MONCKTON CHAMBERS

ACTING "PROMPTLY" AND "PRE-PROMPTLY": *HOLLERAN* SUMMARISES SOME NEW AND FAMILIAR CONCEPTS IN PROCUREMENT LAW

By Jennifer Skilbeck
March 2005

The issue

Most practitioners used to believe that as long as proceedings for a breach of the Procurement Regulations were brought within three months of the alleged breach the court would be unlikely to find them out of time[1]. No-one believes that any longer, but the question is how promptly must they be brought? Must they be brought before the necessary evidence can reasonably be collected and considered? Must they be brought before the complainant has had time to consider the full implications of litigation dispassionately?

If the alleged breach occurs early in the procedure it can in principle be remedied. The pressure is on complainants to apply for an injunction at that time or lose their right to a remedy altogether. *Holleran v Severn Trent Water* (QBD, 4 November 2004) concerned such a situation and provides a useful recent summary of the relevant law. Holleran were excluded from a procurement procedure for which they had failed, in substance, to apply at the relevant time, and about which they claimed they were inadequately informed.

When grounds first arise

"Grounds first arise" when the unlawful decision was taken. The Judge held that the substantive alleged breach was the dispatch of the notice to the OJEU on 12th May, (rather than its publication on 20th May). Proceedings were issued on 10th November, (as soon as advice was sought), well beyond the three month limit. The judge dismissed Holleran's attempts to find later breaches in order to bring the actual claim within a three month period. Even in respect of the later alleged breaches the judge expressed the view that the requirement to bring proceedings promptly required that they should have been brought within a few days of the relevant events, not just within three months.

[1] All the Regulations require that "proceedings are brought promptly and in any event within 3 months from the date when grounds first arose unless the Court considers that there is good reason for extending the period within which proceedings may be brought". They all contain a further provision that proceedings may not be brought unless the claimant has previously informed the other party of the alleged breaches and their intention of bringing proceedings.

Monckton Chambers
1 & 2 Raymond Buildings
Gray's Inn
London WC1R 5NR

Tel 020 7405 7211
Fax 020 7405 2084
DX LDE 257

chambers@monckton.com
www.monckton.com

The letter before action

The Judge set out the importance of the letter before action, noting that even in the absence of any statutory provision for a specific period of time between it and beginning proceedings, it was not an "empty formality". That letter therefore had to be sent "pre-promptly" to give the contracting authority or utility an opportunity to remedy the defect (§§46-49).

The extension of time and "prejudice"

The Judge considered whether there were grounds for extending time (§§50-55). The scope of "good reason" could not be defined or circumscribed; relevant factors might include the length and reasons for the delay, the extent to which the claimant or defendant contributed to the delay, and prejudice. Ignorance of the law or the exercise of commercial judgment were not grounds for extension of time. The delay in issuing proceedings was accounted for by Holleran's other commitments in connection with other procurements.

Perhaps of greatest interest in *Holleran* is the issue of prejudice. When damages only are claimed, or claimed in the alternative, it is difficult to see where the prejudice to the defendant or third parties lies. The Judge held "the effect of a damages claim on a complex contracts process and its unsettling disruption of it is prejudice enough". He seemed to indicate that since the re-running of the competition after the announcement of the successful candidates would have been difficult an extension of time would amount to prejudice even in a damages claim.
That interpretation contrasts sharply with two recent cases against the European Commission in respect of their own procurements that were subject to judicial review. Injunctions were not urgently required "to avoid serious and irredeemable damage": Case T-303/04 *European Dynamics v Commission*; Case T-447/04R *Capgemini Nederland BV v Commission*. English courts will, by contrast, regard damages as an inadequate remedy where what is lost is a chance of success.

Implications for practitioners

There is little doubt that time will be extended in some cases, notably when the claimant could not have known of the decision, or where the defendant deliberately obfuscates. But what about the normal case when during a procurement process a number of possible breaches may occur? Is it realistic that within a few days of actual knowledge the tenderer issue a letter before action followed swiftly by injunctive proceedings? Must a tenderer take time out from a procurement process to start proceedings which are likely in practice to finish his chances of ultimate success in winning the tender? The current interpretation is contrary to the current approach to civil proceedings which are designed to avoid an over hasty rush into litigation where possible.

If proceedings have to be brought precipitately by way of an injunction, claimants will be deterred from taking action, and not just because of the fear of the cross-undertaking in damages. Contracting authorities and utilities will then only have to wait a few days before they can carry on with the alleged unlawful procedure without significant fear of challenge. An emphasis on injunctive relief is just what the Commission wants, though ironically compliance with the law would probably be better achieved if the normal legal procedures applied and tenderers could wait and see whether they were successful before making a claim and follow the pre-action protocols. Ill-considered challenges started in the heat of the moment would be avoided.

For the practitioner acting for the claimant the law increasingly requires exceptionally swift action, and perhaps a great deal of ingenuity in bringing the client who has hesitated within the time limits. The contracting authority or utility, on the other hand, can, by following a transparent procedure, expect to deflect claims more easily. Meanwhile all parties will suffer from the attenuation of "promptness", and the uncertainty consequent upon the compensating importance of the Court's discretion to extend time.

For more information on Jennifer Skilbeck, please contact the Clerks on 020 7405 7211 or consult the 'Find a Barrister' Section on www.monckton.com.

MONCKTON CHAMBERS

ACTING "PROMPTLY" AND "PRE-PROMPTLY": *HOLLERAN* SUMMARISES SOME NEW AND FAMILIAR CONCEPTS IN PROCUREMENT LAW

By Jennifer Skilbeck
March 2005

The issue

Most practitioners used to believe that as long as proceedings for a breach of the Procurement Regulations were brought within three months of the alleged breach the court would be unlikely to find them out of time[1]. No-one believes that any longer, but the question is how promptly must they be brought? Must they be brought before the necessary evidence can reasonably be collected and considered? Must they be brought before the complainant has had time to consider the full implications of litigation dispassionately?

If the alleged breach occurs early in the procedure it can in principle be remedied. The pressure is on complainants to apply for an injunction at that time or lose their right to a remedy altogether. *Holleran v Severn Trent Water* (QBD, 4 November 2004) concerned such a situation and provides a useful recent summary of the relevant law. Holleran were excluded from a procurement procedure for which they had failed, in substance, to apply at the relevant time, and about which they claimed they were inadequately informed.

When grounds first arise

"Grounds first arise" when the unlawful decision was taken. The Judge held that the substantive alleged breach was the dispatch of the notice to the OJEU on 12th May, (rather than its publication on 20th May). Proceedings were issued on 10th November, (as soon as advice was sought), well beyond the three month limit. The judge dismissed Holleran's attempts to find later breaches in order to bring the actual claim within a three month period. Even in respect of the later alleged breaches the judge expressed the view that the requirement to bring proceedings promptly required that they should have been brought within a few days of the relevant events, not just within three months.

[1] All the Regulations require that "proceedings are brought promptly and in any event within 3 months from the date when grounds first arose unless the Court considers that there is good reason for extending the period within which proceedings may be brought". They all contain a further provision that proceedings may not be brought unless the claimant has previously informed the other party of the alleged breaches and their intention of bringing proceedings.

Monckton Chambers
1 & 2 Raymond Buildings
Gray's Inn
London WC1R 5NR

Tel 020 7405 7211
Fax 020 7405 2084
DX LDE 257

chambers@monckton.com
www.monckton.com

The letter before action

The Judge set out the importance of the letter before action, noting that even in the absence of any statutory provision for a specific period of time between it and beginning proceedings, it was not an "empty formality". That letter therefore had to be sent "pre-promptly" to give the contracting authority or utility an opportunity to remedy the defect (§§46-49).

The extension of time and "prejudice"

The Judge considered whether there were grounds for extending time (§§50-55). The scope of "good reason" could not be defined or circumscribed; relevant factors might include the length and reasons for the delay, the extent to which the claimant or defendant contributed to the delay, and prejudice. Ignorance of the law or the exercise of commercial judgment were not grounds for extension of time. The delay in issuing proceedings was accounted for by Holleran's other commitments in connection with other procurements.

Perhaps of greatest interest in *Holleran* is the issue of prejudice. When damages only are claimed, or claimed in the alternative, it is difficult to see where the prejudice to the defendant or third parties lies. The Judge held "the effect of a damages claim on a complex contracts process and its unsettling disruption of it is prejudice enough". He seemed to indicate that since the re-running of the competition after the announcement of the successful candidates would have been difficult an extension of time would amount to prejudice even in a damages claim.
That interpretation contrasts sharply with two recent cases against the European Commission in respect of their own procurements that were subject to judicial review. Injunctions were not urgently required "to avoid serious and irredeemable damage": Case T-303/04 *European Dynamics v Commission*; Case T-447/04R *Capgemini Nederland BV v Commission*. English courts will, by contrast, regard damages as an inadequate remedy where what is lost is a chance of success.

Implications for practitioners

There is little doubt that time will be extended in some cases, notably when the claimant could not have known of the decision, or where the defendant deliberately obfuscates. But what about the normal case when during a procurement process a number of possible breaches may occur? Is it realistic that within a few days of actual knowledge the tenderer issue a letter before action followed swiftly by injunctive proceedings? Must a tenderer take time out from a procurement process to start proceedings which are likely in practice to finish his chances of ultimate success in winning the tender? The current interpretation is contrary to the current approach to civil proceedings which are designed to avoid an over hasty rush into litigation where possible.

If proceedings have to be brought precipitately by way of an injunction, claimants will be deterred from taking action, and not just because of the fear of the cross-undertaking in damages. Contracting authorities and utilities will then only have to wait a few days before they can carry on with the alleged unlawful procedure without significant fear of challenge. An emphasis on injunctive relief is just what the Commission wants, though ironically compliance with the law would probably be better achieved if the normal legal procedures applied and tenderers could wait and see whether they were successful before making a claim and follow the pre-action protocols. Ill-considered challenges started in the heat of the moment would be avoided.

For the practitioner acting for the claimant the law increasingly requires exceptionally swift action, and perhaps a great deal of ingenuity in bringing the client who has hesitated within the time limits. The contracting authority or utility, on the other hand, can, by following a transparent procedure, expect to deflect claims more easily. Meanwhile all parties will suffer from the attenuation of "promptness", and the uncertainty consequent upon the compensating importance of the Court's discretion to extend time.

For more information on Jennifer Skilbeck, please contact the Clerks on 020 7405 7211 or consult the 'Find a Barrister' Section on www.monckton.com.

MONCKTON CHAMBERS

ACTING "PROMPTLY" AND "PRE-PROMPTLY": *HOLLERAN* SUMMARISES SOME NEW AND FAMILIAR CONCEPTS IN PROCUREMENT LAW

By Jennifer Skilbeck
March 2005

The issue

Most practitioners used to believe that as long as proceedings for a breach of the Procurement Regulations were brought within three months of the alleged breach the court would be unlikely to find them out of time[1]. No-one believes that any longer, but the question is how promptly must they be brought? Must they be brought before the necessary evidence can reasonably be collected and considered? Must they be brought before the complainant has had time to consider the full implications of litigation dispassionately?

If the alleged breach occurs early in the procedure it can in principle be remedied. The pressure is on complainants to apply for an injunction at that time or lose their right to a remedy altogether. *Holleran v Severn Trent Water* (QBD, 4 November 2004) concerned such a situation and provides a useful recent summary of the relevant law. Holleran were excluded from a procurement procedure for which they had failed, in substance, to apply at the relevant time, and about which they claimed they were inadequately informed.

When grounds first arise

"Grounds first arise" when the unlawful decision was taken. The Judge held that the substantive alleged breach was the dispatch of the notice to the OJEU on 12th May, (rather than its publication on 20th May). Proceedings were issued on 10th November, (as soon as advice was sought), well beyond the three month limit. The judge dismissed Holleran's attempts to find later breaches in order to bring the actual claim within a three month period. Even in respect of the later alleged breaches the judge expressed the view that the requirement to bring proceedings promptly required that they should have been brought within a few days of the relevant events, not just within three months.

[1] All the Regulations require that "proceedings are brought promptly and in any event within 3 months from the date when grounds first arose unless the Court considers that there is good reason for extending the period within which proceedings may be brought". They all contain a further provision that proceedings may not be brought unless the claimant has previously informed the other party of the alleged breaches and their intention of bringing proceedings.

Monckton Chambers
1 & 2 Raymond Buildings
Gray's Inn
London WC1R 5NR

Tel 020 7405 7211
Fax 020 7405 2084
DX LDE 257

chambers@monckton.com
www.monckton.com

The letter before action

The Judge set out the importance of the letter before action, noting that even in the absence of any statutory provision for a specific period of time between it and beginning proceedings, it was not an "empty formality". That letter therefore had to be sent "pre-promptly" to give the contracting authority or utility an opportunity to remedy the defect (§§46-49).

The extension of time and "prejudice"

The Judge considered whether there were grounds for extending time (§§50-55). The scope of "good reason" could not be defined or circumscribed; relevant factors might include the length and reasons for the delay, the extent to which the claimant or defendant contributed to the delay, and prejudice. Ignorance of the law or the exercise of commercial judgment were not grounds for extension of time. The delay in issuing proceedings was accounted for by Holleran's other commitments in connection with other procurements.

Perhaps of greatest interest in *Holleran* is the issue of prejudice. When damages only are claimed, or claimed in the alternative, it is difficult to see where the prejudice to the defendant or third parties lies. The Judge held "the effect of a damages claim on a complex contracts process and its unsettling disruption of it is prejudice enough". He seemed to indicate that since the re-running of the competition after the announcement of the successful candidates would have been difficult an extension of time would amount to prejudice even in a damages claim.
That interpretation contrasts sharply with two recent cases against the European Commission in respect of their own procurements that were subject to judicial review. Injunctions were not urgently required "to avoid serious and irredeemable damage": Case T-303/04 *European Dynamics v Commission*; Case T-447/04R *Capgemini Nederland BV v Commission*. English courts will, by contrast, regard damages as an inadequate remedy where what is lost is a chance of success.

Implications for practitioners

There is little doubt that time will be extended in some cases, notably when the claimant could not have known of the decision, or where the defendant deliberately obfuscates. But what about the normal case when during a procurement process a number of possible breaches may occur? Is it realistic that within a few days of actual knowledge the tenderer issue a letter before action followed swiftly by injunctive proceedings? Must a tenderer take time out from a procurement process to start proceedings which are likely in practice to finish his chances of ultimate success in winning the tender? The current interpretation is contrary to the current approach to civil proceedings which are designed to avoid an over hasty rush into litigation where possible.

If proceedings have to be brought precipitately by way of an injunction, claimants will be deterred from taking action, and not just because of the fear of the cross-undertaking in damages. Contracting authorities and utilities will then only have to wait a few days before they can carry on with the alleged unlawful procedure without significant fear of challenge. An emphasis on injunctive relief is just what the Commission wants, though ironically compliance with the law would probably be better achieved if the normal legal procedures applied and tenderers could wait and see whether they were successful before making a claim and follow the pre-action protocols. Ill-considered challenges started in the heat of the moment would be avoided.

For the practitioner acting for the claimant the law increasingly requires exceptionally swift action, and perhaps a great deal of ingenuity in bringing the client who has hesitated within the time limits. The contracting authority or utility, on the other hand, can, by following a transparent procedure, expect to deflect claims more easily. Meanwhile all parties will suffer from the attenuation of "promptness", and the uncertainty consequent upon the compensating importance of the Court's discretion to extend time.

For more information on Jennifer Skilbeck, please contact the Clerks on 020 7405 7211 or consult the 'Find a Barrister' Section on www.monckton.com.

MONCKTON CHAMBERS

ACTING "PROMPTLY" AND "PRE-PROMPTLY": *HOLLERAN* SUMMARISES SOME NEW AND FAMILIAR CONCEPTS IN PROCUREMENT LAW

By Jennifer Skilbeck
March 2005

The issue

Most practitioners used to believe that as long as proceedings for a breach of the Procurement Regulations were brought within three months of the alleged breach the court would be unlikely to find them out of time[1]. No-one believes that any longer, but the question is how promptly must they be brought? Must they be brought before the necessary evidence can reasonably be collected and considered? Must they be brought before the complainant has had time to consider the full implications of litigation dispassionately?

If the alleged breach occurs early in the procedure it can in principle be remedied. The pressure is on complainants to apply for an injunction at that time or lose their right to a remedy altogether. *Holleran v Severn Trent Water* (QBD, 4 November 2004) concerned such a situation and provides a useful recent summary of the relevant law. Holleran were excluded from a procurement procedure for which they had failed, in substance, to apply at the relevant time, and about which they claimed they were inadequately informed.

When grounds first arise

"Grounds first arise" when the unlawful decision was taken. The Judge held that the substantive alleged breach was the dispatch of the notice to the OJEU on 12th May, (rather than its publication on 20th May). Proceedings were issued on 10th November, (as soon as advice was sought), well beyond the three month limit. The judge dismissed Holleran's attempts to find later breaches in order to bring the actual claim within a three month period. Even in respect of the later alleged breaches the judge expressed the view that the requirement to bring proceedings promptly required that they should have been brought within a few days of the relevant events, not just within three months.

[1] All the Regulations require that "proceedings are brought promptly and in any event within 3 months from the date when grounds first arose unless the Court considers that there is good reason for extending the period within which proceedings may be brought". They all contain a further provision that proceedings may not be brought unless the claimant has previously informed the other party of the alleged breaches and their intention of bringing proceedings.

Monckton Chambers
1 & 2 Raymond Buildings
Gray's Inn
London WC1R 5NR

Tel 020 7405 7211
Fax 020 7405 2084
DX LDE 257

chambers@monckton.com
www.monckton.com

The letter before action

The Judge set out the importance of the letter before action, noting that even in the absence of any statutory provision for a specific period of time between it and beginning proceedings, it was not an "empty formality". That letter therefore had to be sent "pre-promptly" to give the contracting authority or utility an opportunity to remedy the defect (§§46-49).

The extension of time and "prejudice"

The Judge considered whether there were grounds for extending time (§§50-55). The scope of "good reason" could not be defined or circumscribed; relevant factors might include the length and reasons for the delay, the extent to which the claimant or defendant contributed to the delay, and prejudice. Ignorance of the law or the exercise of commercial judgment were not grounds for extension of time. The delay in issuing proceedings was accounted for by Holleran's other commitments in connection with other procurements.

Perhaps of greatest interest in *Holleran* is the issue of prejudice. When damages only are claimed, or claimed in the alternative, it is difficult to see where the prejudice to the defendant or third parties lies. The Judge held "the effect of a damages claim on a complex contracts process and its unsettling disruption of it is prejudice enough". He seemed to indicate that since the re-running of the competition after the announcement of the successful candidates would have been difficult an extension of time would amount to prejudice even in a damages claim.
That interpretation contrasts sharply with two recent cases against the European Commission in respect of their own procurements that were subject to judicial review. Injunctions were not urgently required "to avoid serious and irredeemable damage": Case T-303/04 *European Dynamics v Commission*; Case T-447/04R *Capgemini Nederland BV v Commission*. English courts will, by contrast, regard damages as an inadequate remedy where what is lost is a chance of success.

Implications for practitioners

There is little doubt that time will be extended in some cases, notably when the claimant could not have known of the decision, or where the defendant deliberately obfuscates. But what about the normal case when during a procurement process a number of possible breaches may occur? Is it realistic that within a few days of actual knowledge the tenderer issue a letter before action followed swiftly by injunctive proceedings? Must a tenderer take time out from a procurement process to start proceedings which are likely in practice to finish his chances of ultimate success in winning the tender? The current interpretation is contrary to the current approach to civil proceedings which are designed to avoid an over hasty rush into litigation where possible.

If proceedings have to be brought precipitately by way of an injunction, claimants will be deterred from taking action, and not just because of the fear of the cross-undertaking in damages. Contracting authorities and utilities will then only have to wait a few days before they can carry on with the alleged unlawful procedure without significant fear of challenge. An emphasis on injunctive relief is just what the Commission wants, though ironically compliance with the law would probably be better achieved if the normal legal procedures applied and tenderers could wait and see whether they were successful before making a claim and follow the pre-action protocols. Ill-considered challenges started in the heat of the moment would be avoided.

For the practitioner acting for the claimant the law increasingly requires exceptionally swift action, and perhaps a great deal of ingenuity in bringing the client who has hesitated within the time limits. The contracting authority or utility, on the other hand, can, by following a transparent procedure, expect to deflect claims more easily. Meanwhile all parties will suffer from the attenuation of "promptness", and the uncertainty consequent upon the compensating importance of the Court's discretion to extend time.

For more information on Jennifer Skilbeck, please contact the Clerks on 020 7405 7211 or consult the 'Find a Barrister' Section on www.monckton.com.

MONCKTON CHAMBERS

ACTING "PROMPTLY" AND "PRE-PROMPTLY": *HOLLERAN* SUMMARISES SOME NEW AND FAMILIAR CONCEPTS IN PROCUREMENT LAW

By Jennifer Skilbeck
March 2005

The issue

Most practitioners used to believe that as long as proceedings for a breach of the Procurement Regulations were brought within three months of the alleged breach the court would be unlikely to find them out of time[1]. No-one believes that any longer, but the question is how promptly must they be brought? Must they be brought before the necessary evidence can reasonably be collected and considered? Must they be brought before the complainant has had time to consider the full implications of litigation dispassionately?

If the alleged breach occurs early in the procedure it can in principle be remedied. The pressure is on complainants to apply for an injunction at that time or lose their right to a remedy altogether. *Holleran v Severn Trent Water* (QBD, 4 November 2004) concerned such a situation and provides a useful recent summary of the relevant law. Holleran were excluded from a procurement procedure for which they had failed, in substance, to apply at the relevant time, and about which they claimed they were inadequately informed.

When grounds first arise

"Grounds first arise" when the unlawful decision was taken. The Judge held that the substantive alleged breach was the dispatch of the notice to the OJEU on 12th May, (rather than its publication on 20th May). Proceedings were issued on 10th November, (as soon as advice was sought), well beyond the three month limit. The judge dismissed Holleran's attempts to find later breaches in order to bring the actual claim within a three month period. Even in respect of the later alleged breaches the judge expressed the view that the requirement to bring proceedings promptly required that they should have been brought within a few days of the relevant events, not just within three months.

[1] All the Regulations require that "proceedings are brought promptly and in any event within 3 months from the date when grounds first arose unless the Court considers that there is good reason for extending the period within which proceedings may be brought". They all contain a further provision that proceedings may not be brought unless the claimant has previously informed the other party of the alleged breaches and their intention of bringing proceedings.

Monckton Chambers
1 & 2 Raymond Buildings
Gray's Inn
London WC1R 5NR

Tel 020 7405 7211
Fax 020 7405 2084
DX LDE 257

chambers@monckton.com
www.monckton.com

The letter before action

The Judge set out the importance of the letter before action, noting that even in the absence of any statutory provision for a specific period of time between it and beginning proceedings, it was not an "empty formality". That letter therefore had to be sent "pre-promptly" to give the contracting authority or utility an opportunity to remedy the defect (§§46-49).

The extension of time and "prejudice"

The Judge considered whether there were grounds for extending time (§§50-55). The scope of "good reason" could not be defined or circumscribed; relevant factors might include the length and reasons for the delay, the extent to which the claimant or defendant contributed to the delay, and prejudice. Ignorance of the law or the exercise of commercial judgment were not grounds for extension of time. The delay in issuing proceedings was accounted for by Holleran's other commitments in connection with other procurements.

Perhaps of greatest interest in *Holleran* is the issue of prejudice. When damages only are claimed, or claimed in the alternative, it is difficult to see where the prejudice to the defendant or third parties lies. The Judge held "the effect of a damages claim on a complex contracts process and its unsettling disruption of it is prejudice enough". He seemed to indicate that since the re-running of the competition after the announcement of the successful candidates would have been difficult an extension of time would amount to prejudice even in a damages claim.
That interpretation contrasts sharply with two recent cases against the European Commission in respect of their own procurements that were subject to judicial review. Injunctions were not urgently required "to avoid serious and irredeemable damage": Case T-303/04 *European Dynamics v Commission*; Case T-447/04R *Capgemini Nederland BV v Commission*. English courts will, by contrast, regard damages as an inadequate remedy where what is lost is a chance of success.

Implications for practitioners

There is little doubt that time will be extended in some cases, notably when the claimant could not have known of the decision, or where the defendant deliberately obfuscates. But what about the normal case when during a procurement process a number of possible breaches may occur? Is it realistic that within a few days of actual knowledge the tenderer issue a letter before action followed swiftly by injunctive proceedings? Must a tenderer take time out from a procurement process to start proceedings which are likely in practice to finish his chances of ultimate success in winning the tender? The current interpretation is contrary to the current approach to civil proceedings which are designed to avoid an over hasty rush into litigation where possible.

If proceedings have to be brought precipitately by way of an injunction, claimants will be deterred from taking action, and not just because of the fear of the cross-undertaking in damages. Contracting authorities and utilities will then only have to wait a few days before they can carry on with the alleged unlawful procedure without significant fear of challenge. An emphasis on injunctive relief is just what the Commission wants, though ironically compliance with the law would probably be better achieved if the normal legal procedures applied and tenderers could wait and see whether they were successful before making a claim and follow the pre-action protocols. Ill-considered challenges started in the heat of the moment would be avoided.

For the practitioner acting for the claimant the law increasingly requires exceptionally swift action, and perhaps a great deal of ingenuity in bringing the client who has hesitated within the time limits. The contracting authority or utility, on the other hand, can, by following a transparent procedure, expect to deflect claims more easily. Meanwhile all parties will suffer from the attenuation of "promptness", and the uncertainty consequent upon the compensating importance of the Court's discretion to extend time.

For more information on Jennifer Skilbeck, please contact the Clerks on 020 7405 7211 or consult the 'Find a Barrister' Section on www.monckton.com.