</b>	227	199	247	241	414	370	302	
Change %		-12.3%	24.1%	-2.4%	71.8%	-10.6%	-18.4%	51.8%
<b>West Hants FPC</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Change %		-100.0%						
<b>Winchester Family Court</b>	18	6	7	13	-	11	17	
Change %		-66.7%	16.7%	85.7%	-100.0%		54.5%	183.3%
<b>Chippenham &amp; Trowbridge Family Court</b>	32	35	26	5	0	0	0	
Change %		9.4%	-25.7%	-80.8%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Salisbury Family Court</b>	45	53	22	15	-	-	-	
Change %		17.8%	-58.5%	-31.8%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Swindon Family Court</b>	97	51	111	176	150	175	221	
Change %		-47.4%	117.6%	58.6%	-14.8%	16.7%	26.3%	333.3%
<b>Wiltshire FPC</b>	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	
Change %		100.0%	-100.0%					-100.0%
<b>South West</b>	1,991	1,904	2,128	2,399	2,320	2,331	2,337	433
Change %		-4.4%	11.8%	12.7%	-3.3%	0.5%	0.3%	22.7%
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	19,507	19,526	23,098	23,735	23,528	23,925	26,156	6,630
Change %		0.1%	18.3%	2.8%	-0.9%	1.7%	9.3%	34.0%

Welsh Courts	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Aberystwyth Family Court</b>	5	4	2	3	-	-	-	-4
Change %		-20.0%	-50.0%	50.0%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Brecknock Family Court</b>	5	1	2	3	0	0	0	-1
Change %		-80.0%	100.0%	50.0%				-100.0%
<b>Haverfordwest Family Court</b>	7	20	18	27	-	6	7	-13
Change %		185.7%	-10.0%	50.0%	-100.0%		16.7%	-65.0%
<b>Llanelli Family Court</b>	18	13	25	14	0	0	12	-1
Change %		-27.8%	92.3%	-44.0%	-100.0%			-7.7%
<b>Welshpool Family Court</b>	6	10	1	5	-	-	-	-10
Change %		66.7%	-90.0%	400.0%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Welshpool FPC</b>	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Change %			-100.0%					
<b>Carmarthen Family Court</b>	5	7	7	26	-	-	-	-7
Change %		40.0%	0.0%	271.4%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Blackwood Family Court</b>	15	33	18	20	8	0	0	-33
Change %		120.0%	-45.5%	11.1%	-60.0%	-100.0%		-100.0%
<b>Newport (Gwent) Family Court</b>	22	33	24	23	43	46	43	10
Change %		50.0%	-27.3%	-4.2%	87.0%	7.0%	-6.5%	30.3%
<b>Caernarfon Family Court</b>	24	7	25	9	17	38	8	1
Change %		-70.8%	257.1%	-64.0%	88.9%	123.5%	-78.9%	14.3%
<b>Flintshire FPC</b>	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	0
Change %								
<b>Llangefni Family Court</b>	22	28	21	12	0	0	0	-28
Change %		27.3%	-25.0%	-42.9%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Prestatyn Justice Centre</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	11
Change %								
<b>Rhyl Family Court</b>	33	34	40	32	31	0	0	-34
Change %		3.0%	17.6%	-20.0%	-3.1%	-100.0%		-100.0%
<b>Wrexham Family Court</b>	53	30	38	27	26	32	38	8
Change %		-43.4%	26.7%	-28.9%	-3.7%	23.1%	18.8%	26.7%
<b>Wrexham FPC</b>	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Change %		-100.0%		-100.0%				
<b>Bridgend Family Court</b>	3	5	7	6	-	-	-	-5
Change %		66.7%	40.0%	-14.3%	-100.0%			-100.0%
<b>Bridgend FPC</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Change %								
<b>Cardiff &amp; The Vale FPC</b>	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	0
Change %			-100.0%					
<b>Cardiff Family Court</b>	32	32	41	43	36	28	35	3
Change %		0.0%	28.1%	4.9%	-16.3%	-22.2%	25.0%	9.4%
<b>Merthyr Tydfil Family Court</b>	11	5	3	12	12	12	8	3
Change %		-54.5%	-40.0%	300.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-33.3%	60.0%
<b>Pontypridd Family Court</b>	20	16	37	37	7	0	0	-16
Change %		-20.0%	131.3%	0.0%	-81.1%	-100.0%		-100.0%
<b>Pontypridd FPC</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-1
Change %		-100.0%						-100.0%
<b>Port Talbot Family Court</b>	10	28	28	16	16	9	8	-20
Change %		180.0%	0.0%	-42.9%	0.0%	-43.8%	-11.1%	-71.4%
<b>Swansea Family Court</b>	31	40	21	32	7	39	20	-20
Change %		29.0%	-47.5%	52.4%	-78.1%	457.1%	-48.7%	-50.0%
<b>Swansea FPC</b>	0	1	0	0	8	0	0	-1
Change %			-100.0%			-100.0%		-100.0%
<b>Wales</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>-158</b>
Change %		7.7%	5.7%	-5.7%	-39.2%	-0.5%	-9.5%	-45.4%
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,526</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>23,735</b>	<b>23,528</b>	<b>23,925</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Change %		0.1%	18.3%	2.8%	-0.9%	1.7%	9.3%	34.0%

**Tables of Non-Molestation Orders by Police Region**  
 Year-on-year changes with comparisons to national totals

London	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
London	5,323	5,257	5,661	5,456	5,075	4,857	4,915	-342
Change %		-1.2%	7.7%	-3.6%	-7.0%	-4.3%	1.2%	-6.5%

Midlands Police Forces	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Derbyshire</b>	64	71	135	262	306	384	530	459
Change %		10.9%	90.1%	94.1%	16.8%	25.5%	38.0%	646.5%
<b>Leicestershire</b>	224	211	296	377	510	638	791	580
Change %		-5.8%	40.3%	27.4%	35.3%	25.1%	24.0%	274.9%
<b>Northamptonshire</b>	236	196	283	345	413	404	475	279
Change %		-16.9%	44.4%	21.9%	19.7%	-2.2%	17.6%	142.3%
<b>Nottinghamshire</b>	287	238	309	248	266	232	246	8
Change %		-17.1%	29.8%	-19.7%	7.3%	-12.8%	6.0%	3.4%
<b>Staffordshire</b>	443	386	437	491	545	603	615	229
Change %		-12.9%	13.2%	12.4%	11.0%	10.6%	2.0%	59.3%
<b>Thames Valley</b>	172	130	174	261	208	313	363	233
Change %		-24.4%	33.8%	50.0%	-20.3%	50.5%	16.0%	179.2%
<b>Warwickshire</b>	128	95	75	49	42	0	0	-95
Change %		-25.8%	-21.1%	-34.7%	-14.3%			-100.0%
<b>West Mercia</b>	242	161	196	299	265	283	312	151
Change %		-33.5%	21.7%	52.6%	-11.4%	6.8%	10.2%	93.8%
<b>West Midlands</b>	1,114	1,222	2,292	2,773	3,043	2,684	3,196	1,974
Change %		9.7%	87.6%	21.0%	9.7%	-11.8%	19.1%	161.5%
<b>All Midlands Police Forces</b>	2,910	2,710	4,197	5,105	5,598	5,541	6,550	3,840
Change %		-6.9%	54.9%	21.6%	9.7%	-1.0%	18.2%	141.7%

<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	19,507	19,526	23,098	23,735	23,528	23,925	26,156	6,630
Change %		0.1%	18.3%	2.8%	-0.9%	1.7%	9.3%	34.0%



North East Police Forces	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Cleveland</b>	383	362	413	429	381	332	382	<b>20</b>
Change %		-5.5%	14.1%	3.9%	-11.2%	-12.9%	15.1%	<b>5.5%</b>
<b>Durham</b>	164	147	147	125	103	135	138	<b>-9</b>
Change %		-10.4%	0.0%	-15.0%	-17.6%	31.1%	2.2%	<b>-6.1%</b>
<b>Humberside</b>	363	278	326	380	328	349	318	<b>40</b>
Change %		-23.4%	17.3%	16.6%	-13.7%	6.4%	-8.9%	<b>14.4%</b>
<b>North Yorkshire</b>	269	327	316	308	237	246	266	<b>-61</b>
Change %		21.6%	-3.4%	-2.5%	-23.1%	3.8%	8.1%	<b>-18.7%</b>
<b>Northumbria</b>	703	600	557	463	390	422	421	<b>-179</b>
Change %		-14.7%	-7.2%	-16.9%	-15.8%	8.2%	-0.2%	<b>-29.8%</b>
<b>South Yorkshire</b>	179	221	298	235	274	487	575	<b>354</b>
Change %		23.5%	34.8%	-21.1%	16.6%	77.7%	18.1%	<b>160.2%</b>
<b>West Yorkshire</b>	1,378	1,273	1,424	1,301	1,233	1,217	1,554	<b>281</b>
Change %		-7.6%	11.9%	-8.6%	-5.2%			<b>22.1%</b>
<b>North East Police Forces</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>-3</b>
Change %		<b>16.1%</b>	<b>26.9%</b>	<b>-22.6%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>-18.5%</b>	<b>19.3%</b>	<b>-2.8%</b>

<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,526</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>23,735</b>	<b>23,528</b>	<b>23,925</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Change %		<b>0.1%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>-0.9%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>

North West Police Forces	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Cheshire</b>	234	313	352	308	267	182	199	<b>-114</b>
Change %		33.8%	12.5%	-12.5%	-13.3%	-31.8%	9.3%	<b>-36.4%</b>
<b>Cumbria</b>	39	36	24	54	24	61	40	<b>4</b>
Change %		-7.7%	-33.3%	125.0%	-55.6%	154.2%	-34.4%	<b>11.1%</b>
<b>Greater Manchester</b>	655	783	1,108	1,078	1,079	1,207	1,070	<b>287</b>
Change %		19.5%	41.5%	-2.7%	0.1%	11.9%	-11.4%	<b>36.7%</b>
<b>Lancashire</b>	560	533	613	411	456	480	571	<b>38</b>
Change %		-4.8%	15.0%	-33.0%	10.9%	5.3%	19.0%	<b>7.1%</b>
<b>Merseyside</b>	524	565	736	650	658	773	1,133	<b>568</b>
Change %		7.8%	30.3%	-11.7%	1.2%	17.5%	46.6%	<b>100.5%</b>
<b>North West Police Forces</b>	<b>2,012</b>	<b>2,230</b>	<b>2,833</b>	<b>2,501</b>	<b>2,484</b>	<b>2,703</b>	<b>3,024</b>	<b>794</b>
Change %		<b>10.8%</b>	<b>27.0%</b>	<b>-11.7%</b>	<b>-0.7%</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>35.6%</b>

<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,526</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>23,735</b>	<b>23,528</b>	<b>23,925</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Change %		<b>0.1%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>-0.9%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>

South East Police Forces	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Bedfordshire</b>	334	262	287	269	361	436	461	199
Change %		-21.6%	9.5%	-6.3%	34.2%	20.8%	5.7%	76.0%
<b>Cambridgeshire</b>	244	183	232	295	243	192	198	15
Change %		-25.0%	26.8%	27.2%	-17.6%	-21.0%	3.1%	8.2%
<b>Essex</b>	399	587	759	694	632	745	918	331
Change %		47.1%	29.3%	-8.6%	-8.9%	17.9%	23.2%	56.4%
<b>Hertfordshire</b>	316	425	471	520	437	420	536	111
Change %		34.5%	10.8%	10.4%	-16.0%	-3.9%	27.6%	26.1%
<b>Kent</b>	814	871	1,091	1,084	1,320	1,247	1,155	284
Change %		7.0%	25.3%	-0.6%	21.8%	-5.5%	-7.4%	32.6%
<b>Norfolk</b>	253	248	139	216	132	128	195	-53
Change %		-2.0%	-44.0%	55.4%	-38.9%	-3.0%	52.3%	-21.4%
<b>Suffolk</b>	100	124	107	99	123	97	28	-96
Change %		24.0%	-13.7%	-7.5%	24.2%	-21.1%	-71.1%	-77.4%
<b>Surrey</b>	250	297	296	252	204	287	237	-60
Change %		18.8%	-0.3%	-14.9%	-19.0%	40.7%	-17.4%	-20.2%
<b>Sussex</b>	312	384	405	566	686	724	1,028	644
Change %		23.1%	5.5%	39.8%	21.2%	5.5%	42.0%	167.7%
<b>Thames Valley</b>	487	489	643	678	514	590	472	-17
Change %		0.4%	31.5%	5.4%	-24.2%	14.8%	-20.0%	-3.5%
<b>South East Police Forces</b>	<b>3,509</b>	<b>3,870</b>	<b>4,430</b>	<b>4,673</b>	<b>4,652</b>	<b>4,866</b>	<b>5,246</b>	<b>1,376</b>
Change %		10.3%	14.5%	5.5%	-0.4%	4.6%	7.8%	35.6%
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,526</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>23,735</b>	<b>23,528</b>	<b>23,925</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Change %		0.1%	18.3%	2.8%	-0.9%	1.7%	9.3%	34.0%

South West Police Forces	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Avon &amp; Somerset</b>	399	353	409	461	409	459	565	<b>212</b>
Change %		-11.5%	15.9%	12.7%	-11.3%	12.2%	23.1%	<b>60.1%</b>
<b>Devon &amp; Cornwall</b>	445	366	354	379	279	371	336	<b>-30</b>
Change %		-17.8%	-3.3%	7.1%	-26.4%	33.0%	-9.4%	<b>-8.2%</b>
<b>Dorset</b>	356	406	436	551	480	375	350	<b>-56</b>
Change %		14.0%	7.4%	26.4%	-12.9%	-21.9%	-6.7%	<b>-13.8%</b>
<b>Gloucestershire</b>	115	125	152	166	172	93	105	<b>-20</b>
Change %		8.7%	21.6%	9.2%	3.6%	-45.9%	12.9%	<b>-16.0%</b>
<b>Hampshire</b>	501	513	618	646	830	858	753	<b>240</b>
Change %		2.4%	20.5%	4.5%	28.5%	3.4%	-12.2%	<b>46.8%</b>
<b>Wiltshire</b>	175	141	159	196	150	175	221	<b>80</b>
Change %		-19.4%	12.8%	23.3%	-23.5%	16.7%	26.3%	<b>56.7%</b>
<b>South West Police Forces</b>	<b>1,991</b>	<b>1,904</b>	<b>2,128</b>	<b>2,399</b>	<b>2,320</b>	<b>2,331</b>	<b>2,337</b>	<b>433</b>
Change %		<b>-4.4%</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>-3.3%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>22.7%</b>
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,526</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>23,735</b>	<b>23,528</b>	<b>23,925</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Change %		<b>0.1%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>-0.9%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>

Welsh Police Forces	2011/12 Total	2012/13 Total	2013/14 Total	2014/15 Total	2015/16 Total	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	17/18 v 12/13
<b>Dyfed Powys</b>	46	55	56	78	0	6	19	<b>-36</b>
Change %		19.6%	1.8%	39.3%	-100.0%		216.7%	<b>-65.5%</b>
<b>Gwent</b>	37	66	42	43	51	46	43	<b>-23</b>
Change %		78.4%	-36.4%	2.4%	18.6%	-9.8%	-6.5%	<b>-34.8%</b>
<b>North Wales</b>	133	99	132	80	74	70	57	<b>-42</b>
Change %		-25.6%	33.3%	-39.4%	-7.5%	-5.4%	-18.6%	<b>-42.4%</b>
<b>South Wales</b>	107	128	138	146	86	88	71	<b>-57</b>
Change %		19.6%	7.8%	5.8%	-41.1%	2.3%	-19.3%	<b>-44.5%</b>
<b>Welsh Police Forces</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>-158</b>
Change %		7.7%	5.7%	-5.7%	-39.2%	-0.5%	-9.5%	<b>-45.4%</b>
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>19,507</b>	<b>19,526</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>23,735</b>	<b>23,528</b>	<b>23,925</b>	<b>26,156</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Change %		0.1%	18.3%	2.8%	-0.9%	1.7%	9.3%	<b>34.0%</b>

15<sup>th</sup> October 2018

### **Families Need Fathers - because both parents matter**

FNF is a registered UK national charity providing information and support on shared parenting issues arising from family breakdown, and support to divorced and separated parents, irrespective of gender or marital status. FNF is NOT a fathers' rights group - we support the best interests of children - namely mature and collaborative parenting by both parents - an objective which is inadequately promoted in the family court system and associated services.

Our primary concern is the maintenance of the child's meaningful relationship with both parents.

Founded in 1974, FNF helps thousands of parents every year.

